

---

**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. 1324-A**

**1940 October 28**

**New York City, NY –  
Madison Square Garden Address**

SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT  
MADISON SQUARE GARDEN  
NEW YORK CITY  
OCTOBER 28, 1940

---

Tonight I take up again the public duty -- the far from disagreeable duty -- of answering major campaign falsifications with facts.

Last week in Philadelphia, I nailed the falsehood about some fanciful secret treaties, to dry on the barn door. I nailed that falsehood and other falsehoods the way when I was a boy up in Dutchess County, we used to nail up the skins of foxes and weasels.

Tonight I am going to nail up the falsifications that have to do with our relations with the rest of the world, and with the building up of our army, navy and air defense. It is a very dangerous thing to distort facts about such things.

If repeated over and over again, it is ~~more~~ apt to create a sense of fear and doubt in the minds of some of the American people.

I now brand as false the statement being made by Republican campaign orators, day after day and night after night, that the rearming of America was slow, that it is hamstrung and impeded, that it will never be able to meet threats from abroad.

That particular misstatement was invented about the time of the Republican National Convention. Before that, the responsible Republican leaders had been singing an entirely different song. For almost seven years the Republican leaders in the Congress kept on saying that I was placing too much emphasis on national defense.

And now today these men of great vision have suddenly discovered that there is a war on in Europe and another one in Asia. And so, now, always with their eyes on the good old ballot box, they are charging that we have placed too little emphasis on national defense.

(910)

But, unlike them, the printed pages of the Congressional Record cannot be changed or suppressed at election time. And based on that permanent record of their speeches and their votes, I make this assertion -- that if the Republican leaders had been in control of the Congress of the United States during the past seven years, the important measures for our defense would not now be law; and that the Army and Navy of the United States would still be in almost the same condition in which I found them in 1933.

I make these charges against the responsible political leadership of the Republican Party. There are millions of patriotic Republicans who have at all times been in sympathy with the efforts of this Administration to arm itself adequately for defense.

To Washington in the past few months have come not two or three or a dozen, but several hundred of the best business executives in the United States -- Republicans and Democrats alike.

Not holding company lawyers or executives, but men experienced in actual production -- production of all the types of machines and tools and steel that have made this nation the industrial leader of the world.

I asked Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Stettinius and Mr. Harriman and Mr. Budd and the many others to serve because I believe they are certainly among the ablest men in the country in their own fields. I do not know their politics. I do not care about their politics. All I know is that they are cooperating one hundred per cent with this Administration in our efforts for national defense. And this Government is cooperating with them -- one hundred per cent.

All of these men -- all of American industry and American labor -- are doing magnificent and unselfish work. The progress today proves it.

I shall have occasion in a later speech to tell more about the work they are doing, and about the progress which has been made in our defense.

When the first World War ended we were one of the strongest naval and military powers in the world. When this Administration first came into office fifteen years later, we were one of the weakest.

As early as 1933 the storm was gathering in Europe and in Asia. Year by year I reported the warnings of danger from our listening posts in foreign lands. But I was only called "an alarmist" by the Republican leadership, and by the great majority of the Republican papers.

Year by year I asked for more and more defense appropriations. In addition, I allocated hundreds of millions of dollars for defense work from relief funds, from Civilian Conservation Corps funds and from Public Works funds -- as was understood by the Congress when the funds were voted.

Today our Navy is at a peak of efficiency and fighting strength. Ship for ship, and man for man, it is as powerful

*single navy*  
and efficient as any that ever sailed the seas in the history

*It is not as powerful as combinations of other Navies that*  
*of the world. Our Army and our air forces are now at the*  
*highest level they have ever been in peacetime. But in the*  
*any attack*  
*by 445.*

light of existing dangers they are not great enough for the absolute safety of America.

While this great, constructive work was going forward, the Republican leaders were trying to block our efforts toward national defense. They not only voted against these efforts; but they stated time and again through the years that they were unnecessary and extravagant, that our armed strength was sufficient for any emergency.

I propose now to indict these Republican leaders out of their own mouths -- these leaders who now disparage our defenses -- indict them with what they themselves said in the days before this election year, about how adequate our defenses already were.

Listen to this statement for instance. I quote:

"The facts are that we have [the largest and most powerful Navy we ever had, except for two years after the World War, and] the greatest air forces we ever had and a match for any nation".

Now who do you think made this statement in June 1938?

It was not I. It was not even a member of this Administration.

It was the ranking Republican member of the House Committee  
on Foreign Affairs, Republican leader, Hamilton Fish.

And now listen to ex-President Hoover speaking in that  
same year of 1938. I quote:

"We shall be expending nine hundred million  
dollars more than any nation on earth", he complained.

"We are leading in the arms race".

And now listen to Republican leader Senator Vandenberg,  
also speaking in 1938. He said that our defense expenditures  
had already bought us (and I quote) "an incomparably efficient  
Navy"; and he said further "I rise in opposition to this  
super-super Navy bill. I do not believe it is justified by  
any conclusive demonstration of national necessity".

And now listen to Republican leader Senator Taft -- the  
runner-up this year for the Republican Presidential nomination --  
speaking in February 1940. I quote:

"The increase of the Army and Navy over the tremendous appropriations of the current year seems to be unnecessary if we are concerned solely with defense".

There is the record; there is the permanent crystal clear record. Until the present political campaign opened, Republican leaders, in Congress and out, shouted from the housetops that our defenses were fully adequate.

(920)

Today they complain that this Administration has starved our armed forces, that our Navy is anemic, our Army puny, our air forces piteously weak.

This is a remarkable somersault.

I wonder if the election could have something to do with it. If the Republican leaders were telling the truth in 1938, [redacted], then -- out of their own mouths -- they stand convicted of inconsistency today. If they are ~~not~~ telling the truth today, then they stand convicted of inconsistency in 1938. [redacted]

The simple truth is that the Republican Party played politics with defense in 1938 and 1939. They are playing politics with national security today.

The same group will still control their party policy in the Congress. It is the Congress which passes the laws of the United States. The record of these Republican leaders shows what a slim chance the cause of strong defense would have, if they were in control.

Not only in their statements but in their votes is written their record of sabotage of this Administration's continual efforts to increase our defenses to meet the dangers that loomed ever larger upon the horizon.

For example, deeply concerned over what was happening in Europe, I asked the Congress in January, 1938, for a naval expansion of twenty per cent -- forty-six additional ships and nine hundred and fifty new planes.

What did the Republican leaders do when they had this chance to increase our national defense almost three years ago? You would think from their present barrage of verbal pyrotechnics, that they rushed in to pass that bill, or that they even demanded a larger expansion of the Navy.

But, ah! my friends, they were not in a national campaign for votes then.

In those days, they were trying to build up a different kind of political fence.

In those days, they thought that the way to win votes was by representing this Administration as extravagant in national defense, indeed as hysterical and as manufacturing panics and inventing foreign dangers.

But now, in the serious days of 1940, all is changed! Not only because they are serious days; but because they are election days as well.

On the radio these Republican orators swing through the air with the greatest of ease; but the American people are not voting this year for the best trapeze performer.

9.25

The plain fact is that when the naval expansion bill was submitted to the Congress the Republican leaders jumped in to fight it.

Who were they? There was the present Republican candidate for Vice President, Senator McNary. There were Senator Vandenberg and Senator Nye. There was the man who would be the Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Congressman Fish.

The first thing they did was to try to eliminate the battleships from the bill. The Republicans in the House voted sixty-seven to twenty against building them; and in the Senate the Republicans voted seven to four against building them.

The record is certainly clear that back in 1938 the Republican leaders were positive that we needed no more battleships. The naval expansion bill was passed; but it was passed by Democratic votes in the Congress -- in spite of Republican opposition.

Again, in March, 1939, the Republican Senators voted twelve to four against the bill for one hundred and two million dollars to buy certain strategic defense materials which we did not have in the United States.

In March, 1939, the Republicans in the Senate voted eleven to eight against increasing the authorized number of planes in the Navy.

In June, 1939, Republicans in the House voted one hundred and forty-four to eight in favor of reducing appropriations for the Army Air Corps.

Now that proves this one simple fact. It proves that if the Republican leaders had been in control in 1938 and 1939, these measures to increase our Navy and our air forces would have been defeated overwhelmingly.

I say that the Republican leaders played politics with defense in 1938 and 1939. I say that they are playing politics with our national security today.

One more example:

The Republican campaign orators and leaders are all now yelling "me too" on help to Britain. But last Fall they had their chance to vote to give aid to Britain and other democracies -- and they turned it down.

This chance came when I recommended that the Congress repeal the embargo on the shipment of armaments and munitions to nations at war, and permit such shipment on a "cash-and-carry basis". It is only because of the repeal of the embargo law that we have been able to sell planes and ships and guns and munitions to victims of aggression.

How did the Republicans vote on the repeal of this embargo?

In the Senate the Republicans voted fourteen to six against it. In the House the Republicans voted one hundred and forty to nineteen against it.

(C 30)

The Act was passed by Democratic votes but it was over the opposition of the Republican leaders. And just to name *among many others* a few, the following Republican leaders voted against the  
Act -- Senators McNary, Vandenberg, Nye and Johnson; Congressmen Martin, Barton and Fish.

Now, at the eleventh hour, they have discovered what we knew all along -- that overseas success in warding off invasion by dictatorship forces means safety to the United States, as well as to those smaller nations which still retain their independence; and the restoration of sovereignty to those smaller nations which have temporarily lost it. One of the keystones of American policy is the recognition of the right of small nations to survive and prosper.

Great Britain would never have received an ounce of help from us -- if the decision had been left to Martin, Barton and Fish.

Let us come down to one more example -- which took place just two months ago.

In the Senate there was an amendment to permit the United States Government to prevent profiteering or unpatriotic obstruction by any corporation in defense work. It permitted the Government to take over, with reasonable compensation, any manufacturing plant which refused to cooperate in national defense. The Republican Senators voted against this Russell-Overton Amendment on August 28, 1940, eight to six.

The bill was adopted all right -- by Democratic votes. But the opposing vote of those eight Republican leaders showed what would happen if the national government were turned over to their control. Their vote said, in effect, that they put money rights ahead of human lives -- to say nothing of national security.

You and I, and the overwhelming majority of Americans, will never stand for that.

Outside the halls of Congress eminent Republican candidates began to turn new somersaults. At first they denounced the bill. Then when public opinion rose up to demand it, they seized their trapeze with the greatest of ease, and reversed themselves in mid-air.

This record of Republican leadership -- a record of timidity, weakness and short-sightedness -- is as bad in international as in military affairs.

It is the same record of timidity, weakness and shortsightedness which they showed in domestic affairs when they were in control before 1933.

But the Republican leaders' memories seem to have been short, in this, as in other matters. And by the way -- who was it said that an elephant never forgets?

It is the same record of timidity, weakness and shortsightedness which governed the policy of the confused, reactionary governments in France and England before the war.

That fact was discovered too late in France.

It was discovered just in time in Great Britain.

Please God, may that spirit never prevail in our land.

For eight years our main concern has been to look for peace and the preservation of peace.

9.55

In 1935, in the face of growing dangers throughout the world, your Government undertook to eliminate the hazards which in the past had led to war.

By the Neutrality Act of 1935, and by other steps: We made it possible to prohibit American citizens from traveling on vessels belonging to countries at war. Was that right?

We made it clear that American investors, who put their money into enterprises in foreign nations, could not call on American warships or soldiers to bail out their investments. Was that right?

We made it clear that we would not use American armed forces to intervene in affairs of the sovereign Republics to the south of us. Was that right?

We made it clear that ships flying the American flag could not carry munitions to a belligerent; and that they must stay out of war zones. Was that right?

In all these ways, we made it clear to every American, and to every foreign nation, that we would avoid becoming entangled through some episode beyond our borders.

These were measures to keep us at peace. And through all the years of war since 1935, there has been no entanglement.

In July, 1937, Japan invaded China.

On January 3, 1938, I called the attention of the nation to the danger of the whole world situation.

It was clear that rearmament was now a necessary implement of peace. I asked for large additions to American defenses.

I was called an alarmist -- and worse names than that.

In March, 1938, German troops marched into Vienna.

In September, 1938, came the Munich crisis. German, French and Czech armies were mobilized. The result was only an abortive armistice.

I said then: "It is becoming increasingly clear that peace by fear has no higher nor more enduring quality than peace by the sword".

940

Three months later, at Lima, the twenty-one American  
Republics solemnly agreed to stand together to defend the  
independence of each one of us.

The declaration at Lima was a great step toward peace.  
For unless the Hemisphere is safe, we are not safe.

Matters grew steadily worse in Europe. Czecho-Slovakia  
was overrun by the Nazis. General war seemed inevitable.

Yet even then Republican leaders kept chanting,  
"There will be no war".

A few months later -- on the first of September, 1939,--  
war came.

The steps which we had carefully planned were put into  
effect.

American ships were kept from danger zones.

American citizens were helped to come home.

Unlike 1914, there was no financial upheaval.

The American Republics set up at Panama a system of  
patrolling the waters of the whole Western Hemisphere.

I ask you to support a continuance of this type of affirmative, realistic fight for peace. The alternative is to risk the future of the country in the hands of those with this record of timidity, weakness and short-sightedness, or in the inexperienced hands of those who in these perilous days, are willing recklessly to imply that our boys are already on their way to the transports.

This affirmative search for peace calls for clear vision. It is necessary to mobilize resources, minds and skills, and every active force for peace in the world.

We have steadily sought to keep mobilized the greatest force of all -- religious faith, devotion to God.

Your Government is working at all times with representatives of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths. Without these spiritual forces we cannot make or maintain peace, *and with* *they* *of them work with us toward* *that great end.*

This is the ideal so well expressed in a letter to me from His Holiness the Pope at Christmas time last year. He said: "We have been deeply moved by the \*\*\*\*thought contained in your note. \*\*\*\*\*That in this hour of world-wide pain and misgiving the Chief Magistrate of the great North American Federation, under the spell of the Holy Night of Christmas, should have taken such a prominent place in the vanguard of those who would promote peace and generously succor the victims of the war, bespeaks a providential help, which we acknowledge with grateful joy and increased confidence".

Since His Holiness wrote those words, the shadows have are still heavy deepened over the faith and hope of humankind.

We -- who walk in the ways of peace and freedom and light -- have seen the tragedies enacted in one free land after another.

We have not been blind to the causes, or to the consequences, of these tragedies.

We guard ourselves against all evils -- spiritual as well as material -- which may beset us. We guard against the forces of anti-Christian aggression, which may attack us from without, and the forces of ignorance and fear which may corrupt us from within.

We shall continue to go forward in firm faith. We shall continue to go forward in peace.

*Franziska Neumann*  
\*\*\*\*\*  
*Orig. reading copy*

#1324

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT  
Madison Square Garden, New York  
October 28, 1940, 10.00 P.M.

MR. CHAIRMAN, GOVERNOR LEBAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

No campaign can possibly be complete without this great  
Garden meeting. (Applause)

I have had a very wonderful day in New York, all five  
boroughs. But, as you know, I have had an anxious day too because  
three or four times during the day I have had to be in touch with  
the Department of State, with the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull,  
(applause) because, unfortunately, it seems that another war has  
broken out on the other side of the ocean, and I am quite sure that  
all of you will feel the same sorrow in your hearts that I feel --  
the sorrow in our hearts for the Italian people and the Grecian  
people, that they should have been involved together in conflict.

Tonight it is the second time I take up (again) once more  
the public duty -- the far from disagreeable duty -- of answering  
major campaign falsifications with facts. (Applause)

Last week in Philadelphia, which is supposed to be the  
City of Brotherly Love, but isn't always -- I nailed the falsehood  
about some fanciful secret treaties, I nailed them up to dry on the  
barn door. (Laughter) I nailed that falsehood and other falsehoods  
the way when I was a boy up in Dutchess County we used to nail up  
the skins of foxes and weasels. (Laughter) And I think it was a  
kinsman of mine, about thirty years ago, who invented the word,  
"weasel words."

Tonight I am going to nail up the falsifications that have

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.

(beginning) ~~and then again~~

with the first set of you listeners you had said I  
should not yet apologize for what I said now as ~~but~~ ~~when~~ ~~when~~  
~~the~~ ~~about~~ ~~if~~ ~~not~~ ~~had~~ ~~said~~ I ~~you~~ ~~not~~ ~~should~~ ~~wait~~ ~~not~~ ~~to~~ ~~said~~  
~~the~~ ~~lesson~~ ~~when~~ ~~to~~ ~~informed~~ ~~the~~ ~~what~~ ~~to~~ ~~informed~~ ~~the~~  
and you realize that's why I ~~disseminated~~ ~~disseminated~~ (emphasis)  
that when action is I have ~~want~~ ~~got~~ ~~to~~ ~~this~~ ~~radio~~ ~~not~~ ~~no~~ ~~you~~ ~~said~~  
-- ~~but~~ I ~~just~~ ~~should~~ ~~say~~ ~~at~~ ~~where~~ ~~you~~ ~~not~~ ~~last~~ ~~the~~ ~~way~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~  
~~return~~ ~~and~~ ~~has~~ ~~since~~ ~~called~~ ~~not~~ ~~you~~ ~~and~~ ~~you~~ ~~not~~ ~~written~~ ~~an~~  
~~million~~ ~~of~~ ~~united~~ ~~enviroment~~ ~~need~~ ~~and~~ ~~blame~~ ~~not~~ ~~and~~ ~~blame~~  
any ~~one~~ ~~(times)~~ ~~or~~ ~~one~~ ~~I~~ ~~will~~ ~~attack~~ ~~not~~ ~~at~~ ~~it~~ ~~bigotry~~  
returning to -- ~~the~~ ~~environment~~ ~~not~~ ~~not~~ -- ~~the~~ ~~sliding~~ ~~off~~  
(emphasis) ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~multicultural~~ ~~message~~ ~~that~~  
~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~of~~ ~~because~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~mislabeling~~ ~~of~~ ~~down~~ ~~real~~  
mislabeling ~~eds~~ ~~below~~ I -- ~~giving~~ ~~it~~ ~~not~~ ~~had~~ ~~real~~ ~~mislabeling~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~  
not ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~at~~ ~~an~~ ~~most~~ ~~bully~~ ~~I~~ ~~should~~ ~~know~~ ~~but~~ ~~not~~ ~~the~~  
mislabeling ~~radio~~ ~~has~~ ~~become~~ ~~such~~ ~~below~~ I (emphasis) ~~such~~ ~~and~~  
an ~~idea~~ ~~of~~ ~~been~~ ~~we~~ ~~should~~ ~~invited~~ ~~at~~ ~~go~~ ~~you~~ ~~a~~ ~~new~~ ~~I~~ ~~have~~ ~~the~~ ~~and~~  
~~as~~ ~~you~~ ~~at~~ ~~Value~~ ~~I~~ ~~and~~ (emphasis) ~~please~~ ~~you~~ ~~not~~ ~~to~~ ~~make~~ ~~an~~  
~~error~~ ~~not~~ ~~but~~ ~~not~~ ~~one~~ ~~any~~ ~~right~~ ~~facts~~ ~~only~~ ~~to~~ ~~provide~~  
and ~~not~~ ~~and~~ ~~not~~ ~~not~~ ~~at~~ ~~go~~ ~~line~~ ~~or~~ ~~policy~~ ~~we~~ ~~1~~ ~~think~~

to do with our relations with the rest of the world, (and) with the building up of our Army, our Navy and our air defense. It's (is) a very dangerous thing for the United States to distort facts about (such) things (.) like that, because (If) if repeated over and over again, it is (also) apt to create a sense of fear (and) a sense of doubt in the minds of some (of the) American people.

And so I now brand as false the statement being made by Republican campaign orators (boos), day after day and night after night, that the rearming of America was slow, that it is hamstrung and impeded, that it will never be able to meet threats from abroad. Those are the whisperings of appeasers.

That particular misstatement (was invented) has a history. It came into the world last June, just about the time of the Republican National Convention. (Laughter) Before that, the responsible Republican leaders had been singing an entirely different song. For almost seven years the Republican leaders in the Congress kept on saying that I was placing too much emphasis on national defense.  
(Applause)

And now today these men of great vision, they have suddenly discovered that there is a war/going on in Europe and another one in Asia. And so, now, always with their eyes on the good old ballot box, they are charging that we have placed too little emphasis on national defense.

But, unlike them, the printed pages of the Congressional Record cannot be changed or suppressed at election time. (Applause) And based on that permanent record of their speeches and their votes, I make this assertion -- that if the Republican leaders had been in

control of the Congress of the United States during the past seven years, the important measures for our defenses would not now be law; (and) I make the assertion that the Army and Navy of the United States would still be in almost the same condition in which I found them in 1933. (Applause)

Remember, I am (make) making (these) those charges against the responsible political leadership of the Republican Party. But there are millions -- millions and millions -- of patriotic Republicans who have at all times been in sympathy with the efforts of this Administration to arm itself adequately for purposes of defense.

(Applause)

And to Washington in the past few months have come not two or three or a dozen but several hundred of the best business executives in the United States -- Republicans and Democrats alike. Not holding company (lawyers or) executives or lawyers, (but) I am talking about men experienced in actual production -- production of all the types of machines and tools and steel and everything else that have made this nation the industrial leader of the world.

Yes, I have asked Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Stettinius and Mr. Harriman and Mr. Budd and the many others to serve their Government because I certainly believe that they are (certainly) among the ablest men in the (country) nation in their own fields. (Applause) I do not know their politics. I do not care about their politics. (Applause) All I know is that they are cooperating one hundred per cent with this Administration in our efforts for national defense. (Applause) And, the other way around, this Government is cooperating with them -- one hundred per cent.

All of these men -- all of American industry and American labor -- they are all doing magnificent and unselfish work. And the progress of today proves it. (Applause)

I shall have occasion (in a later speech) on Wednesday or Friday or Saturday of this week to tell more about the work they are doing, that they are turning out, and about the progress (which) that has been made in our whole picture of defense.

When the World War, I mean the first World War (ended) broke out, we were pretty weak, but by the end of it we were the strongest, one of the strongest naval and military powers in the world. But when this Administration first came into office fifteen years later, we were one of the weakest.

As early as that year of 1933 the storm (was gathering) in Europe. was gathering and it was gathering in Asia. Year by year I reported the warnings of danger from our listening posts in foreign lands. But I was only called "an alarmist" by the Republican leadership, and by the great majority of the Republican (papers) newspapers of the country. (Boos)

Year by year I asked for more and more defense appropriations. In addition, I allocated hundreds of millions of dollars for defense work from relief funds, (from) the (Civilian Conservation Corps funds) C.C.C. helped, (and from Public Works funds) the Public Works helped -- as was understood by the Congress when the (funds were voted) money was voted by them.

Today our Navy is at a peak of efficiency and fighting strength. Ship for ship, (and) man for man, it is as powerful and efficient as any single navy that ever sailed the seas in (the) history.

(of the world) (Applause) But, it is not as powerful as combinations of other navies that might be put together in an attack upon us. Our Army and our air forces are now at the highest level that they have ever been in peacetime. But in the light of existing dangers they are not great enough for the absolute safety of America at home.

While this great, constructive work was going forward -- what happened? -- the Republican leaders were definitely and beyond peradventure of doubt trying to block our efforts toward national defense. They not only voted against these efforts; but they stated time and again through the years that they were unnecessary, (and) that they were extravagant, that our armed strength was sufficient for any emergency.

I propose now to indict these Republican leaders out of their own mouths (applause) -- these leaders who now disparage our defenses -- indict them with what they themselves said in the days before this election year, about how adequate our defenses already were.

Listen to this (statement) for instance: (I quote:)

"The facts are that we have (the largest and most powerful Navy we ever had, except for two years after the World War, and) the greatest air forces we ever had and a match for any nation."

Now, who do you (think) suppose made (this) that statement (in June 1938?) a little over two years ago? It was not I. It was not even a member of this Administration. It was the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Republican leader, Hamilton Fish. (Boos)

And now listen to the only living ex-President of the United States (Hoover speaking in that same year of 1939. I quote:). He said

in that same year, two years ago:

"We shall be expending nine hundred million dollars more than any other nation on earth,"

(he complained.)

"We are leading in the arms race."

And now listen to Republican leader Senator Vandenberg, (boos) also speaking (in 1938) at that time. He said that our defense expenditures had already (bought) brought us (and I quote) "an incomparably efficient Navy"; and he said further, "I rise in opposition to this super-super Navy bill. (Laughter) I do not believe it is justified by any conclusive demonstration of national necessity."

And (now) then listen to what Republican leader Senator Taft -- the runner-up (this year) for the Republican Presidential nomination this year, said: (speaking in February, 1940. I quote:) Why, just this past February, 1940, he said:

"The increase of the Army and Navy over the tremendous appropriations of the current year seems to be unnecessary if we are concerned solely with defense." (Laughter and applause)

There is the record on that; (there is) the permanent crystal clear record. Until the present political campaign opened, Republican leaders, in (Congress) and out of the Congress, shouted from the house-tops that our defenses were fully adequate.

Today they (complain) proclaim that this Administration has starved our armed forces, that our Navy is anemic, (laughter) our Army puny, (laughter) our air forces pitifully weak.

(This) Yes, it is a remarkable somersault.

I wonder if the election could have something to do with it. (Laughter) And this seems what they would have called "logic" when I

was at school: If the Republican leaders were telling the truth in 1938 and 1939, then -- out of their own mouths -- they stand convicted of inconsistency today. (Applause) And, as we used to say, per contra, if they are (not) telling the truth today, (then) they stand convicted of inconsistency in 1938 (and 1939).

Why, the simple truth is that the Republican Party, through its leadership, played politics with defense, the defense of the United States, in 1938 and 1939. And they are playing politics with the national security of America today. (Applause)

(The) That same group (will) would still control their party (policy) in (the) Congress at the next session. It is the Congress (which) that passes the laws of the United States. The record of (these) those Republican leaders shows what a slim chance the cause of strong defense would have, if they were in control.

Not only in their statements but in their votes is written their record of sabotage of this Administration's continual efforts to increase our defenses to meet the dangers that loomed ever larger and larger upon the horizon.

For example, deeply concerned over what was happening in Europe, I asked the Congress in January, 1938, for a naval expansion of twenty per cent -- forty-six additional ships (and), nine hundred and fifty new planes.

What did the Republican leaders do when they had this chance to increase our national defense almost three years ago? You would think from their present barrage of verbal pyrotechnics, (laughter) that they rushed in to pass that bill, or that they even demanded a larger expansion (of) for the Navy.

But, ah! my friends, they were not in a national campaign for votes then. (Laughter)

In those days they were trying to build up a different kind of political fence.

In those days they thought that the way to win votes was by representing this Administration as extravagant in national defense, indeed as hysterical (and), as manufacturing panics and inventing foreign dangers.

But now, in the serious days of 1940, all is changed! Not only because they are serious days, but because they are election days as well. (Applause)

To use the old, old example that is always good: On the radio these Republican orators swing through the air with the greatest of ease; (laughter) but the American people are not voting this year for the best trapeze performer. (Laughter and applause)

The plain fact is that when (the) that naval (expansion) bill I was speaking about was submitted to the Congress, the Republican leaders jumped in to fight it.

Who were they? There was the present Republican candidate for Vice President, Senator McNary. (Boos) There were Senator Vandenberg and Senator Nye. And there was the man who would be the Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Congressman Fish. (Boos)

The first thing they did was to try to eliminate the battleships from the bill. The Republicans in the House voted sixty-seven to twenty against building them; and in the Senate, where the Republicans had a much smaller number, the Republicans voted seven to four

against building them.

The record is (certainly) perfectly clear that back in 1938 (the Republican leaders) they were positive in their own minds that we needed no more battleships. The naval expansion bill, of course, was passed; but it was passed by Democratic votes in the Congress -- in spite of the Republicans (opposition).

You see, I am talking by the book. Again, in March, 1939, the Republican Senators voted twelve to four against the bill for one hundred and two million dollars to buy certain strategic (defense) war materials (which) that we (did not) needed, that we do not have in (the United States) this country.

In March, 1939, the Republicans in the Senate voted eleven to eight against increasing the authorized number of planes in the Navy.

In June, 1939, Republicans in the House voted one hundred and forty-four to eight in favor of reducing the appropriations for the Army Air Corps. (Boos)

Now that proves this one simple fact: It proves that if the Republican leaders had been in control in the Congress in 1938 and 1939, these measures to increase our Navy and our Army and our air forces would have been defeated overwhelmingly.

I say that (the Republican) those leaders played politics with defense in 1938 and (1939.) I say that they are playing politics with our national security today.

(One more example:) Turn another page:

The Republican campaign orators and leaders are all now yelling "me too" (laughter)-- and especially I know in the past few

days they are saying "me too" on help to Britain. (Applause) But last fall, this fall, 1940, they had their chance to vote to give aid to Britain and other democracies -- and they turned it down.

This chance came when I recommended that the Congress repeal the embargo on the shipment of armaments and munitions to nations at war, and permit such shipment on a "cash-and-carry basis." (It is only because of the repeal of the embargo law that we have been able to sell planes and ships and guns and munitions to victims of aggression.)

But how did the Republicans vote on the repeal of (this) that embargo?

In the Senate the Republicans voted fourteen to six against it. And in the House, this time, the Republicans voted one hundred and forty to nineteen against it. (Boos)

Yes, the Act was passed by Democratic votes (applause) but it was over the opposition of the Republican leaders. And just to name a few, the following Republican leaders, among many others, voted against the Act -- Senators McNary, Vandenberg, Nye and Johnson; now wait, a perfectly beautiful alliteration -- Congressmen Martin, Barton and Fish. (Laughter and applause.)

Now, now, at the eleventh hour, they have discovered what we knew all along -- that overseas success in warding off invasion by dictatorship forces means safety (to) of the United States. (Applause) (as well as to those) It means also independence, continued independence, to those smaller nations which still retain their independence. (Applause) And it means (the) restoration of sovereignty to those smaller nations which have temporarily lost it. (Applause) As we

know, one of the keystones of American policy is the recognition of the right of small nations to survive and prosper. (Applause)

So, we can well say that (Great) Britain and a lot of other nations would never have received (an) one ounce of help from us -- if the decision had been left to Martin, Barton and Fish.

And, finally, let (us) we come down to (one more example -- which took place just) something that happened two months ago.

In the Senate there was an amendment to permit the United States Government to prevent profiteering or unpatriotic obstruction by any corporation in defense work. It permitted the Government to take over, with reasonable compensation, any manufacturing plant which refused to cooperate in national defense. (Applause) And the Republican Senators voted against this Russell-Overton Amendment on August 28, 1940, eight to six.

The bill was adopted all right -- by Democratic votes. (Applause) But the opposing vote of those eight Republican leaders showed what would happen if the National Government were turned over to their control. For their vote said, in effect, that they put money rights ahead of human lives -- to say nothing of national security.

You and I, and the overwhelming majority of Americans, will never stand for that. (Applause)

Let's go: Outside the halls of Congress eminent Republican candidates began to turn new somersaults. At first they denounced (the) that bill about making corporations do something, to match the obligation of human lives. Yes, at first they denounced the bill, but then, when public opinion rose up to demand it, they seized their trapeze with the greatest of ease, and reversed themselves in mid-air. (Applause and laughter)

This record of Republican leadership -- a record of timidity, of weakness (and), of short-sightedness -- is as bad in international as in military affairs.

It is the same record of timidity, of weakness (and), of short-sightedness which they showed in domestic affairs when they were in control before 1933. (Applause)

But the Republican leaders' memories seem to have been short, in this, as in some other matters. And by the way -- who was it said that an elephant never forgets? (Laughter and applause)

Yes, it is the same record of timidity, of weakness and of short-sightedness (which) that governed the policy of the confused, reactionary governments in France and England before the war.

That fact was discovered too late in France.

It was discovered just in time in (Great Britain) England.  
(Applause)

(Please) Pray God, (may that spirit never prevail in our land) that, having discovered it, we won't forget it either. (Applause)

For eight years our main concern, as you know and as the nation knows, has been to look for peace and the preservation of peace.  
(Applause)

Back in 1935, in the face of growing dangers throughout the world, your Government undertook to eliminate (the) certain hazards which in the past had led us (to) into war.

By the Neutrality Act of 1935, and by other steps:

We made it possible to prohibit American citizens from traveling on vessels belonging to countries at war. Was that right? (Yes --  
applause)

We made it clear that American investors, who put their money into enterprises in foreign nations, could not call on American warships or American soldiers to bail out their investments. Was that right? (Yes -- applause)

We made it clear that we would not use American armed forces to intervene in affairs of the sovereign republics to the south of us. Was that right? (Yes -- applause)

We made it clear that ships flying the American flag could not carry munitions to a belligerent; and that they must stay out of war zones. Was that right? (Applause)

In all these ways we made it clear to every American, and to every foreign nation that we would avoid becoming entangled through some episode beyond our borders.

(These) Those were measures to keep us at peace. And through all the years (of war) since 1935, there has been no entanglement and there will be no entanglement. (Applause)

And we have had plenty of chances to get into trouble. I know that well.

In (July,) 1937, in July, Japan invaded China.

On January 3, 1938, I called the attention of the nation to the danger of the whole world situation.

It was clear that rearmament was now, unfortunately, a necessary implement of peace. And I asked for large additions to American defenses. Yes, I was called an alarmist -- and worse names than that. (Laughter) I have learned by now to take it on the chin. (Applause)

In March, 1938, German troops marched into Vienna.

In September, 1938, came the Munich crisis. (Boos) German,

French and Czech armies were mobilized. The result was only an abortive armistice.

I said then: "It is becoming increasingly clear that peace by fear has no higher (nor) or more enduring quality than peace by the sword."

Three months later, at Lima, Peru, the twenty-one American Republics, including our own, solemnly agreed to stand together to defend the independence of each one of us. (Applause)

(The) That declaration at Lima was a great step toward peace. For unless the Hemisphere is safe, we are not safe.

Matters, matters in Europe grew steadily worse (in Europe). Czechoslovakia was overrun by the Nazis. (Boos) General war seemed inevitable.

Yet even then, in the summer of 1939, the Republican leaders kept chanting, "There will be no war."

A few months later -- on the first of September, 1939 -- war came.

The steps, the steps which we had carefully planned were put into effect.

American ships were kept from danger zones.

American citizens were helped to come home.

And, unlike 1914, there was no financial upheaval. (Applause)

Very soon, in a few weeks, the American Republics set up at Panama a system of patrolling the waters of the whole Western Hemisphere, with success.

I (ask you) am asking the American people to support a continuance of this type of affirmative, realistic fight for peace. (Applause)

The alternative is to risk the future of the country in the hands of those with this record of timidity, weakness and short-sightedness or to risk it in the hands, (in) the inexperienced hands, of those who in these perilous days are willing recklessly to imply that our boys are already on their way to the transports. (Boos)

But, on our side, this affirmative search for peace calls for clear vision. It is necessary to mobilize resources, to mobilize minds and skills, and every active force for peace in all the world.

We have steadily sought to keep mobilized the greatest force of all -- religious faith, devotion to God. (Applause)

Your Government is working at all times with representatives of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths. (Applause) Without these (spiritual forces we cannot make or maintain peace, and all three of them work with us toward that great end) three, all three of them, without them working with us toward that great end, things would not be clear or as easy.

Shadows, shadows (however) are still heavy over the faith and the hope of mankind.

We -- who walk in the ways of peace and freedom and light -- we have seen the tragedies enacted in one free land after another.

We have not been blind to the causes, or (to) the consequences of these tragedies.

We guard ourselves against all evils -- spiritual as well as material -- which may beset us. We guard against the forces of anti-Christian aggression, which may attack us from without, and the forces of ignorance and fear which may corrupt us from within.

We (shall continue to) go forward (in) with firm faith. And we shall continue to go forward in peace.

HOLD FOR RELEASE

HOLD FOR RELEASE

HOLD FOR RELEASE

October 28, 1940

CAUTION: The following address of the President, to be delivered in Madison Square Garden, New York, MUST BE HELD IN CONFIDENCE until released.

NOTE: Release to editions of all newspapers appearing on the streets NOT LATER THAN 10:00 P.M., E.S.T., October 28, 1940. The same release of the text of the address also applies to radio announcers and news commentators.

CARE MUST BE EXERCISED TO PREVENT PREMATURE PUBLICATION.

1673

STEPHEN EARLY  
Secretary to the President

-----

Tonight I take up again the public duty -- the far from disagreeable duty -- of answering major campaign falsifications with facts.

Last week in Philadelphia, I nailed the falsehood about some fanciful secret treaties, to dry on the barn door. I nailed that falsehood and other falsehoods the way when I was a boy up in Dutchess County, we used to nail up the skins of foxes and weasels.

Tonight I am going to nail up the falsifications that have to do with our relations with the rest of the world, and with the building up of our army, navy and air defenses. It is a very dangerous thing to distort facts about such things. If repeated over and over again, it is also apt to create a sense of fear and doubt in the minds of some of the American people.

I now brand as false the statement being made by Republican campaign orators, day after day and night after night, that the rearming of America was slow, that it is hamstrung and impeded, that it will never be able to meet threats from abroad.

That particular misstatement was invented about the time of the Republican National Convention. Before that, the responsible Republican leaders had been singing an entirely different song. For almost seven years the Republican leaders in the Congress kept on saying that I was placing too much emphasis on national defense.

And now today these men of great vision have suddenly discovered that there is a war on in Europe and another one in Asia. And so, now, always with their eyes on the good old ballot box, they are charging that we have placed too little emphasis on national defense.

But, unlike them, the printed pages of the Congressional Record cannot be changed or suppressed at election time. And based on that permanent record of their speeches and their votes, I make this assertion -- that if the Republican leaders had been in control of the Congress of the United States during the past seven years, the important measures for our defense would not now be law; and that the Army and Navy of the United States would still be in almost the same condition in which I found them in 1933.

I make these charges against the responsible political leadership of the Republican Party. There are millions of patriotic Republicans who have at all times been in sympathy with the efforts of this Administration to arm itself adequately for defense.

To Washington in the past few months have come not two or three or a dozen, but several hundred of the best business executives in the United States -- Republicans and Democrats alike. Not holding company lawyers or executives, but men experienced in actual production -- production of all the types of machines and tools and steel that have made this nation the industrial leader of the world.

I asked Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Stettinius and Mr. Harriman and Mr. Budd and the many others to serve because I believe they are certainly among the ablest men in the country in their own fields. I do not know their politics. I do not care about their politics. All I know is that they are cooperating one hundred per cent with this Administration in our efforts for national defense. And this Government is cooperating with them -- one hundred per cent.

All of these men -- all of American industry and American labor -- are doing magnificent and unselfish work. The progress today proves it.

I shall have occasion in a later speech to tell more about the work they are doing, and about the progress which has been made in our defense.

When the first World War ended we were one of the strongest naval and military powers in the world. When this Administration first came into office fifteen years later, we were one of the weakest.

As early as 1933 the storm was gathering in Europe and in Asia. Year by year I reported the warnings of danger from our listening posts in foreign lands. But I was only called "an alarmist" by the Republican leadership, and by the great majority of the Republican papers.

Year by year I asked for more and more defense appropriations. In addition, I allocated hundreds of millions of dollars for defense work from relief funds, from Civilian Conservation Corps funds and from Public Works funds -- as was understood by the Congress when the funds were voted.

Today our Navy is at a peak of efficiency and fighting strength. Ship for ship, and man for man, it is as powerful and efficient as any that ever sailed the seas in the history of the world. Our Army and our air forces are now at the highest level they have ever been in peacetime. But in the light of existing dangers they are not great enough for the absolute safety of America.

While this great, constructive work was going forward, the Republican leaders were trying to block our efforts toward national defense. They not only voted against these efforts; but they stated time and again through the years that they were unnecessary and extravagant, that our armed strength was sufficient for any emergency.

I propose now to indict these Republican leaders out of their own mouths -- these leaders who now disparage our defenses -- indict them with what they themselves said in the days before this election year, about how adequate our defenses already were.

Listen to this statement for instance. I quote:

"The facts are that we have the largest and most powerful Navy we ever had, except for two years after the World War, and the greatest air forces we ever had and a match for any nation".

Now who do you think made this statement in June 1938? It was not I. It was not even a member of this Administration. It was the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Republican leader, Hamilton Fish.

And now listen to ex-President Hoover speaking in that same year of 1938. I quote:

"We shall be expending nine hundred million dollars more than any nation on earth", he complained. "We are leading in the arms race".

And now listen to Republican leader Senator Vandenberg, also speaking in 1938. He said that our defense expenditures had already bought us (and I quote) "an incomparably efficient Navy"; and he said further "I rise in opposition to this super-super Navy bill. I do not believe it is justified by any conclusive demonstration of national necessity".

And now listen to Republican leader Senator Taft -- the runner-up this year for the Republican Presidential nomination -- speaking in February 1940. I quote:

"The increase of the Army and Navy over the tremendous appropriations of the current year seems to be unnecessary if we are concerned solely with defense".

There is the record; there is the permanent crystal clear record. Until the present political campaign opened, Republican leaders, in Congress and out, shouted from the housetops that our defenses were fully adequate.

Today they complain that this Administration has starved our armed forces, that our Navy is anemic, our Army puny, our air forces pitifully weak.

This is a remarkable somersault.

I wonder if the election could have something to do with it. If the Republican leaders were telling the truth in 1938, then -- out of their own mouths -- they stand convicted of inconsistency today. If they are not telling the truth today, then they stand convicted of inconsistency in 1938.

The simple truth is that the Republican Party played politics with defense in 1938 and 1939. They are playing politics with national security today.

The same group will still control their party policy in the Congress. It is the Congress which passes the laws of the United States. The record of these Republican leaders shows what a slim chance the cause of strong defense would have, if they were in control.

Not only in their statements but in their votes is written their record of sabotage of this Administration's continual efforts to increase our defenses to meet the dangers that loomed ever larger upon the horizon.

For example, deeply concerned over what was happening in Europe, I asked the Congress in January, 1938, for a naval expansion of twenty per cent -- forty-six additional ships and nine hundred and fifty new planes.

What did the Republican leaders do when they had this chance to increase our national defense almost three years ago? You would think from their present barrage of verbal pyrotechnics, that they rushed in to pass that bill, or that they even demanded a larger expansion of the Navy.

But, ah! my friends, they were not in a national campaign for votes then.

In those days, they were trying to build up a different kind of political fence.

In those days, they thought that the way to win votes was by representing this Administration as extravagant in national defense, indeed as hysterical and as manufacturing panics and inventing foreign dangers.

But now, in the serious days of 1940, all is changed! Not only because they are serious days; but because they are election days as well.

On the radio these Republican orators swing through the air with the greatest of ease; but the American people are not voting this year for the best trapeze performer.

The plain fact is that when the naval expansion bill was submitted to the Congress the Republican leaders jumped in to fight it.

Who were they? There was the present Republican candidate for Vice President, Senator McNary. There were Senator Vandenberg and Senator Nye. There was the man who would be the Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Congressman Fish.

The first thing they did was to try to eliminate the battleships from the bill. The Republicans in the House voted sixty-seven to twenty against building them; and in the Senate the Republicans voted seven to four against building them.

The record is certainly clear that back in 1938 the Republican leaders were positive that we needed no more battleships. The naval expansion bill was passed; but it was passed by Democratic votes in the Congress -- in spite of Republican opposition.

Again, in March, 1939, the Republican Senators voted twelve to four against the bill for one hundred and two million dollars to buy certain strategic defense materials which we did not have in the United States.

In March, 1939, the Republicans in the Senate voted eleven to eight against increasing the authorized number of planes in the Navy.

In June, 1939, Republicans in the House voted one hundred and forty-four to eight in favor of reducing appropriations for the Army Air Corps.

Now that proves this one simple fact. It proves that if the Republican leaders had been in control in 1938 and 1939, those measures to increase our Navy and our air forces would have been defeated overwhelmingly.

I say that the Republican leaders played politics with defense in 1938 and 1939. I say that they are playing politics with our national security today.

One more example:

The Republican campaign orators and leaders are all now yelling "me too" on help to Britain. But last Fall they had their chance to vote to give aid to Britain and other democracies -- and they turned it down.

This chance came when I recommended that the Congress repeal the embargo on the shipment of armaments and munitions to nations at war, and permit such shipment on a "cash-and-carry basis". It is only because of the repeal of the embargo law that we have been able to sell planes and ships and guns and munitions to victims of aggression.

How did the Republicans vote on the repeal of this embargo?

In the Senate the Republicans voted fourteen to six against it. In the House the Republicans voted one hundred and forty to nineteen against it.

The Act was passed by Democratic votes but it was over the opposition of the Republican leaders. And just to name a few, the following Republican leaders voted against the Act -- Senators McNary, Vandenburg, Hyde and Johnson; Congressman Martin, Barton and Fish.

Now, at the eleventh hour, they have discovered what we knew all along -- that overseas success in warding off invasion by dictatorship forces meant safety to the United States as well as to those smaller nations which still retain their independence and the restoration of sovereignty to those smaller nations which have temporarily lost it. One of the keystones of American policy is the recognition of the right of small nations to survive and prosper.

Great Britain would never have received an ounce of help from us -- if the decision had been left to Martin, Barton and Fish.

Let us come down to one more example -- which took place just two months ago.

In the Senate there was an amendment to permit the United States Government to prevent profiteering or unpatriotic obstruction by any corporation in defense work. It permitted the Government to take over, with reasonable compensation, any manufacturing plant which refused to cooperate in national defense. The Republican Senators voted against this Russell-Overton Amendment on August 28, 1940, eight to six.

The bill was adopted all right -- by Democratic votes. But the opposing vote of those eight Republican leaders showed what would happen if the national government were turned over to their control. Their vote said, in effect, that they put money rights ahead of human lives -- to say nothing of national security.

You and I, and the overwhelming majority of Americans, will never stand for that.

Outside the halls of Congress eminent Republican candidates began to turn now somersaults. At first they denounced the bill. Then when public opinion rose up to demand it, they seized their trapozes with the greatest of ease, and reversed themselves in mid-air.

This record of Republican leadership -- a record of timidity, weakness and short-sightedness -- is as bad in international as in military affairs.

It is the same record of timidity, weakness and short-sightedness which they showed in domestic affairs when they were in control before 1933.

But the Republican leaders' memories seem to have been short, in this, as in other matters. And by the way -- who was it said that an elephant never forgets?

It is the same record of timidity, weakness and short-sightedness which governed the policy of the confused, reactionary governments in France and England before the war.

That fact was discovered too late in France.

It was discovered just in time in Great Britain.

Please God, may that spirit never prevail in our land.

For eight years our main concern has been to look for peace and the preservation of peace.

In 1935, in the face of growing dangers throughout the world, your Government undertook to eliminate the hazards which in the past had led to war.

By the Neutrality Act of 1935, and by other steps:

We made it possible to prohibit American citizens from traveling on vessels belonging to countries at war. Was that right?

We made it clear that American investors, who put their money into enterprises in foreign nations, could not call on American warships or soldiers to bail out their investments. Was that right?

We made it clear that we would not use American armed forces to intervene in affairs of the sovereign Republics to the south of us. Was that right?

We made it clear that ships flying the American flag could not carry munitions to a belligerent; and that they must stay out of war zones. Was that right?

In all these ways, we made it clear to every American, and to every foreign nation, that we would avoid becoming entangled through some episode beyond our borders.

These were measures to keep us at peace. And through all the years of war since 1935, there has been no entanglement.

In July, 1937, Japan invaded China.

On January 3, 1939, I called the attention of the nation to the danger of the whole world situation.

It was clear that rearmament was now a necessary implement of peace. I asked for large additions to American defenses. I was called an alarmist -- and worse names than that.

In March, 1938, German troops marched into Vienna.

In September, 1938, came the Munich crisis. German, French and Czech armies were mobilized. The result was only an abortive armistice.

I said then: "It is becoming increasingly clear that peace by fear has no higher nor more enduring quality than peace by the sword".

Three months later, at Lima, the twenty-one American Republics solemnly agreed to stand together to defend the independence of each one of us.

The declaration at Lima was a great step toward peace. For unless the Hemisphere is safe, we are not safe.

Matters grew steadily worse in Europe. Czecho-Slovakia was overrun by the Nazis. General war seemed inevitable.

Yet even then Republican leaders kept chanting, "There will be no war."

A few months later -- on the first of September, 1939 -- war came.

The steps which we had carefully planned were put into effect.

American ships were kept from danger zones.

American citizens were helped to come home.

Unlike 1914, there was no financial upheaval.

The American Republics set up at Panama a system of patrolling the waters of the whole Western Hemisphere.

I ask you to support a continuance of this type of affirmative, realistic fight for peace. The alternative is to risk the future of the country in the hands of those with this record of timidity, weakness and short-sightedness or in the inexperienced hands of those who in these perilous days, are willing recklessly to imply that our boys are already on their way to the transports.

This affirmative search for peace calls for clear vision. It is necessary to mobilize resources, minds and skills, and every active force for peace in the world.

We have steadily sought to keep mobilized the greatest force of all -- religious faith, devotion to God.

Your Government is working at all times with representatives of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths. Without these spiritual forces we cannot make or maintain peace, and all three of them work with us toward that great end.

Shadows, however, are still heavy over the faith and hope of humankind.

We -- who walk in the ways of peace and freedom and light -- have seen the tragedies enacted in one free land after another.

We have not been blind to the causes, or to the consequences, of these tragedies.

We guard ourselves against all evils -- spiritual as well as material -- which may beset us. We guard against the forces of anti-Christian aggression, which may attack us from without, and the forces of ignorance and fear which may corrupt us from within.

We shall continue to go forward in firm faith. We shall continue to go forward in peace.

*J.W.*  
HOLD FOR RELEASE

HOLD FOR RELEASE

HOLD FOR RELEASE

October 28, 1940

CAUTION: The following address of the President, to be delivered in Madison Square Garden, New York, MUST BE HELD IN CONFIDENCE until released.

NOTE: Release to editions of all newspapers appearing on the streets NOT EARLIER THAN 10:00 P.M., E.S.T., October 28, 1940. The same release of the text of the address also applies to radio announcers and news commentators.

CARE MUST BE EXERCISED TO PREVENT PREMATURE PUBLICATION.

STEPHEN EARLY  
Secretary to the President

-----



SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT  
MADISON SQUARE GARDEN  
NEW YORK CITY  
OCTOBER 28, 1940

---

Tonight I take up again the public duty -- the far from disagreeable duty -- of answering major campaign falsifications with facts.

Last week in Philadelphia, I nailed the falsehood about some fanciful secret treaties, to dry on the barn door. I nailed that falsehood and other falsehoods the way when I was a boy up in Dutchess County, we used to nail up the skins of foxes and weasels.

Tonight I am going to nail up the falsifications that have to do with our relations with the rest of the world, and with the building up of our army, navy and air defense. It is a very dangerous thing to distort facts about such things.

If repeated over and over again, it is also apt to create a sense of fear and doubt in the minds of some of the American people.

I now brand as false the statement being made by Republican campaign orators, day after day and night after night, that the rearming of America was slow, that it is hamstrung and impeded, that it will never be able to meet threats from abroad.

That particular misstatement was invented about the time of the Republican National Convention. Before that, the responsible Republican leaders had been singing an entirely different song. For almost seven years the Republican leaders in the Congress kept on saying that I was placing too much emphasis on national defense.

And now today these men of great vision have suddenly discovered that there is a war on in Europe and another one in Asia. And so, now, always with their eyes on the good old ballot box, they are charging that we have placed too little emphasis on national defense.

But, unlike them, the printed pages of the Congressional Record cannot be changed or suppressed at election time. And based on that permanent record of their speeches and their votes, I make this assertion -- that if the Republican leaders had been in control of the Congress of the United States during the past seven years, the important measures for our defense would not now be law; and that the Army and Navy of the United States would still be in almost the same condition in which I found them in 1933.

I make these charges against the responsible political leadership of the Republican Party. There are millions of patriotic Republicans who have at all times been in sympathy with the efforts of this Administration to arm itself adequately for defense.

To Washington in the past few months have come not two or three or a dozen, but several hundred of the best business executives in the United States -- Republicans and Democrats alike.

Not holding company lawyers or executives, but men experienced in actual production -- production of all the types of machines and tools and steel that have made this nation the industrial leader of the world.

I asked Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Stettinius and Mr. Harriman and Mr. Budd and the many others to serve because I believe they are certainly among the ablest men in the country in their own fields. I do not know their politics. I do not care about their politics. All I know is that they are cooperating one hundred per cent, with this Administration in our efforts for national defense. And this Government is cooperating with them -- one hundred per cent.

All of these men -- all of American industry and American labor -- are doing magnificent and unselfish work. The progress today proves it.

I shall have occasion in a later speech to tell more about the work they are doing, and about the progress which has been made in our defense.

When the first World War ended we were one of the strongest naval and military powers in the world. When this Administration first came into office fifteen years later, we were one of the weakest.

As early as 1933 the storm was gathering in Europe and in Asia. Year by year I reported the warnings of danger from our listening posts in foreign lands. But I was only called "an alarmist" by the Republican leadership, and by the great majority of the Republican papers.

Year by year I asked for more and more defense appropriations. In addition, I allocated hundreds of millions of dollars for defense work from relief funds, from Civilian Conservation Corps funds and from Public Works funds -- as was understood by the Congress when the funds were voted.

Today our Navy is at a peak of efficiency and fighting strength. Ship for ship, and man for man, it is as powerful and efficient as any that ever sailed the seas in the history of the world. Our Army and our air forces are now at the highest level they have ever been in peacetime. But in the

light of existing dangers they are not great enough for the absolute safety of America.

While this great, constructive work was going forward, the Republican leaders were trying to block our efforts toward national defense. They not only voted against these efforts; but they stated time and again through the years that they were unnecessary and extravagant, that our armed strength was sufficient for any emergency.

I propose now to indict these Republican leaders out of their own mouths -- these leaders who now disparage our defenses -- indict them with what they themselves said in the days before this election year, about how adequate our defenses already were.

Listen to this statement for instance. I quote:

3

"The facts are that we have the largest and most powerful Navy we ever had, except for two years after the World War, and the greatest air forces we ever had and a match for any nation".

Now who do you think made this statement in June 1938?

It was not I. It was not even a member of this Administration.

It was the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Republican leader, Hamilton Fish.

And now listen to ex-President Hoover speaking in that same year of 1938. I quote:

"We shall be expending nine hundred million dollars more than any nation on earth", he complained.

"We are leading in the arms race".

And now listen to Republican leader Senator Vandenberg, also speaking in 1938. He said that our defense expenditures had already bought us (and I quote) "an incomparably efficient Navy"; and he said further "I rise in opposition to this super-super Navy bill. I do not believe it is justified by any conclusive demonstration of national necessity".

And now listen to Republican leader Senator Taft -- the runner-up this year for the Republican Presidential nomination -- speaking in February 1940. I quote:

"The increase of the Army and Navy over the tremendous appropriations of the current year seems to be unnecessary if we are concerned solely with defense".

There is the record; there is the permanent crystal clear record. Until the present political campaign opened, Republican leaders, in Congress and out, shouted from the housetops that our defenses were fully adequate.

Today they complain that this Administration has starved our armed forces, that our Navy is anemic, our Army puny, our air forces piteously weak.

This is a remarkable somersault.

I wonder if the election could have something to do with it. If the Republican leaders were telling the truth in 1938 and 1939, then -- out of their own mouths -- they stand convicted of inconsistency today. If they are not telling the truth today, then they stand convicted of inconsistency in 1938 and 1939.

41 lines

The simple truth is that the Republican Party played politics with defense in 1938 and 1939. They are playing politics with national security today.

The same group will still control their party policy in the Congress. It is the Congress which passes the laws of the United States. The record of these Republican leaders shows what a slim chance the cause of strong defense would have, if they were in control.

Not only in their statements but in their votes is written their record of sabotage of this Administration's continual efforts to increase our defenses to meet the dangers that loomed ever larger upon the horizon.

For example, deeply concerned over what was happening in Europe, I asked the Congress in January, 1938, for a naval expansion of twenty per cent -- forty-six additional ships and nine hundred and fifty new planes.

What did the Republican leaders do when they had this chance to increase our national defense almost three years ago? You would think from their present barrage of verbal pyrotechnics, that they rushed in to pass that bill, or that they even demanded a larger expansion of the Navy.

But, ah! my friends, they were not in a national campaign for votes then.

In those days, they were trying to build up a different kind of political fence.

In those days, they thought that the way to win votes was by representing this Administration as extravagant in national defense, indeed as hysterical and as manufacturing panics and inventing foreign dangers.

But now, in the serious days of 1940, all is changed! Not only because they are serious days; but because they are election days as well.

On the radio these Republican operators swing through the air with the greatest of ease; but the American people are not voting this year for the best trapeze performer.

The plain fact is that when the naval expansion bill was submitted to the Congress the Republican leaders jumped in to fight it.

Who were they? There was the present Republican candidate for Vice President, Senator McNary. There were Senator Vandenberg and Senator Myrick. There was the man who would be the Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Congressman Fish.

The first thing they did was to try to eliminate the battleships from the bill. The Republicans in the House voted sixty-seven to twenty against building them; and in the Senate the Republicans voted seven to four against building them.

The record is certainly clear that back in 1936 the Republican leaders were positive that we needed no more battleships. The naval expansion bill was passed; but it was passed by Democratic votes in the Congress -- in spite of Republican opposition.

Again, in March, 1939, the Republican Senators voted twelve to four against the bill for one hundred and two million dollars to buy certain strategic defense materials which we did not have in the United States.

In March, 1939, the Republicans in the Senate voted eleven to eight against increasing the authorized number of planes in the Navy.

In June, 1939, Republicans in the House voted one hundred and forty-four to eight in favor of reducing appropriations for the Army Air Corps.

Now that proves this one simple fact. It proves that if the Republican leaders had been in control in 1938 and 1939, these measures to increase our Navy and our air forces would have been defeated overwhelmingly.

I say that the Republican leaders played politics with defense in 1938 and 1939. I say that they are playing politics with our national security today.

One more example:

The Republican campaign orators and leaders are all now yelling "me too" on help to Britain. But last Fall they had their chance to vote to give aid to Britain and other democracies -- and they turned it down.

This chance came when I recommended that the Congress repeal the embargo on the shipment of armaments and munitions to nations at war, and permit such shipment on a "cash-and-carry basis". It is only because of the repeal of the embargo law that we have been able to sell planes and ships and guns and munitions to victims of aggression.

How did the Republicans vote on the repeal of this embargo?

In the Senate the Republicans voted fourteen to six against it. In the House the Republicans voted one hundred and forty to nineteen against it.

The Act was passed by Democratic votes but it was over the opposition of the Republican leaders. And just to name a few, the following Republican leaders voted against the Act -- Senators McNary, Vandenberg, Nye and Johnson; Congressmen Martin, Barton and Fish.

Now, at the eleventh hour, they have discovered what we knew all along -- that overseas success in warding off invasion by dictatorship forces means safety to the United States as well as to those smaller nations which still retain their independence and the restoration of sovereignty to those smaller nations which have temporarily lost it. One of the keystones of American policy is the recognition of the right of small nations to survive and prosper.

Great Britain would never have received an ounce of help from us -- if the decision had been left to Martin, Barton and Fish.

Let us come down to one more example -- which took place just two months ago.

In the Senate there was an amendment to permit the United States Government to prevent profiteering or unpatriotic obstruction by any corporation in defense work. It permitted the Government to take over, with reasonable compensation, any manufacturing plant which refused to cooperate in national defense. The Republican Senators voted against this Russell-Overton amendment on August 28, 1940, eight to six.

The bill was adopted all right -- by Democratic votes. But the opposing vote of those eight Republican leaders showed what would happen if the national government were turned over to their control. Their vote said, in effect, that they put money rights ahead of human lives -- to say nothing of national security.

You and I, and the overwhelming majority of Americans, will never stand for that.

Outside the <sup>H</sup>walls of Congress eminent Republican candidates began to turn new somersaults. At first they denounced the bill. Then when public opinion rose up to demand it, they seized their trapeze with the greatest of ease, and reversed themselves in mid-air.

This record of Republican leadership — a record of timidity, weakness and short-sightedness — is as bad in international as in military affairs.

It is the same record of timidity, weakness and shortsightedness which they showed in domestic affairs when they were in control before 1933.

But the Republican leaders' memories seem to have been short, in this, as in other matters. And by the way -- who was it said that an elephant never forgets?

It is the same record of timidity, weakness and shortsightedness which governed the policy of the confused, reactionary governments in France and England before the war.

The fact was discovered too late in France.

It was discovered just in time in Great Britain.

Please God, may that spirit never prevail in our land.  
For eight years our main concern has been to ~~look~~ for  
peace and the preservation of peace.

In 1935, in the face of growing dangers throughout the world, your Government undertook to eliminate the hazards which in the past had led to war.

By the Neutrality Act of 1935, and by other steps: We made it possible to prohibit American citizens from traveling on vessels belonging to countries at war. Was that right?

We made it clear that American investors, who put their money into enterprises in foreign nations, could not call on American warships or soldiers to bail out their investments. Was that right?

We made it clear that we would not use American armed forces to intervene in affairs of the sovereign Republics to the south of us. Was that right?

We made it clear that ships flying the American flag could not carry munitions to a belligerent; and that they must stay out of war zones. Was that right?

In all these ways, we made it clear to every American, and to every foreign nation, that we would avoid becoming entangled through some episode beyond our borders.

These were measures to keep us at peace. And through all the years of war since 1935, there has been no entanglement.

In July, 1937, Japan invaded China.

On January 3, 1938, I called the attention of the nation to the danger of the whole world situation.

It was clear that rearmament was now a necessary implement of peace. I asked for large additions to American defenses.

I was called an alarmist -- and worse names than that.

In March, 1938, German troops marched into Vienna.

In September, 1938, came the Munich crisis. German, French and Czech armies were mobilized. The result was only an abortive armistice.

I said then: "It is becoming increasingly clear that peace by fear has no higher nor more enduring quality than peace by the sword".

Three months later, at Lima, the twenty-one American Republics solemnly agreed to stand together to defend the independence of each one of us.

The declaration at Lima was a great step toward peace. For unless the Hemisphere is safe, we are not safe.

Matters grew steadily worse in Europe. Czecho-Slovakia was overrun by the Nazis. General war seemed inevitable.

Yet even then Republican leaders kept chanting, "There will be no war".

A few months later -- on the first of September, 1939, -- war came.

The steps which we had carefully planned were put into effect.

American ships were kept from danger zones.

American citizens were helped to come home.

Unlike 1914, there was no financial upheaval.

The American Republics set up at Panama a system of patrolling the waters of the whole Western Hemisphere.

I ask you to support a continuance of this type of affirmative, realistic fight for peace. The alternative is to risk the future of the country in the hands of those with this record of timidity, weakness and short-sightedness or in the inexperienced hands of those who in these perilous days, are willing recklessly to imply that our boys are already on their way to the transports.

This affirmative search for peace calls for clear vision. It is necessary to mobilize resources, minds and skills, and every active force for peace in the world.

We have steadily sought to keep mobilized the greatest force of all -- religious faith, devotion to God.

Your Government is working at all times with representatives of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths. Without these spiritual forces we cannot make or maintain peace.

This is the ideal so well expressed in a letter to me from His Holiness the Pope at Christmas time last year. He said: "We have been deeply moved by the \*\*\*\*thought contained in your note. \*\*\*\*\*That in this hour of world-wide pain and misgiving the Chief Magistrate of the great North American Federation, under the spell of the Holy Night of Christmas, should have taken such a prominent place in the vanguard of those who would promote peace and generously succor the victims of the war, bespeaks a providential help, which we acknowledge with grateful joy and increased confidence".

Since His Holiness wrote those words, the shadows have deepened over the faith and hope of humankind.

We -- who walk in the ways of peace and freedom and light -- have seen the tragedies enacted in one free land after another.

We have not been blind to the causes, or to the consequences, of these tragedies.

We guard ourselves against all evils -- spiritual as well as material -- which may beset us. We guard against the forces of anti-Christian aggression, which may attack us from without, and the forces of ignorance and fear which may corrupt us from within.

We shall c9ntinue to go forward in firm faith. We shall continue to go forward in peace.

\*\*\*\*\*

CORRECTIONS

CORRECTIONS

CORRECTIONS

Page 3, fourth paragraph:

Make read

N O T "speaking in that same year of 1938"  
"1939."

Page 3, 12th paragraph, 2nd sentence:

Make read

N O T "were telling the truth in 1938, then --"  
"were telling the truth in 1938 and 1939, then --"

Same paragraph, last sentence:

Make read

"convicted of inconsistency in 1938,"  
ELIMINATING  
"and 1939."

Stephen Early,  
Secretary to the President

*Mark S. Garden*  
*Oct. 28. 1940*  
*m.s.f.*

*Second Draft*  
~~Second Draft~~  
*2nd Draft*

SPECH OF THE PRESIDENT

MADISON SQUARE GARDEN

OCTOBER 28, 1940

Tonight I take up again the public duty - the far from disagreeable duty - of answering major campaign falsifications with facts.

Last week in Philadelphia I spoke of techniques of propaganda which had been invented in Europe by dictators] - methods of propaganda which have been imported into the United States in this campaign. I <sup>being made by Republican leaders</sup> speak of false statements about the present industrial and economic state of the nation. I nailed the falsehood about some fanciful secret treaties, to dry on the barn door. I nailed that falsehood and other falsehoods - the way when I was a boy up in Dutchess County we used to nail up the skins of foxes and weasels and woodpeckers.] Tonight [in my second talk] I am going to nail up the falsifications that have to do with our relations with the rest of the world, and with the building up of our army, navy and air defense. It is a very dangerous thing to distort facts about such things.

Falsehood in this field gives encouragement, and almost extends invitation, to aggressor nations to further their designs or their attacks upon this hemisphere. [More than that.] If repeated over and over again, it is apt to create a sense of fear and doubt in the minds of some of the American people. [That, as we know, is the chief <sup>idea</sup> ~~kind of~~ <sup>deliberately</sup> ~~dictator~~ propaganda that they have used on their intended victims before they strike.]

I now brand as false the statement being made by Republican campaign orators, day after day and night after night, that the re-arming of America was slow [and inefficient], that it is [being] hamstrung and impeded, that it will never be able to meet threats from abroad. I charge that when they repeat such falsehoods, they show that they are ~~more~~ more interested in votes than in national security.

That particular type of falsehood was invented about the time of the Republican National Convention. Before that, the responsible Republican leaders had been singing an entirely different song. For almost seven years [in my service as President,] the Republican leaders in the Congress kept on saying that I was placing too much emphasis on national defense. I could always count on their opposition to ~~every proposal made to improve our defense.~~

- 5 -

And now today those same prophets - these men of great vision have suddenly been awakened to the truth, the truth that they have been hearing from the Secretary of State and from me for sixty years. They have suddenly discovered that there is a war on strays with their eye on the good old in Europe and another one in Asia. And so, now, they are charging bitter box, that we have placed too little emphasis on national defense.

But, unlike them, the printed pages of the Congressional Record cannot be changed or suppressed at election time. There you will find the record of their speeches and their votes. And based on that

record, I make this assertion - that if the Republican leaders had been in control of the Congress of the United States during the past seven years, an important measure for our defense would now be law; and that the Army and Navy of the United States would still be in the deplorable condition in which I found them in 1933.

I make these charges against the responsible political leadership of the Republican Party. You know that the same group,

[as most of them were] will control their party policy in Congress and outside] If a Republican President were elected.] whether it is the minority or the majority party.

LIA

There are millions of  
Many patriotic Republicans, [ ]  
members of my Cabinet, Secretary of War Stimson and Secretary of the  
Treasury, have at all times been in sympathy with the efforts of  
this Administration to arm itself adequately for defense.

To Washington in the past few months have come not two or  
three or a dozen, but several hundred of the best business executives  
in the United States -- Republicans and Democrats alike. Not holding  
company lawyers or executives, but men experienced in actual production  
- production of all the machines and tools and steel that have made  
this country the industrial leader of the world. [Literally all kinds]  
I asked dropped their work and came to Washington.]

I asked Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Tettinius and Mr. Harriman and  
~~and the others~~  
Mr. Budd because I believe they are the ablest men in the country in  
their own fields. I don't know about their politics. I don't care  
about their politics. All I [need to] know is that they're cooperating  
with this Administration in our efforts for national defense. And this  
Government is cooperating with them - one hundred percent.

SECOND DRAFT

- 5 -

All of these men - all of American industry and American labor - are doing magnificent and unselfish work. The progress to date proves it. I shall have occasion in a later speech to tell [the world] more about what they're doing, and about the progress which has been made.

When the first World War ended we were one of the strongest naval and military powers in the world. When this Administration first came into office fifteen years later, we were one of the weakest.

As early as 1933 the storm was gathering in Europe and in Asia. Year by year I reported [by annual message and by special message] the warnings of danger from our listening posts in foreign lands. I was called an alarmist by the Republican leadership.

Year by year I asked for more and more defense appropriations. I got them from a Congress that was Democratic. There were direct Congressional appropriations for the Army and Navy. I allocated hundreds of millions of dollars for defense work from relief funds, from C.G.C. funds and from Public Works funds, as was intended by the Congress when the funds were voted.

Today our Navy is at a peak of efficiency and fighting strength. Ship for ship, and man for man, it is as powerful and efficient as any that ever sailed the seas in the history of the world. Our Army and our air forces are now at the highest level they have ever been in peacetime.

While this great, constructive work <sup>American</sup> has been going forward, the Republican leaders were trying [on every occasion to weaken or] to bloc our efforts toward national defense. They not only voted against these efforts; but they stated time and again through the years that our armed strength was sufficient for any emergency. But I knew otherwise, and told them so time and again through the years,

I propose to indict these Republican leaders out of their own mouths with what they said in the days before this election year about our defenses already were.

Listen to this statement for instance. I quote:

"The facts are that we have the largest and most powerful Navy we ever had, except for two years after the World War, and the greatest air force we ever had, and a match for any nation."

*for a speech  
our*

SECOND DRAFT

- 7 -

in June 1938?

Now who do you think made this statement? It was not I.

It was not even a member of this Administration. It was the ranking

Republican member of the House Committee on Military Affairs, ~~Republ~~  
Leader, Representative Hamilton Fish. [He made that glowing statement in

June, 1938.]

Republican Leader

And now listen to Senator Vandenberg, also speaking in 1938.

He said that our defense expenditures had <sup>already</sup> bought us (and I quote)

"an incomparably efficient Navy"; and he said further "I rise in opposition to this super - super Navy bill. I do not believe it is justified by any conclusive demonstration of national necessity".  
~~that was in 1933 before there was any thought of this~~

~~questions~~

Republican Leader

And now listen to President Hoover speaking in that

same year of 1938. I quote:

"We shall be spending \$30 million more annually  
to complicate  
any nation on earth," ~~in Europe~~ speaking in the

same year.

Republican Leader,

And now listen to Mr. Landon, at that time the head of the

Republican Party, speaking in 1939, after the outbreak of the war  
in Europe. I quote:

"We are in better position to defend ourselves against  
a foreign foe than we have ever been in the past."

*Republican leaders — the runners-up*

And now listen to Senator Taft — up this year for the Republican Presidential nomination — *speaking at* — ~~as~~ — February 1940, are

~~said~~, I quote:

"The increase of the Army and Navy over the tremendous appropriations of the current year seems to be unnecessary if we are concerned solely with defense." *There* ~~is~~ *was* the record; there is the crystal clear record. Until *election* the present campaign opened, [until there was a partisan advantage to be gained by the charge of unpreparedness, ~~away~~] Republican leaders, in Congress and out, shouted from the housetops that our defenses were fully adequate.

Today they complain that this administration has starved our armed forces, that our Navy is anemic, our Army puny, our air forces pitifully weak. P This is a remarkable assault. P I wonder if the election could have something to do with it.

If the Republican leaders were telling the truth in 1938 and 1939, then they stand convicted — out of their own mouths — ~~invariably~~ ~~of falsehood~~ today. If they are telling the truth today, then they stand convicted again out of their own mouths ~~or unconvicted~~ ~~of falsehood~~, in 1938 and 1939.

- 9 -

The simple truth is that the Republican Party played politics with defense in 1938 and 1939. They are playing politics with national security today.

Insert A.

How do you think the Republican leaders came to make these statements in 1938 and 1939?

What was the occasion for these statements in 1938 and 1939 that our defenses were fully adequate to any and all emergencies?

The answer must be painfully embarrassing to the Republicans today. Not only in their statements but in their actions. For in the answer to their record of obstruction, their record of sabotage of this administration's continual efforts to increase our defenses to meet the dangers that loomed ever larger upon the horizon.

The occasion for these statements was in each case some proposal made by this administration to increase the Navy, the Army, or the air forces. When there was a concrete opportunity to vote for additional defense, the leaders of the Republican Party, without exception, declared that our defenses were entirely adequate and that I, in requesting further appropriations, was an alarmist.

For example, Deeply concerned over what was happening in Europe, with the implications of what probably would happen, I asked the Congress in January, 1938, for a naval expansion of 20% -- forty-six additional

These Republican leaders were, are, and will be, the  
leaders of their party, inside and outside the Congress. They ~~and the~~  
~~leaders~~  
would be largely responsible for the legislation and the policies  
of this government. It is the Congress which passes the laws of  
the United States -- not the President. I know from long experience  
that there must be team work between the Executive and the Congress.  
The record of these Republican leaders shows what a slim chance the  
cause of strong hemispheric defense would have if they were in  
control.

ships and nine hundred and fifty new ~~guns~~ <sup>planes</sup>.

What did the Republican leaders do ~~with~~ <sup>plan they had</sup> this chance to almost three years ago. increase our national defense? You would think from their present berrage of verbal pyrotechnics, that they ~~would have helped to pass~~ <sup>reached in</sup> that bill, or that they ~~might even have~~ demanded a larger expansion of the Navy.

But, ah! my friends, they were not in a national campaign for votes then. In those days they were trying to build up a different kind of political fence. In those days, they were interested in building up a claim of economy. In those days, they thought that the way to win votes was by representing this Administration as extravagant in [building up] national defense, indeed as hysterical and as manufacturing panics and foreign dangers which did not exist.

But now, in the serious days of 1940, ~~that~~ <sup>and</sup> all is changed! Not <sup>and</sup> dangerous would be. They are serious dang; but because they are election days, so well. Today they have done ~~their~~ <sup>their</sup> serious back-flop. But they cannot blot out the printed facts [which have been set] in cold type in the record.

They ~~may~~ swing through the air <sup>in</sup> the radio with the greatest of ease; but the American people are not voting this year for the best trapeze performer.

SECOND DRAFT

- 11 -

The plain fact is that when the naval expansion bill was submitted to the Congress the Republican leaders jumped in to fight it.

Who were they? There was the present Republican candidate for Vice President, Senator McNary. There were Senator Vandenberg and Senator Key <sup>True and</sup> the man who would be the Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Congressman ~~Hammond~~ Fish.

~~These leaders certainly were in control of their party in the Congress; and they are still in control of their party in Congress. They got the kind of votes they wanted. Listen to this.~~

The first thing they did was to try to eliminate the battleships from the bill. The Republicans in the House voted 67 to 20 against building them; and in the Senate the Republicans voted 7 to 4 against building them. <sup>Literally</sup> The record is clear that back in 1935 the Republican leaders were <sup>positive</sup> ~~sane~~ that we needed no more battleships.

~~The~~ <sup>1934</sup> ~~that~~ <sup>1934</sup> naval expansion bill passed, but it passed because of Democratic votes in the Congress, and in spite of Republican opposition.

~~Just listen to what Senator Vandenberg had to say in the debate on that bill. I quote: "I rise in opposition to this super-super-Navy bill. I do not believe it is justified by any conclusive demonstration of national necessity".~~

I can go on and cite many other examples relating to many other defense bills. [not early in 1939, but in 1938.]

In March, 1939, the Republican Senators voted twelve to four against the bill for \$102,000,000 to buy certain strategic ~~defenses~~ materials which we did not have in the United States.

In March, 1939, the Republicans in the Senate voted eleven to eight against increasing the authorized number of planes in the Navy.

In June, 1939, Republicans in the House voted one hundred and forty-four to eight in favor of reducing ~~any~~ appropriations for the Air Corps.

Now that proves this simple fact and no amount of falsification in a political campaign two and a half years later will ever wipe it out. It proves that if the Republican leaders were in control of the

United States Government ~~in January, 1940, they would increase our~~

Navy and our air force would have been defeated overwhelmingly. [Yet]

those same Republican leaders dare to try to deceive the American people now into believing that they were the friends of strong defense. They do not tell the American people the plain truth -- that they blocked and fought and stood in the way of strong defense. ]

I say that the Republican leaders played politics with defense in 1936 and 1939. *I say that* They are playing politics with our national security today.

One more example:

The Republican campaign orators and leaders are all now yelling "me too" on help to Britain. *[They are doing it now because it is politically expedient.]* But when they had a chance *last fall* to vote to give aid to Britain, *they turned it down*. — and they turned it down, *on the congressional vote*. This chance came *[when they voted]* on my recommendation to *The shipment of* repeal the embargo on armaments and munitions to belligerent nations and to *permit such shipment on a* *"cash-and-carry basis".* I made this recommendation because it was clear that our embargo law helped aggressors and harassed the victims of aggression. It is only because of the repeal of the embargo law that we have been able to sell planes and ships and guns and munitions of all kinds to Great Britain. How did the Republicans vote on the repeal of this embargo? This will be uncomfortable listening for some of them.

In the Senate the Republicans voted fourteen to six against *[this law under which we are now giving aid to Britain.]* In the House the Republicans voted one hundred and forty to nineteen against *[such aid]* it.

The Act was passed by Democratic votes but it was over the opposition of the Republican leaders. And just to name a few, the following Republican leaders voted against the Act -- Senators McNary, <sup>Thur</sup> Vandenberg, and Johnson; Congressmen Martin, Barton and Fish.

[And Congressman Martin, as you know, is ~~the~~ man in charge of the Republican National Campaign, and the man who would be Speaker of the House if they obtained control.]

Oh it is so easy now when they know how the American people feel about aid to Britain in their great struggle to save Democracy in Europe and to protect us from attack, for these Republican leaders to rush on to the bandwagon <sup>for</sup> help and more help to Britain. *Insert A*

But it was only a year ago that they spoke more eloquently by their votes than they now speak even in their campaign speeches. If they had had their way a year ago, Great Britain would never have received an ounce of help from us.

Let us come down to one more example -- which took place just two months ago.

In the Senate there was a ~~bill~~ <sup>Amendment</sup> pending to permit the United States Government to prevent profiteering or unpatriotic obstruction in defense work by any corporation. It permitted the Government to take over, with reasonable compensation, any manufacturing plant which refused to

*J. M. C.* At the eleventh hour, they have discovered what we knew all

*A 14*

along -- that the success of Britain in warding off invasion by  
dictatorship forces means the safety of those smaller nations which  
still retain their independence and the restoration of sovereignty  
to those smaller nations which have temporarily lost it. One of  
the keystones of American policy is the recognition of the right of  
small nations to survive and prosper.

*A*

cooperate in national defense. The Republican Senators voted against this ~~(so-called)~~ Russell-Overton Amendment on August 28, 1940, eight to six.

*But* the vote of those eight Republican leaders showed what would happen if the national government were turned over to their control. Their vote said, in effect, that they put money rights ahead of human lives.

You and I, and the overwhelming majority of Americans, will never stand for that.

*The bill was adopted all right by Democratic votes, but only over the bitter opposition of the Republican leaders.*

Outside the walls of Congress eminent candidates began to turn new somersaults. At first they denounced the bill. Then when public opinion rose up to demand it, they seized their ~~old~~ trapeze with the greatest of ease and reversed themselves in mid-air.

*This* I have cited ~~the~~ record of Republican leadership of timidity, weakness and short-sightedness in international and military affairs between 1933 and 1940.

SECOND DRAFT

- 16 -

It is the same record of timidity, weakness and shortsightedness which they showed in domestic affairs when this Government was under their control between 1929 and 1933.



B →

It is the same record of timidity, weakness and shortsightedness which governed the policy of the reactionary governments in France and England immediately before the war.

P That fact was discovered too late in France.

<sup>P</sup> Thank God, <sup>F</sup> For the point of view of American democracy, it was discovered in time in Great Britain.

P <sup>MAN</sup> Please God, that spirit ~~may~~ never prevail in our land.

For eight years our main concern has been to look for peace and the preservation of peace.

In 1935 your Government, in the face of growing dangers throughout the world, undertook to eliminate the hazards which had

led to international trouble and war in the past. ~~We lead the nations~~

~~in a wholly new policy.~~ <sup>P</sup> By the Neutrality Act of 1935, <sup>and other steps;</sup> <sup>P</sup> We made it possible to prohibit American citizens from traveling on vessels belonging to countries at war.

<sup>With great</sup> We made it clear that American investors, putting their money into enterprises in foreign nations, could not call on American warships or soldiers to bail out their investments.

*Spurk B. TP* <sup>Handwritten</sup>  
p. 16 The Republican leaders' memories seem to have been short, in  
this, as in other matters. And by the way -- who was it said that an  
elephant never forgets??

We made it clear that we would not send American armed forces into the sovereign Republics to the south of us.

We made it clear that we would not lend our money to countries at war, lest that act would provide an excuse for ~~them~~ <sup>to get into</sup> war.

We made it clear that ships flying the American flag could not carry munitions to a belligerent; and that they must stay out of war zones.

In <sup>all</sup> these ways, we made it clear to every American, and to every foreign nation, that we would avoid entanglement through some episode beyond our borders.

These were measures to keep us at peace. They have been successful. <sup>all</sup> <sup>1931</sup> through the years of wars since ~~1930~~, there has been no episode.

In July, 1937, Japan invaded China, commencing a disastrous war which is not yet ended. On January 3, 1938, I called the attention <sup>of the nation to the danger of the whole world situation.</sup> It was clear that rearmament was now the only guarantee of peace. I asked for large additions to American defenses. I was called an alarmist and worse names than that.

In April, 1938, a horrified world saw German troops march into Vienna.

In September, 1938, came the Munich crisis -- German, French

and Czech armies were mobilized. The result was <sup>only</sup> an abortive armistice.

I said then: "It is becoming increasingly clear that peace by fear has no higher nor more enduring quality than peace by the sword".

[The danger that threatened the American hemisphere was increased.] Three months later, at Lima, the twenty-one American Republics solemnly agreed to stand together to defend the independence of each one of us. ←

[The declaration at Lima met with the cry of the Republican Party that it was an "entangling alliance". They failed to realize that if the nations on the east coast of South America were to fall into the control of a European coalition, it would inevitably prove to be an entering wedge of a European conqueror into the Republics of the West Indies, the Republics of Central America, and our immediate neighbor on the south, the Republic of Mexico.] Unless the Hemisphere is safe, we are not safe. The declaration at Lima was a great step toward peace.

Matters grew steadily worse in Europe. Czecho-Slovakia was overrun by the Nazis. General war seemed inevitable. Yet ~~absent~~ every <sup>left</sup> ~~the~~ senator <sup>left</sup> ~~absent~~, every moment Republican senators ~~said~~, "There will be no war".

War came on the first of September, 1939.

The steps which we had carefully planned were put into effect.

American ships were kept from danger zones.

American citizens were helped to come home.

Unlike 1914, there was no financial upheaval. <sup>DT</sup> The American Republics set up at Panama a system of patrolling the waters of the whole western hemisphere.

~~With the actual fact of a general European war, we were ready for the maintenance of our own peace.~~

Throughout all this tragic period of brutal war and spreading hatred -- we have steadfastly sought to keep mobilized the greatest active force for peace in the world -- religion -- belief in God,

Your Government is working at all times with representatives of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths. In our churches we are keeping alive the highest ideals of humanity, against the time when their human spiritual values will be most needed. Without these spiritual forces we cannot make or maintain peace.

*This is the ideal ~~message~~ as well expressed in a letter to me from His Holiness the Pope at Christmas time last year. He said: "We have been deeply*

INSERT

A p. 19

Are you going to trust your future and the lives of your children  
to this type of affirmative, realistic fight for peace. Or would you rather  
turn them over to the inexperienced hands of those with no record at  
all -- to those, who in these perilous days, are willing ~~to sacrifice you~~  
<sup>recklessly & simply</sup>  
~~by implying~~ that our boys are already on their way to the transports?

\* \* \*

moved by the [redacted] thought contained in your note in which the spirit of Christmas and the desire to see it applied to the great human problems have found such eloquent expression \* \* \* And now that in this hour of world-wide pain and misgiving the Chief Magistrate of the great North American Federation, under the spell of the Holy Night of Christmas, should have taken such a prominent place in the vanguard of those who would promote peace and generously succor the victims of the war, bespeaks a providential help, which we acknowledge with grateful joy and increased confidence".

SECTION 21

Since His Holiness wrote those beautiful words, the shadows have deepened over the faith and hope of humankind.

We - who ~~would~~ walk in the ways of peace and freedom and light - we have seen the tragedies enacted in one free land after another.

We have not been blind to the causes, or <sup>to</sup> the consequences, of these tragedies.

~~are determined~~  
We have vowed, <sup>not</sup> that those evil things shall never happen here.

We shall guard ourselves against all evils - spiritual as well as material - which may beset us. We guard against the forces of anti-Christian aggression which may attack us from without, and the forces of ignorance and fear which may corrupt us from within.

We shall continue to go forward in firm faith, ~~that we may always~~ and shall continue to go forward in peace.

Z

all 3 three drafts

85 pp.

2nd edition Sg. Garden

10/23/40

201

THIRD DRAFT

SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT

MADISON SQUARE GARDEN

OCTOBER 28, 1940

*Damn it sonny  
right there wrong with  
a voice - never*

Tonight I take up again the public duty - the far from disagreeable duty - of answering major campaign falsifications with facts.

Last week in Philadelphia [I spoke of methods of propaganda which have been imported into the United States in this campaign. I spoke of false statements being made by Republican leaders about the present industrial and economic state of the nation.] I nailed the falsehood about some fanciful secret treaties, to dry on the Barn door. I nailed that falsehood and other falsehoods the way when I was a boy up in Dutchess County, we used to nail up the skins of foxes and weasels.

Tonight I am going to nail up the falsifications that have to do with our relations with the rest of the world, and with the building up of our army, navy and air defense. It is a very dangerous thing to distort facts about such things. [Falsehood in this field gives encouragement and almost extends invitation] to aggressor nations to further their designs or their attacks upon this hemisphere. If repeated over and over again, it is also apt to create a sense of fear and doubt in the minds of some of the American people.

THIRD DRAFT

- 2 -

I now brand as false the statement being made by Republican campaign orators, day after day and night after night, that the rearming of America was slow, that it is hamstrung and impeded, that it will never be able to meet threats from abroad. [I charge that when they repeat such falsehoods, they show that they are more interested in votes than in national security.]

*misstatement*  
That particular falsehood was invented about the time of the Republican National Convention. Before that, the responsible Republican leaders had been singing an entirely different song. For almost seven years the Republican leaders in the Congress kept on saying that I was placing too much emphasis on national defence.

And now today these men of great vision have suddenly discovered *This is not my handwriting* that there is a war on in Europe and another one in Asia. And so, now, always with their eye on the good old ballot box, they are charging that we have placed too little emphasis on national defense.

But, unlike them, the printed pages of the Congressional Record cannot be changed or suppressed at election time. [There you will find the record] of their speeches and their votes. And based on that record *Document* I make this assertion - that if the Republican leaders had been in control of the Congress of the United States during the past seven

### THIRD DRAFT

— 3 —

years, the important measures for our defense would not now be law;

and that the Army and Navy of the United States would still be in ~~the~~<sup>Chosen the place</sup>

(Unpleasant condition in which I found them in 1933.

I make these charges against the responsible political leader-  
ship of the Republican Party. You know that the same group will still  
control their party policy in the Congress, and outside of the Congress,  
whether they be the minority or the majority party.

(There are millions of patriotic Republicans who have at all times been in sympathy with the efforts of this Administration to arm itself adequately for defense.

To Washington in the past few months have come not two or three or a dozen, but several hundred of the best business executives in the United States -- Republicans and Democrats alike. Not holding company lawyers or executives, but men experienced in actual production - production of all the types of machines and tools and steel that have made this country the industrial leader of the world.

I asked Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Stottinius and Mr. Harriman and  
Mr. Budd and the others because I believe they are the ablest men in the  
country in their own fields. I do not know their politics. I do not  
care about their politics. All I know is that they are cooperating one  
hundred per cent.

## THIRD DRAFT

- 4 -

with this Administration in our efforts for national defense. And this Government is cooperating with them - one hundred percent.

All of these men - all of American industry and American labor - are doing magnificent and unselfish work. The progress to date proves it.

I shall have occasion in a later speech to tell more about the work they are doing, and about the progress which has been made, in defense.

When the first World War ended we were one of the strongest naval and military powers in the world. When this Administration first came into office fifteen years later, we were one of the weakest.

As early as 1933 the storm was gathering in Europe and in Asia. Year by year I reported the warnings of danger from our listening posts in foreign lands. But I was only called "an alarmist" by the Republican leadership, ~~and by the first majority of The Republican papers,~~

Year by year I asked for more and more defense appropriations.

[There were direct Congressional appropriations for the Army and Navy.]

In addition, I allocated hundreds of millions of dollars for defense work from relief funds, from CCC funds and from Public Works funds, —

~~It was~~ <sup>It was</sup> understood by the Congress when the funds were voted.

Today our Navy is at a peak of efficiency and fighting strength.

## THIRD DRAFT

- 5 -

Ship for ship, and man for man, it is as powerful and efficient as any that ever sailed the seas in the history of the world. Our Army

and our air forces are now at the highest level they have ever been in

peacetime. *But in the light of existing dangers they are not yet enough for the absolute safety of America.*

While this great, constructive work was going forward, the Republican leaders were trying to block our efforts toward national defense. They not only voted against these efforts; but they stated time and again through the years that they were unnecessary and extravagant, that our armed strength was sufficient for any emergency. [But I knew otherwise, and, time and again through the years, I told them so.]

I propose now to indict these Republican leaders out of their own mouths - these leaders who now disparage our defenses - indict them with what they themselves said in the days before this election year, about how adequate our defenses already were.

Listen to this statement for instance. I quote:

"The facts are that we have the largest and most powerful Navy we ever had, except for two years after the World War, and the greatest air forces we ever had and a match for any nation."

Now who do you think made this statement in June 1938? It

was not I. It was not even a member of this Administration. It was the

ranking Republican member of the House Committee on ~~Military~~ Affairs,

Republican leader, Hamilton Fish.

*Insert A*

~~And now listen to Republican Leader, Mr. Landon, at that time  
the head of the Republican Party, speaking in 1939, after the outbreak  
of the war in Europe. I quote:~~

~~"we are in better position to defend ourselves against  
a foreign foe than we have ever been in the past."~~

And now listen to Republican leader Senator Vandenberg, also  
speaking in 1938. He said that our defense expenditures had already  
brought us (and I quote) "an incomparably efficient Navy"; and he said  
further "I rise in opposition to this super-super Navy bill. I do not  
believe it is justified by any conclusive demonstration of national  
necessity".

And now listen to Republican leader Senator Taft - the runner-up  
this year for the Republican Presidential nomination - speaking in  
February 1940. I quote:

~~"The increase of the Army and Navy over the tremen-~~  
~~dous appropriations of the current year seems to~~

Inset A p 6

And now listen to ex-President Hoover speaking in  
that same year of 1939. I quote:

"We shall be expending nine hundred million  
dollars more than any nation on earth", he  
complained, "We are leading in the arms race".

## THIRD DRAFT

- 7 -

be unnecessary if we are concerned solely with

defense."

*permanent,*  
 There is the record; there is the crystal clear record. Until  
 the present political campaign opened, Republican leaders, in Congress  
 and out, shouted from the housetops that our defenses were fully  
 adequate.

Today they complain that this administration has starved our  
 armed forces, that our Navy is anemic, our Army puny, our air forces  
 pitifully weak.

This is a remarkable somersault.

I wonder if the election could have something to do with it.

*S. David B.*  
 The simple truth is that the Republican Party played politics

with defense in 1936 and 1939. They are playing politics with national

security today. *P* The same group will still control their  
 party policy in the Congress.

*It is the Congress which passes the laws of the United States --*

*[not the President.]* I know from long experience that there must be team  
 work between the Executive and the Congress. *] The record of these*  
 Republican leaders shows what a slim chance the cause of strong defense  
 would have, if they were in control.

Not only in their statements but in their votes is written

*Insert B. p. 7*

If the Republican leaders were telling the truth  
in 1938 and 1939, then -- out of their own mouths -- they  
stand convicted of inconsistency today. If they are not  
telling the truth today, then they stand convicted of  
inconsistency in 1938 and 1939.

3  
THIRD DRAFT

- 6 -

their record of sabotage of this administration's continual efforts to increase our defenses to meet the dangers that loomed ever larger upon the horizon.

For example, deeply concerned over what was happening in Europe, I asked the Congress in January, 1938, for a naval expansion of 20% -- forty-six additional ships and nine hundred and fifty new planes.

What did the Republican leaders do when they had this chance to increase our national defense almost three years ago? You would think from their present barrage of verbal pyrotechnics, that they rushed in to pass that bill, or that they even demanded a larger expansion of the Navy.

But, ah! my friends, they were not in a national campaign for votes then.

In those days, they were trying to build up a different kind of political fence.

[ In those days, they were interested in building up a specious claim of economy. ]

In those days, they thought that the way to win votes was by

B  
THIRD DRAFT

- 9 -

representing this Administration as extravagant in national defense,

indeed as hysterical and as manufacturing panics and foreign dangers.

[which did not exist.]

But now, in the serious days of 1940, all is changed! Not only because they are serious days; but because they are election days as well.

[Today they have done a spectacular back-flop. But they cannot blot out the printed facts in cold type in the record.]

On the radio ~~may~~ swing through the air with the greatest of ease; but the American people are not voting this year for the best trapeze performer. //

The plain fact is that when the naval expansion bill was submitted to the Congress the Republican leaders jumped in to fight it.

Who were they? There was the present Republican candidate for Vice President, Senator McNary. There were Senator Vandenberg and Senator Nye. There was the man who would be the Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Congressman Fish.

The first thing they did was to try to eliminate the battleships from the bill. The Republicans in the House voted 67 to 20

## THIRD DRAFT

- 10 -

against building them ; and in the Senate the Republicans voted 7 to 4 against building them.

The record is certainly clear that back in 1938 the Republican leaders were positive that we needed no more battleships. The naval expansion bill was passed; but it was passed ~~because of~~ Democratic votes in the Congress. <sup>by</sup> [It was passed] in spite of Republican opposition.

[ I can go on and cite many other examples relating to many other defense bills.]

*Again*, In March, 1939, the Republican Senators voted twelve to four against the bill for \$102,000,000 to buy certain strategic defense materials which we did not have in the United States.

In March, 1939, the Republicans in the Senate voted eleven to eight against increasing the authorized number of planes in the Navy.

In June, 1939, Republicans in the House voted one hundred and forty-four to eight in favor of reducing appropriations for the Army Air Corps.

Now that proves this simple fact, [and no amount of falsification in a political campaign two and a half years later will ever wipe it out.] It proves that if the Republican leaders <sup>had been</sup> in control

THIRDDRAFT

- 11 -

[of the United States Government] in 1938 and 1939, these measures to increase our Navy and our air forces would have been defeated overwhelmingly.

I say that the Republican leaders played politics with defense in 1938 and 1939. I say that they are playing politics with our national security today.

One more example:

The Republican campaign orators and leaders are all now yelling "me too" on help to Britain. But last Fall they had a chance to vote <sup>Their</sup> ~~and other democrats~~ to give aid to Britain - and they turned it down.

*when I recommended that the Congress*  
*This chance came on the Congressional vote on my recommendation*  
to repeal the embargo on the shipment of armaments and munitions to <sup>abusing</sup> ~~belligerent nations and~~ permit such shipment on a "cash-and-carry basis". [I made this recommendation because it was clear that our embargo law was in some cases helping aggressors and injuring the victims of aggression.] It is only because of the repeal of the embargo law that we have been able to sell planes and ships and guns and munitions ~~esp. to~~ <sup>to victims of aggression</sup>.

SECRET EXHIBIT

- 12 -

How did the Republicans vote on the repeal of this  
embargo?

[This will be uncomfortable listening for some of them.]

In the Senate the Republicans voted fourteen to six  
against it. In the House the Republicans voted one hundred  
and forty to nineteen against it.

The Act was passed by Democratic votes but it was over  
the opposition of the Republican leaders. And just to name a  
few, the following Republican leaders voted against the Act —  
Senators McNary, Vandenberg, Nye, and Johnson; Congressmen Martin,  
Barton and Fish.

[Oh it is so easy now when they know how the American  
people feel about aid to Britain in ~~this~~ great struggle to  
save democracy in Europe, for these Republican leaders to rush  
on to the bandwagon for help and more help.]

R. Wright At the eleventh hour, they have discovered what we knew  
*overseas*  
all along — that the success ~~of~~ in warding off invasion

## THIRD DRAFT

- 15 -

to the United States as well as to  
by dictatorship forces means ~~the~~ safety of those smaller nations  
which still retain their independence and the restoration of  
sovereignty to those smaller nations which have temporarily lost  
it. One of the keystones of American policy is the recognition  
of the right of small nations to survive and prosper.

[It was only a year ago that they spoke more eloquently  
by their votes than they now speak even in their campaign speeches.]

[If they had had their way a year ago, Great Britain would never  
have received an ounce of help from us. if the decision had been  
left to Martin, Buxton + Fisher.]

Let us come down to one more example -- which took place  
just two months ago.

In the Senate there was an amendment to permit the  
United States Government to prevent profiteering or unpatriotic  
obstruction by any corporation in defense work. It permitted the  
Government to take over, with reasonable compensation, any manu-  
facturing plant which refused to cooperate in national defense.  
The Republican Senators voted against this Russell-Overton Amend-  
ment on August 28, 1940, eight to six.

The bill was adopted all right by Democratic votes.  
But the <sup>c</sup>vote of those eight Republican leaders showed what would

## THIRD DRAFT

- 14 -

happen if the national government were turned over to their control. Their vote said, in effect, that they put money rights ahead of human lives, *- to say nothing of material security,*

You and I, and the overwhelming majority of Americans, will never stand for that.

Outside the halls of Congress eminent candidates began to turn new somersaults. At first they denounced the bill. Then when public opinion rose up to demand it, they seized their trapezes with the greatest of ease, and reversed themselves in mid-air.

[I have cited this record of Republican leadership of — as bad — timidity, weakness and short-sightedness in international [as in military affairs, between 1933 and 1940.]

It is the same record of timidity, weakness and shortsightedness which they showed in domestic affairs when [this Government was under their control between 1929 and 1933.] They were in control before 1933. But the Republican leaders' memories seem to have been short, in this, as in other matters. And by the way -- who was it said that an elephant never forgets?

184

THIRD DRAFT

- 15 -

It is the same record of timidity, weakness and short-sightedness which governed the policy of the reactionary governments in France and England ~~immediately~~ before the war.

That fact was discovered too late in France.

~~From the point of view of American democracy, it was~~  
~~just~~  
discovered in time in Great Britain.

Please God, may that spirit never prevail in our land.

For eight years our main concern has been to look for peace and the preservation of peace.

In 1935 ~~your Government~~, in the face of growing dangers throughout the world, ~~undertook to eliminate the hazards which~~  
~~had led to [international trouble and] war in the past.~~

By the Neutrality Act of 1935, and other steps:

We made it possible to prohibit American citizens from traveling on vessels belonging to countries at war. *Was that right?*

We made it clear that American investors, who put their money into enterprises in foreign nations, could not call on American warships or soldiers to bail out their investments.

We made it clear that we would not ~~send~~ <sup>use</sup> American armed forces into the sovereign Republics to the south of us.

178

[We made it clear that we would not lend our money to countries at war, lest that act would provide an excuse for war.] *Mr. Roosevelt*

We made it clear that ships flying the American flag could not carry munitions to a belligerent; and that they must stay out of war zones.

In all these ways, we made it clear to every American, and to every foreign nation, that we would avoid entanglement through some episode beyond our borders.

These were measures to keep us at peace. [They have been successful.] *And* For through all the years of wars since 1935, there has been no episode entanglement.

In July, 1937, Japan invaded China, [commencing a disastrous war which is not yet ended.]

On January 3, 1938, I called the attention of the nation to the danger of the whole world situation.

It was clear that rearmament was now [the only guarantee of peace.] *A necessary implement of peace.* I asked for large additions to American defenses. I was called an alarmist - and worse names than that.

*March*  
In April, 1938, [a horrified world saw] German troops march into

Vissna.

In September, 1938, came the Munich crisis, ~~#~~ German, French and Czech armies were mobilized. The result was only an abortive armistice.

I said then: "It is becoming increasingly clear that peace by fear has no higher nor more enduring quality than peace by the sword".

Three months later, at Lima, the twenty-one American Republics solemnly agreed to stand together to defend the independence of each one of us.

*For* Unless the Hemisphere is safe, we are not safe. *P* The declaration at Lima was a great step toward peace.

Matters grew steadily worse in Europe. Czechoslovakia was overrun by the Nazis. General war seemed inevitable. *P* Yet even then Republican Senators kept chanting, "There will be no war".

*A few months later*, ~~on~~ *on* the first of September, 1939, ~~we~~ *we* came.

The steps which we had carefully planned were put into effect.

American ships were kept from danger zones.

American citizens were helped to come home.

① THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

This affirmation  
search for peace calls  
for clear vision. It  
is necessary to mobilize re-  
<sup>SOURCE</sup> minds and skills, and,  
every active force for  
peace in the world.

We have steadily  
sought to keep mobilized  
the greatest force of  
all - religious ~~today~~ <sup>today</sup>  
~~SO~~: faith, devotion to God.

- 18

Unlike 1914, there was no financial upheaval.

The American Republics set up at Panama a system of patrolling the waters of the whole western hemisphere.

~~I ask you to support a continuance of  
Are you going to assist me?~~

~~This~~ this type of affirmative, realistic fight for peace. ~~We would you rather turn them over to the inexperienced~~ The alternative is to push the future of the country in the hands of those ~~with no record at all~~ to those who in these perilous days, are willing recklessly to imply that our boys are already on their way to the transports.

~~A~~ Throughout all this tragic period of brutal war and spreading hatred we have steadfastly sought to keep mobilized the greatest active force for peace in the world -- religion -- belief in God.

Your Government is working at all times with representatives of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths. In our churches we are keeping alive the highest ideals of humanity, against the time when their human spiritual values will be most needed. Without these spiritual forces we cannot make or maintain peace.

- 19 -

This is the ideal so well expressed in a letter to me from His Holiness the Pope at Christmas time last year. He said: "We have been deeply moved by the \*\*\* thought contained in your note, [in which the spirit of Christmas and the desire to see it applied to the great human problems have found such eloquent expression \* \* \* And now] that in this hour of world-wide pain and misgiving the Chief Magistrate of the great North American Federation, under the spell of the Holy Night of Christmas, should have taken such a prominent place in the vanguard of those who would promote peace and generously succor the victims of the war, bespeaks a providential help, which we acknowledge with grateful joy and increased confidence".

Since His Holiness wrote those words, the shadows have deepened over the faith and hope of humankind.

We - who walk in the ways of peace and freedom and light - have seen the tragedies enacted in one free land after another.

We have not been blind to the causes, or to the consequences, of these tragedies.

- 20 -

[We are determined that these evil things shall not happen here.]

We [shall] guard ourselves against all evils — spiritual as well as material — which may beset us. We guard against the forces of anti-Christian aggression, which may attack us from without, and the forces of ignorance and fear which may corrupt us from within.

We shall continue to go forward in firm faith. We shall continue to go forward in peace.

- - - -

**STATEMENTS FILE**  
ShorthandBy Kannee

HOLD FOR RELEASE

HOLD FOR RELEASE

HOLD FOR RELEASE

October 28, 1940

**CAUTION:** The following address of the President, to be delivered in Madison Square Garden, New York, MUST BE HELD IN CONFIDENCE until released.

NOTE: Release to editions of all newspapers appearing on the streets NOT LATER THAN 10:00 P.M., E.S.T., October 26, 1940. The same release of the text of the address also applies to radio announcers and news commentators.

CARE MUST BE EXERCISED TO PREVENT INEQUITABLE PUBLICATION.

**STEPHEN BAILY**  
Secretary to the President

Tonight I take up ~~mainly~~ the public duty -- the far from disagreeable duty -- of answering major campaign falsifications with facts.

Last week in Philadelphia, I nailed the falsehood about some fanciful secret treaties, to dry on the barn door. I nailed that falsehood and other falsehoods the way when I was a boy up in Dutchess County, we used to nail up the skins of foxes and weasels.

Tonight I am going to nail up the falsifications that have to do with our relations with the rest of the world, and with the building up of our army, navy and air defense. It's a very dangerous thing to distort facts about such things. If repeated over and over again, it is apt to create a sense of fear and doubt in the minds of some of the American people.

) I now brand as false the statement being made by Republican campaign orators, day after day and night after night, that the rearing of America was slow, that it is hamstrung and impeded, that it will never be able to meet threats from abroad. (

That particular misstatement was invented about the time of the Republican National Convention. Before that, the responsible Republican leaders had been singing an entirely different song. For almost seven years the Republican leaders in the Congress kept on saying that I was placing too much emphasis on national defense.

And now today those men of great vision have suddenly discovered that there is a war on in Europe and another one in Asia. And so, now, always with their eyes on the good old ballot box, they are charging that we have placed too little emphasis on national defense.

But, unlike them, the printed pages of the Congressional record cannot be changed or suppressed at election time. And based on that permanent record of their speeches and their votes, I make this assertion -- that if the republican leaders had been in control of the Congress of the United States during the past seven years, the important measures for our defense would not now be law; that the Army and Navy of the United States would still be in almost the same condition in which I found them in 1933.

I make these charges against the responsible political leadership of the Republican Party. There are millions of patriotic Republicans who have at all times been in sympathy with the efforts of this Administration to arm itself adequately for defense.

To Washington in the past few months have come not two or three or a dozen, but several hundred of the best business executives in the United States -- Republicans and Democrats alike. Now holding company ~~large~~ executives, but men experienced in actual production -- production of all the types of machines and tools and steel that have made this nation the industrial leader of the world.

I asked Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Stettinius and Mr. Harriman and Mr. Budd and the many others to serve, because I believe they are certainly among the ablest men in the country in their own fields. I do not know their politics. I do not care about their politics. All I know is that they are cooperating one hundred per cent with this Administration in our efforts for national defense. And this Government is cooperating with them -- one hundred per cent.

All of these men -- all of American industry and American labor -- are doing magnificent and unselfish work. The progress today proves it.

I shall have occasion in a later speech to tell more about the work they are doing, and about the progress which has been made in our defense.

When the first world War ended we were one of the strongest naval and military powers in the world. When this Administration first came into office fifteen years later, we were one of the weakest.

As early as 1933 the storm was gathering in Europe and in Asia. Year by year I reported the warnings of danger from our listening posts in foreign lands. But I was only called "an alarmist" by the Republican leadership, and by the great majority of the Republican press.

Year by year I asked for more and more defense appropriations. In addition, I allocated hundreds of millions of dollars for defense work from relief funds, from Civilian Conservation Corps Funds and from Public Works Funds -- as was understood by the Congress when the funds were voted.

Today our Navy is at a peak of efficiency and fighting strength. Ship for ship, and man for man, it is as powerful and efficient as anything ever sailed the seas in the history of the world. Our Army and our air forces are now at the highest level they have ever been in peacetime. But in the light of existing dangers they are not great enough for the absolute safety of America.

While this great, constructive work was going forward, the Republican leaders were trying to block our efforts toward national defense. They not only voted against these efforts; but they stated time and again through the years that they were unnecessary and extravagant, that our armed strength was sufficient for any emergency.

I propose now to indict these Republican leaders out of their own mouths -- these leaders who now disparage our defenses -- indict them with what they themselves said in the days before this election year, about how adequate our defenses already were.

Listen to this statement--for instance. I quote:

"The facts are that we have ~~the largest and~~ most powerful Navy we ever had except for two years after the World War, and the greatest air forces we ever had and a match for any nation".

Now who do you ~~think~~ made this statement in ~~1938~~? It was not I. "It was not even a member of this Administration. It was the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Republican leader, Hamilton Fish.

And now listen to ex-President Hoover speaking in that same year of 1938. I quote:

"We shall be expending nine hundred million dollars more than any nation on earth", ~~he complained~~. "We are leading in the arms race".

And now listen to Republican leader Senator Vandenberg, also speaking in 1938. He said that our defense expenditures had already brought us (and I quote) "an incomparably efficient Navy"; and he said further "I rise in opposition to this super-super Navy bill. I do not believe it is justified by any conclusive demonstration of national necessity".

And now listen to Republican leader Senator Taft -- the runner-up this year for the Republican Presidential nomination speaking in February 1940. I quote:

"The increase of the Army and Navy over the tremendous appropriations of the current year seems to be unnecessary if we are concerned solely with defense".

There is the record, there is the permanent crystal clear record. Until the present political campaign opened, Republican leaders, in Congress and out, shouted from the house tops that our defenses were fully adequate.

Today they ~~said~~ that this Administration has starved our armed forces, that our Navy is anemic, our Army puny, our air forces pitifully weak.

I wonder if the election could have something to do with it. If the Republican leaders were telling the truth in 1938 and 1939, then -- out of their own mouths -- they stand convicted of inconsistency today. If they are not telling the truth today, then they stand convicted of inconsistency in 1938.

The simple truth is that the Republican Party played politics with defense in 1938 and 1939. They are playing politics with national security today.

The same group will still control their party policy in the Congress. It is the Congress which passes the laws of the United States. The record of these Republican leaders shows what a slim chance the cause of strong defense would have, if they were in control.

Not only in their statements but in their votes is written their record of sabotage of this Administration's continual efforts to increase our defenses to meet the dangers that loomed ever larger upon the horizon.

For example, deeply concerned over what was happening in Europe, I asked the Congress in January, 1938, for a naval expansion of twenty per cent -- forty-six additional ships and nine hundred and fifty new planes.

What did the Republican leaders do when they had this chance to increase our national defense almost three years ago? You would think from their present barrage of verbal pyrotechnics, that they rushed in to pass that bill, or that they even demanded a larger expansion of the Navy.

But, ah! my friends, they were not in a national campaign for votes then.

In those days, they were trying to build up a different kind of political fence.

In those days, they thought that the way to win votes was by representing this Administration as extravagant in national defense, indeed as hysterical ~~and~~ as manufacturing panics and inventing foreign dangers.

But now, in the serious days of 1940, all is changed: Not only because they are serious days; but because they are election days as well.

On the radio these Republican orators swing through the air with the greatest of ease; but the American people are not voting this year for the best trapzeo performer.

The plain fact is that when the naval expansion bill was submitted to the Congress the Republican leaders jumped in to fight it.

Who were they? There was the present Republican candidate for Vice President, Senator McNary. There were Senator Vandenberg and Senator Key. There was the man who would be the Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Congressman Fish.

The first thing they did was to try to eliminate the battleships from the bill. The Republicans in the House voted sixty-seven to twenty against building them; and in the Senate the Republicans voted seven to four against building them.

The record is certainly clear that back in 1938 ~~the~~ Republican leaders were positive that we needed no more battleships. The naval expansion bill was passed; but it was passed by Democratic votes in the Congress -- in spite of Republicans' opposition.

Again, in March, 1939, the Republican Senators voted twelve to four against the bill for one hundred and two million dollars to buy certain strategic defense materials which we ~~do~~ not have in the United States.

In March, 1939, the Republicans in the Senate voted eleven to eight against increasing the authorized number of planes in the Navy.

In June, 1939, Republicans in the House voted one hundred and forty-four to eight in favor of reducing appropriations for the Army Air Corps.

Now that proves this one simple fact! It proves that if the Republican leaders had been in control in 1938 and 1939, those measures to increase our Navy and our air forces would have been defeated overwhelmingly.

I say that ~~the~~ Republican leaders played politics with defense in 1938 and 1939. I say that they are playing politics with our national security today.

One more example:

The Republican campaign orators and leaders are now yelling "We too can help to Britain." But last Fall they had their chance to vote to give aid to Britain and other democracies -- and they turned it down.

6/1940

This chance came when I recommended that the Congress repeal the embargo on the shipment of armaments and munitions to nations at war, and permit such shipment on a "cash-and-carry basis". It is only because of the repeal of the embargo law that we have been able to sell planes and ships and guns and munitions to victims of aggression.

How did the Republicans vote on the repeal of this embargo?

In the Senate the Republicans voted fourteen to six against it. In the House, the Republicans voted one hundred and forty to nineteen against it.

The Act was passed by Democratic votes, but it was over the opposition of the Republican leaders. And just to name a few, the following Republican leaders voted against the Act -- Senators McNary, Vandenberg, Nye and Johnson; Congressman Martin, Barton and Fish.

Now, at the eleventh hour, they have discovered what we know all along -- that overseas success in warding off invasion by dictatorship forces means safety to the United States as well as to those smaller nations which still retain their independence, and the restoration of sovereignty to those smaller nations which have temporarily lost it. One of the keystones of American policy is the recognition of the right of small nations to survive and prosper.

Great Britain could never have received assistance of help from us -- if the decision had been left to Martin, Barton and Fish.

Let me come down to one more example which took place last two months ago.

In the Senate there was an amendment to permit the United States Government to prevent profiteering or unpatriotic obstruction by any corporation in defense work. It permitted the Government to take over, with reasonable compensation, any manufacturing plant which refused to cooperate in national defense. The Republican Senators voted against this Russell-Overton Amendment on August 28, 1940, eight to six.

The bill was adopted all right -- by Democratic votes. But the opposing vote of those eight Republican leaders showed what would happen if the national government were turned over to their control. Their vote said, in effect, that they put money rights ahead of human lives -- to say nothing of national security.

You and I, and the overwhelming majority of Americans, will never stand for that.

Outside the halls of Congress eminent Republican candidates began to turn hot somersaults. At first they denounced the bill. Then when public opinion rose up to demand it, they seized their trapeze with the greatest of ease, and reversed themselves in mid-air.

This record of Republican leadership -- a record of timidity, weakness and short-sightedness -- is as bad in international as in military affairs.

It is the same record of timidity, weakness and short-sightedness which they showed in domestic affairs when they were in control before 1933.

But the Republican leaders' memories seem to have been short, in this, as in other matters. And by the way -- who was it said that an elephant never forgets?

It is the same record of timidity, weakness and short-sightedness which governed the policy of the confused, reactionary governments in France and England before the war.

That fact was discovered too late in France.

It was discovered just in time in Great Britain.

Please God, may that spirit never prevail in our land.

For eight years our main concern has been to look for peace and the preservation of peace.

In 1935, in the face of growing dangers throughout the world, your Government undertook to eliminate the hazards which in the past had led to war.

By the Neutrality Act of 1935, and by other steps:

We made it possible to prohibit American citizens from traveling on vessels belonging to countries at war. Was that right?

We made it clear that American investors, who put their money into enterprises in foreign nations, could not call on American warships or soldiers to bail out their investments. Was that right?

We made it clear that we would not use American armed forces to intervene in affairs of the sovereign Republics to the south of us. Was that right?

We made it clear that ships flying the American flag could not carry munitions to a belligerent; and that they must stay out of war zones. Was that right?

In all those ways, we made it clear to every American, and to every foreign nation, that we would avoid becoming entangled through some episode beyond our borders.

These were measures to keep us at peace. And through all the years of war since 1935, there has been no entanglement. *Neverland*

On January 3, 1936, I called the attention of the nation to the danger of the whole world situation.

It was clear that rearmament was now a necessary implement of peace. I asked for large additions to American defenses. I was called an alarmist -- and worse names than that.

In March, 1938, German troops marched into Vienna.

In September, 1938, came the Munich crisis. German, French and Czech armies were mobilized. The result was only an abortive armistice.

I said then: "It is becoming increasingly clear that peace by fear has no higher or more enduring quality than peace by the sword".

Three months later, at Lima, the twenty-one American Republics solemnly agreed to stand together to defend the independence of each one of us.

The declaration at Lima was a great step toward peace. For unless the Hemisphere is safe, we are not safe.

As matters grew steadily worse in Europe. Czecho-Slovakia was overrun by the Nazis. General war seemed inevitable.

Yet even then Republican leaders kept chanting, "There will be no war."

A few months later -- on the first of September, 1939, war came.

The steps which we had carefully planned were put into effect.

American ships were kept from danger zones.

American citizens were helped to come home.

Unlike 1914, there was no financial upheaval.

The American Republics set up at Panama a system of patrolling the waters of the whole Western Hemisphere.

We (try) to support a continuance of this type of affirmative, realistic fight for peace. The alternative is to risk the future of the country in the hands of those with this record of timidity, weakness and short-sightedness or in the inexperienced hands of those who in these perilous days, are willing recklessly to imply that our boys are already on their way to the transports.

This affirmative search for peace calls for clear vision. It is necessary to mobilize resources, minds and skills, and every active force for peace in the world.

We have steadily sought to keep mobilized the greatest force of all -- religious faith, devotion to God.

Your Government is working at all times with representatives of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths. Without these spiritual forces we cannot make or maintain peace, and all three of them work with us toward that great end.

Shadows, however, are still heavy over the faith and hope of humankind.

We -- who walk in the ways of peace and freedom and light -- have seen the tragedies enacted in one free land after another.

We have not been blind to the causes, or the consequences, of these tragedies.

We guard ourselves against all evils -- spiritual as well as material -- which may beset us. We guard against the forces of anti-Christian aggression, which may attack us from without, and the forces of ignorance and fear which may corrupt us from within.

We shall continue to go forward in firm faith. We shall continue to go forward in peace.