As you are aware, I have for two years sought to carry on three key problems of the war on the basis, substantially, of existing law. The first of these objectives was the obtaining of adequate manpower under the Selective Service Act in such a way that the personnel of our Army and Navy would be adequately supplied and at the same time the personnel of munition-making transportation and other necessary military and civilian purposes would not be too seriously upset to function.

The second objective related to prices of those articles which might be called the necessities of life. Various controls were established, one after the other, but largely because this was a new field many mistakes were made both on the part of the administrative handling of rationing and also on the part of the public, many of whom were encouraged to cry out against something which was new. It was, of course, hard to explain to a family living within sight of an oil well that they could not use all the gasoline in their car they wanted to use.
The third objective was to stabilize wages as a whole and here again new laws were built on the old structure which with great success had solved labor disputes and untangled inequities.

As a broad result, fair success has been obtained in all three fields. At one time almost everybody in the United States seemed to be talking at once over the issue of manpower. The country inevitably would be on the rocks in another year.

There would be shortages of this, that, and the other necessity -- there would be the closing down of thousands of organizations -- all from the lack of manpower. Our very Army and Navy would not get necessary reinforcements all for the lack of manpower.

And when people got tired of talking, it was discovered that on the whole the manpower problem was being worked out even though it took super-human efforts and super-human good nature to handle matters, like an unheard of congestion of human beings in places like the West Coast and other congested centers.
In regard to the result in the second case, once more everybody seemed to start talking at the same time. To hear the clamor one would have expected thousands of deaths from starvation. One would have thought that everybody who grew potatoes or raised cattle had all gone out of business at the same time.

After the panic had run its course it was discovered that in several parts of the country, mostly at different times, there had for short periods been local shortages in this or that or the other product. And that the general cost of living figures had shown occasional short and sharp rises in some given locality, but that the cost of food on the average for the country had remained relatively stable during the past six months.

Specters of starving children disappeared into thin air. We found that Americans still within our continental limits -- in other words, nearly 130,000,000 of them -- were consuming more poundage of food per capita than in all our previous history and that in addition to that we were feeding three and a half million Americans overseas and supplying large stores of necessary foodstuffs to our Allies who are very definitely helping us to win the war.
When I see our troops on the fighting front, I do not blame them for asking, with a bit of a sneer, "What are people all getting het up about back home?"

On the third matter, I think it is fair to say two things. First, that the men and women who have labored in our factories, who have worked to keep our armies supplied, have done a magnificent job in production. It remains true today that our record of actual strikes is exceedingly small. If, for example, a thousand men and women work in the average community in turning out munitions, the average number of those thousand men and women who are on strike have averaged only about two people -- nine hundred and ninety-eight are working and two are on strike. That is a record which no democracy has ever equaled.

On the other hand, there have been many threats which if carried out would have come close to stopping our war effort. Let me make this clear. The law of October 2, 1942, is clear. The law sets the cost of living as of an immediate prior period and in effect sets the wage scale as of that period, providing,
of course, that if individual trades are i.e. below that base period they can present their cases to a national wage labor board. In that same law, there is a provision that the findings of that War Labor Board shall be subject to an overall examination in order that a general scale shall be assured to the whole country. This, under the law, is carried out by the Stabilization Director, acting for the President.

I think that this has worked well, on the whole, though I assert that in the case of the coal miners of the country a strike was actually put into effect and that to all intents and purposes a gun was held at the head of the government. Everybody knew that you cannot take over coal mines and start them operating either with troops or with civilians, except through an unconscionable delay which would in effect stop the wheels of war industries and transportation for a long period. The government yielded and the miners received more additions to their pay than would have come to them equitably under the War Labor Board decision.

I should think that any of you in a position of responsibility toward the war effort would have done the same thing.
While I was abroad last month a railroad strike was actually ordered. The date was set. Within three days of that date simple prudence required the taking over of the railroads. This was done and now certain leaders are pretending that there would have been no strike at all.

You and I are unable to take psychological risks of that kind at a critical period in our national defense.

All of this rather lengthy review has led me to the conclusion that I must today ask the Congress of the United States to pass a National Service Act.

Fundamentally, a National Service Act is no more radical departure in our national life than a Selective Service Act for soldiers and sailors.

I seek three things. The ending of threats of strikes during the balance of this war, but this would not be fair to the people of this nation unless it were accompanied by the two other objectives I have mentioned above. Food costs must be kept for the necessities of life -- and these are not many in number.
This involves fair prices to the grower of foodstuffs, who, incidentally, have been to their great credit, increasing the volume of their crops. They should not get more than the very handsome figures they already have been receiving during the past year. At the same time, profiting by middle men on the necessities of life require further regulation and better distribution. And finally, on this problem of the cost of living the actual consumers of the nation must be protected even though it may cost money out of the Federal Treasury to attain that end. The total amount involved in this is a very small fraction of what it costs to run this war. Finally, if we maintain this cost of food index, we must, at the same time, maintain the wage and salary standards which are now in effect.

A law providing for these three things — a law which means very little change for increase of government machinery will do much to remove confusion in the public mind, to confute those who professionally are engaged in the pastime of stirring up trouble will, in my judgment, accomplish much at this period of the war.
When I speak of national or universal service, my personal preference would be to have it include women as well as men. For example, in Great Britain for sometime they have been draftible up to the age of 55. No serious hardships have occurred in Britain for the administration of the law has been handled with discretion and on the recommendation of local boards or communities.

In this country today tens of thousands of women are already in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard. Our manpower problem would be simplified if in our shifting needs we had a larger available pool of workers to draw from. I trust the Congress will give special attention to this question.

If we had 600,000 WACS, and WAVES, and SPARS, and MARLIN'S, there would be far less conversation about 60,000 pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.

The responsibility today is that of the Congress of the United States. I have been frank in asking the Congress for a National Service Law. I hope that if the Congress acts it will not give me something which it calls "just as good".
I realize that this is a political year, but this is an issue which transcends politics.

As to the machinery for the establishment and management of National Service, the Congress itself can properly determine its nature just so long as the Congress outlines machinery which is wholly non-partisan in its make-up.
Therefore in order to concentrate all our energies and resources on winning the war, and to maintain a fair and stable economy at home, I recommend that the Congress adopt:

1. A realistic tax law -- which will tax excess purchasing power and all unreasonable profits.

2. A renegotiation of war contracts law -- which will prevent exorbitant profits and assure fair prices to the government.

3. A food subsidies law -- which will prevent rise in the cost of living for consumers.

4. A national service law -- which will prevent strikes, and make available for war production and other essential services every able-bodied adult in this nation in an occupation, during the war, for which the individual is best suited to the war requirements.

These four measures together form a just and equitable whole. I would not recommend a national service bill for example unless the other bills were passed to keep down the cost of living, to share equitably the burdens of taxation, and to prevent undue profits for management.
While in my opinion the Federal Government already has the basic power to draft capital and property of all kinds for war purposes on a basis of just compensation, to the extent that there are any gaps or doubts in that power, the Congress should make it as clear and sweeping as the power to draft labor.

As you know, I have for three years hesitated to recommend a National Service Act. Today, however, I am convinced of its necessity. Although I believe that we and our Allies could win the war without such a measure, I am certain that nothing less than total mobilization will guarantee an earlier victory and reduce the toll of suffering and sorrow and blood.

I have received a positive recommendation for this law from the heads of the War Department, the Navy Department and Maritime Commission. These are the men who bear responsibility for the successful prosecution of the war in the field and for the procurement of the necessary arms and equipment. They say:

"When the very life of the nation, and the civilization of which we are a part, is in peril the responsibility for service is common to all men and women. In such a time there can be no discrimination between the men and women who are assigned by the government to its defense at the
battlefront and the men and women assigned to producing
the vital materials essential to successful military
operations. A prompt enactment of a National Service Law
would be merely an expression of the universality of this
responsibility.

"We are peculiarly aware of the tense and grow-
ing feeling among our soldiers, sailors, Marines and Merchant
Seamen that all-out support of their work at sea, and on
land, and in the air is lacking in the same degree as that
which they must and are displaying at the front. This is
a tendency which cannot be ignored and which bodes ill for
our future national unity when the men now at the front
return home."

I believe the country will agree that those statements
are the solemn truth.

As a writer has recently said, "The strikes and
the legislative raids are due to a double standard of morals —
a different standard for civilians than for soldiers."

The major difficulty which this nation faced in
dealing with the coal strikers and the railroad strikers was
the simple fact that there was absolutely no legal authority
to direct the coal miners and the railroad men to go to work
the way we can order a landing at Salerno or Tarawa. Soldiers
cannot mine coal or run the trains adequately.
That difficulty will be met by a National Service Act.

The trouble we have had in some congested areas has been the inability to direct workers to work in those areas. One of the troubles with manpower on the farms has been the lack of power to keep farm workers on the farms.

Those difficulties will be met by a National Service Act.

I do not base my recommendation merely on problems of mining coal or running railroads or building airplanes or raising food. We must understand that the objective we have in mind is to distribute our manpower and woman power for its most efficient use in the right places, in the right way and at the right time — in uniform or out of uniform. Of course, there will be cases of inconveniences — even of hardships — but the percentage of such cases will be relatively low. Every American will be treated in the same way. He or she will be a substantial part of the war whether assigned to the battlefront or to some war work at home.

If, through national service, the Army and Navy can obtain five hundred thousand more women for the WAVES, SPARS AND MARINES, that many men would be released for other
cuties, and the need would be reduced for drafting pre-Pearl
Harbor fathers.

I hope that the Congress will recognize that although
this is a political year, this is an issue which transcends
politics. Great power must be used for great purposes.

As to the machinery for the establishment and the
management of National Service, the Congress itself should
determine its nature — just so long as the Congress outlines
machinery which is wholly non-partisan in its make-up.

Our armed forces are magnificently fulfilling their
 responsibilities to our country and our people. Now the Congress
faces the responsibility for taking those measures which, however
far-reaching and seemingly unpopular, are essential to national
security in this the most decisive phase of the nation's
greatest war.
Therefore in order to concentrate all our energies and resources on winning the war, and to maintain a fair and stable economy at home, I recommend that the Congress adopt:

(1) A realistic tax law — which will tax excess purchasing power and all unreasonable profits.

(2) A renegotiation of war contracts law — which will prevent exorbitant profits and assure fair prices to the government.

(3) A food subsidies law — which will prevent rise in the cost of living for consumers.

(4) A national service law — which will prevent strikes, and make available for war production and other essential services every able-bodied adult in this nation in an occupation, during the war, for which the individual is best suited to the war requirements.

These four measures together form a just and equitable whole. I would not recommend a national service bill for example unless the other bills were passed to keep down the cost of living, to share equitably the burdens of taxation, and to prevent undue profits, [for management].
While in my opinion the Federal Government already has the basic power to draft capital and property of all kinds for war purposes on a basis of just compensation, to the extent that there are any gaps or doubts in that power, the Congress should make it as clear and sweeping as the power to draft labor.

As you know, I have for three years hesitated to recommend a National Service Act. Today, however, I am convinced of its necessity. Although I believe that we and our Allies could win the war without such a measure, I am certain that nothing less than total mobilization will guarantee an earlier victory and reduce the toll of suffering and sorrow and blood.

I have received a positive recommendation for this law from the heads of the War Department, the Navy Department and Maritime Commission. These are the men who bear responsibility for the successful prosecution of the war in the field and for the procurement of the necessary arms and equipment.

They say:

"When the very life of the nation and the civilization of which we are a part is in peril the responsibility for service is common to all men and women. In such a time there can be no discrimination between the men and women who are assigned by the government to its defense at the
battlfront and the men and women assigned to producing the vital materials essential to successful military operations. A prompt enactment of a National Service Law would be merely an expression of the universality of this responsibility.

"We are peculiarly aware of the tense and growing feeling among our soldiers, sailors, Marines and Merchant Seamen that all-out support of their work at sea, and on land, and in the air is lacking in the same degree as that which they must and are displaying at the front. This is a tendency which cannot be ignored and which bodes ill for our future national unity when the men now at the front return home."

I believe the country will agree that those statements are the solemn truth.

As a writer has recently said, "The strikes and the legislative raids are due to a double standard of morals -- a different standard for civilians than for soldiers."

The major difficulty which this nation faced in dealing with the coal strikers and the railroad strikers was the simple fact that there was absolutely no legal authority to direct the coal miners and the railroad men to go to work the way we can order a landing at Salerno or Tarawa. Soldiers cannot mine coal or run the trains adequately.
That difficulty will be met by a National Service Act.

The trouble we have had in some congested areas has been the inability to direct workers to work in those areas. One of the troubles with manpower on the farms has been the lack of power to keep farm workers on the farms.

Those difficulties will be met by a National Service Act.

I do not base my recommendation merely on problems of mining coal or running railroads or building airplanes or raising food. We must understand that the objective we have in mind is to distribute our manpower and woman power for its most efficient use in the right places, in the right way and at the right time -- in uniform or out of uniform. Of course, there will be cases of inconveniences -- even of hardships -- but the percentage of such cases will be relatively low. Every American will be treated in the same way. He or she will be a substantial part of the war whether assigned to the battlefront or to some war work at home.

If, through national service, the Army and Navy can obtain five hundred thousand more women for the WACS, WAVES, SPARS and WARRIERS, that many men would be released for other
duties. And the need would be reduced for drafting pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.

I hope that the Congress will recognize that although this is a political year, this is an issue which transcends politics. Great power must be used for great purposes.

As to the machinery for the establishment and the management of National Service, the Congress itself should determine its nature—just so long as the Congress outlines machinery which is wholly non-partisan in its make-up.

Our armed forces are magnificently fulfilling their responsibilities to our country and our people. Now the Congress faces the responsibility for taking those measures which, however far-reaching and seemingly unpopular, are essential to national security in this the most decisive phase of the nation's greatest war.
Therefore in order to concentrate all our energies and resources on winning the war, and to maintain a fair and stable economy at home, I recommend that the Congress adopt:

(1) A realistic tax law — which will tax all unreasonable profits, both individual and corporate, and reduce the cost of the war to our sons and daughters.

(2) A continuation of the law for the renegotiation of war contracts so as to prevent exorbitant profits and assure fair prices to the government.

(3) A cost of food law — which will (c) place a floor based on parity under the prices the farmer may expect for his production and (b) place a ceiling on the prices a consumer will have to pay for the food he buys. This should apply to necessities only. It will cost in appropriations an infinitesimal amount compared with the cost of the war.

(4) Early reenactment of the stabilization statute of October 1942. This expires January 30th and if it is not extended well in advance the country might just as well expect price chaos by summer.
(5) A national service law -- which will prevent strikes, and make available for war production and other essential services every able-bodied adult in this nation.

These five measures together form a just and equitable whole. I would not recommend a national service bill for example unless the other bills were passed to keep down the cost of living, to share equitably the burdens of taxation, and to prevent undue profits.

While in my opinion the Federal Government already has the basic power to draft capital and property of all kinds for war purposes on a basis of just compensation, to the extent that there are any gaps or doubts in that power, the Congress should make it as clear and sweeping as the power to draft labor.

As you know, I have for three years hesitated to recommend a National Service Act. Today, however, I am convinced of its necessity. Although I believe that we and our Allies could win the war without such a measure, I am certain that nothing less than total mobilization will guarantee an earlier victory and reduce the toll of suffering and sorrow and blood.
I have received a positive recommendation for this law from the heads of the War Department, the Navy Department and Maritime Commission. These are the men who bear responsibility for the successful prosecution of the war in the field and for the procurement of the necessary arms and equipment. They say:

"When the very life of the nation is in peril the responsibility for service is common to all men and women. In such a time there can be no discrimination between the men and women who are assigned by the government to its defense at the battlefront and the men and women assigned to producing the vital materials essential to successful military operations. A prompt enactment of a National Service Law would be merely an expression of the universality of this responsibility.

"We are peculiarly aware of the tense and growing feeling among our soldiers, sailors, marines and merchant seamen that all-out support of their work at sea, and on land, and in the air is lacking in the same degree as that which they must and are displaying at the front. This is a tendency which cannot be ignored and which bodes ill for our future national unity when the men now at the front return home."

I believe the country will agree that those statements are the solemn truth."
As a writer has recently said, "The strikes and
the legislative raids are due to a double standard of morals —
a different standard for civilians than for soldiers."

The major difficulty which this nation faced in
dealing with the coal strikers and the railroad strikers was
the simple fact that there was absolutely no legal authority
to direct the coal miners and the railroad men to go to work
the way we can order a landing at Salerno or Tarawa. Soldiers
cannot mine coal or run the trains adequately.

The trouble we have had in some congested areas
has been the inability to direct workers to work in those
areas. One of the troubles with manpower on the farms has
been the lack of power to keep farm workers on the farms.

I do not base my recommendation merely on problems
of mining coal or running railroads or building airplanes or
raising food. We must understand that the objective we have
in mind is to distribute our manpower and woman power for its
most efficient use in the right places, in the right way and
at the right time — in uniform or out of uniform. Of course,
there will be cases of inconveniences — even of hardships — but the percentage of such cases will be relatively low.

Every American will be treated in the same way. He or she will be a substantial part of the war whether assigned to the battlefront or to some war work at home.

If, through national service, the Army and Navy can obtain five hundred thousand more women for the WACs, WAVES, SPARS AND MARINES, that many men would be released for other duties. And the need would be reduced for drafting pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.

I hope that the Congress will recognize that although this is a political year, this is an issue which transcends politics. Great power must be used for great purposes.

As to machinery for the establishment and the management of National Service, the Congress itself should determine its nature — just so long as the Congress outlines machinery which is wholly non-partisan in its make-up.
Our armed forces are magnificently fulfilling their responsibilities to our country and our people. Now the Congress faces the responsibility for taking those measures which, however far-reaching and seemingly unpopular, are essential to national security in this the most decisive phase of the nation's greatest war.
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Therefore, in order to concentrate all our energies and
resources on winning the war, and to maintain a fair and stable
economy at home, I recommend that the Congress adopt:

(1) A realistic tax law -- which will tax all unreasonable
profits, both individual and corporate, and reduce the cost of
the war to our sons and daughters.

(2) A continuation of the law for the renegotiation of
war contracts -- which will prevent exorbitant profits and
assure fair prices to the government.

(3) A cost of food law -- which will enable the govern-
ment (a) to place a reasonable floor under the prices the farmer
may expect for his production; and (b) to place a ceiling on
the prices a consumer will have to pay for the food he buys.

This should apply to necessities only; and will require public
funds to carry out. But it will cost in appropriations a
relatively small amount compared with the cost of the war.

(4) Early enactment of the stabilization statute of
October 1942. This expires June 30th, 1942, and if it is not
extended well in advance, the country might just as well expect
price chaos by summer.
(5) A national service law -- which will prevent strikes, and make available for war production or for any other essential services every able-bodied adult in this nation.

These five measures together form a just and equitable whole. I would not recommend a national service law for example unless the other laws were passed to keep down the cost of living, to share equitably the burdens of taxation, and to prevent undue profits.

In my opinion the Federal Government already has the basic power to draft capital and property of all kinds for war purposes on a basis of just compensation; but if there are any gaps or doubts in that power, the Congress should make it as clear and sweeping as the power to draft human beings.

As you know, I have for three years hesitated to recommend a national service act. Today, however, I am convinced of its necessity. Although I am certain that we and our Allies can win the war without such a measure, I am also certain that nothing less than this kind of total mobilization will guarantee an earlier victory and reduce the toll of suffering and sorrow and blood.
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I have received a joint recommendation for this law from the heads of the War Department, the Navy Department and Maritime Commission. These are the men who bear responsibility for the procurement of the necessary arms and equipment, and for the successful prosecution of the war in the field. They say:

"When the very life of the nation is in peril the responsibility for service is common to all men and women. In such a time there can be no discrimination between the men and women who are assigned by the government to its defense at the battlefront and the men and women assigned to producing the vital materials essential to successful military operations. A prompt enactment of a National Service Law would be merely an expression of the universality of this responsibility.

"We are peculiarly aware of the tense and growing feeling among our soldiers, sailors, Marines and Merchant Seamen that all-out support of this work at sea, and on land, and in the air is lacking in the same degree as that which they must and are displaying at the front. This is a tendency which cannot be ignored and which bodes ill for our future national unity when the men now at the front return home."
I believe the country will agree that those statements are the solemn truth.

The major difficulty which this nation faced in dealing with the coal strikers and the railroad strikers was the simple fact that there was absolutely no legal authority to direct the coal miners and the railroad men to go back to work -- as men were directed to make the landings at Salerno or Tarawa.

Furthermore, our soldiers and sailors have been trained for fighting in this war, not for mining coal or running railroads.

I do not, however, base my recommendation only on problems of mining coal or running railroads or building airplanes or raising food. We must understand that the objective we have in mind is to distribute our manpower and woman power for its most efficient use in the right places, in the right way and at the right time -- in uniform or out of uniform. Of course, there will be cases of inconveniences -- even of hardships -- but the percentage of such cases will be relatively low. Every American will be treated in the same way. He or she will be a substantial part of the war -- whether assigned to the battlefront or to some war work at home.
If, through national service, the Army and Navy can obtain five hundred thousand more women for the WACS, WAVES, SPARS AND MARINES, that many men would be released for other duties. And the need would be reduced for drafting pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.

I hope that the Congress will recognize that although this is a political year, this is an issue which transcends politics. Great power must be used for great purposes.

As to machinery for national service, the Congress itself should determine its nature -- but it should be wholly non-partisan in its make-up.

Our armed forces are magnificently fulfilling their responsibilities to our country and our people. Now the Congress faces the responsibility for taking those measures which, however seemingly unpopular, are essential to national security in this the most decisive phase of the nation's greatest war.

***************
Therefore, in order to concentrate all our energies and resources on winning the war, and to maintain a fair and stable economy at home, I recommend that the Congress adopt:

(1) A realistic tax law — which will tax all unreasonable profits, both individual and corporate, and reduce the cost of the war to our sons and daughters. The tax bill which has passed the House does not begin to meet this test.

(2) A continuation of the law for the renegotiation of war contracts — which will prevent exorbitant profits and assure fair prices to the government.

(3) A cost of food law — which will enable the government (a) to place a reasonable floor under the prices the farmer may expect for his production; and (b) to place a ceiling on the prices a consumer will have to pay for the food he buys. This should apply to necessities only; and will require public funds to carry out. But it will cost in appropriations a relatively small amount compared with the cost of the war.

(4) Early reenactment of the stabilization statute of October 1942. This expires June 30th, 1943, and if it is not extended well in advance, the country might just as well expect price chaos by summer.
(5) A national service law — which, for the duration of the war, will prevent strikes, and make available for war production or for any other essential services every able-bodied adult in this nation.

These five measures together form a just and equitable whole. I would not recommend a national service law for example unless the other laws were passed to keep down the cost of living, to share equitably the burdens of taxation, to hold the stabilization line, and to prevent undue profits.

The Federal Government already has the basic power to draft capital and property of all kinds for war purposes on a basis of just compensation.

As you know, I have for three years hesitated to recommend a national service act. Today, however, I am convinced of its necessity. Although I am certain that we and our Allies can win the war without such a measure, I am also certain that nothing less than total mobilization of all our resources of manpower and capital will guarantee an earlier victory and reduce the toll of suffering and sorrow and blood.
I have received a joint recommendation for this law from the heads of the War Department, the Navy Department and Maritime Commission. These are the men who bear responsibility for the procurement of the necessary arms and equipment, and for the successful prosecution of the war in the field. They say:

"When the very life of the nation is in peril the responsibility for service is common to all men and women. In such a time there can be no discrimination between the men and women who are assigned by the government to its defense at the battlefront and the men and women assigned to producing the vital materials essential to successful military operations. A prompt enactment of a National Service Law would be merely an expression of the universality of this responsibility."

I believe the country will agree that those statements are the solemn truth.

These are the main objectives of a National Service Act.
First, to make certain that workers in war production continue on their jobs, under proper safeguards, unless they can be used to greater advantage in other war jobs.

Second, to make certain that every worker is fully utilized.

Third, to make certain that workers who are more needed in war jobs than in the job they are now holding, transfer to jobs where they are most needed.

And finally, to make certain that new workers who are needed to maintain production schedules, are drawn into the labor market and placed where most needed.

National service is the most democratic way to wage a war. Like selective service for the armed forces, it rests on the obligation of each citizen -- man and woman -- to serve his nation to his utmost where he is best qualified. It does not mean reduction in wages. It does not mean loss of traveling expenses. It does not mean loss of retirement, reemployment and seniority rights and benefits. It does not mean that any substantial numbers of war workers will be disturbed in their present jobs.
The compulsory powers under such a statute would be used only when and where needed — and only to the extent needed. Experience in other democratic nations at war — Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand — has shown that the very existence of compulsory powers makes unnecessary their widespread use. National Service has proven to be a unifying moral force — based on an equal and comprehensive legal obligation of all people in the nation at war.

There are millions of American men and women who are not in this war at all. It is not because they do not want to be in it. They are willing, even anxious, to help defeat the enemy. But they want to be told where they can best do their share. National service provides that direction. It will be a means by which every man and woman can find that inner satisfaction which comes from making a patriotic contribution to victory.

It is argued that we have passed the stage in the war where National Service is necessary. But our soldiers and sailors know that is not true. We have traveled a long way,
FIFTH DRAFT
PROJECT Q 38

- 6 -

on a rough road—and, in all journeys, the last mile is the hardest. And it is for that final effort—for the total defeat of our enemies—that we must mobilize our total resources.

It is my conviction that the American people will welcome this win-the-war measure which is based on the eternally just principle of "fair for one, fair for all".

It will give our people at home the assurance that they are standing four-square behind our soldiers and sailors. And it will give our enemies demoralizing assurance that we mean business—that we, 135 million Americans, are on the march and our destinations are Rome, Berlin and Tokyo.

I hope that the Congress will recognize that, although this is a political year, National Service is an issue which transcends politics. Great power must be used for great purposes.

As to the machinery for this measure, the Congress itself should determine its nature—but it should be wholly non-partisan in its make-up.
Our armed forces are valiantly fulfilling their responsibilities to our country and our people. Now the Congress faces the responsibility for taking those measures which, however seemingly unpopular, are essential to national security in this the most decisive phase of the nation's greatest war.
This Nation in the past two years has produced the greatest
effort in its history.

I do not need to repeat to the Congress great numbers of
statistics. I think I can best illustrate with one instance of what
has been done.

In 1941, at the time of Pearl Harbor, we had X aircraft
carriers in service.

During 1942, in the historic naval battles in the Pacific,
we lost Y aircraft carriers. All of these went down fighting after
inflicting tremendous damage on the enemy.

Now, in a simple arithmetic problem, you could subtract Y
from X and say that today we have only A aircraft carriers.

But the fact is that today we have B aircraft carriers
in service and a great many more in various stages of conditioning
or construction.

Furthermore, our carriers today are far better designed
and equipped, their planes are better, their crews are better, as a
result of the actual battle experience we have had.

The same rule applies all along the line of our war pro-
duction and the entire organisation and training of our armed forces.
FIRST DRAFT — RE-SIR

For example, we are now mass producing new heavy bombers which far outdistance the Flying Fortresses and Liberators and all other heavy bombers of all air forces. They outdistance previous models in range, in armor, in armament and in bomb capacity.

America was presented with an historic challenge. America that accepted their challenge and met it.

However, we make a grave mistake if we attempt to compute our national war effort in terms of statistics alone. This great story must be told primarily in terms of the human element — all the sacrifice and the devotion that have been poured into this war by men and women and children who have placed the service of their country above all other considerations.

It has been a gigantic outpouring of human energy and ingenuity and determination.

When this war started, in 1939, thousands of Americans were in our armed forces, and millions were employed in industry or on the farm.

That meant that approximately % of our population was gainfully employed.
Today, nearly eleven million Americans are in our armed forces, and _______ million more are gainfully employed in industry or on the farm. That means ___% of our population — in addition to the millions who are working and working hard in the Red Cross, Civilian Defense, the OPA and Selective Service Boards and all the other essential war activities in which our citizens participate voluntarily and without pay.

Our enemies knew plenty of facts about America. In 1941, before Pearl Harbor, they had all the statistics about our population, our resources, our political system, and so forth. They had knowledge — but they did not have understanding. They had no conception of the latent power - material and human - which, in the past two years, has been mobilized and which has enabled us to stand today, with our Allies, on the threshold of victory.

All of this vast effort has been necessary if we as a Nation are to survive in a world that has been gravely threatened with gangster rule. But I do not think that any of us Americans can be content with mere survival. The sacrifices that have been made impose upon us a sacred obligation to see to it that out of this war we gain something better than mere survival.
The words of Gettysburg are engraved in the hearts of all of us: "We here highly resolve that these honored dead shall not have died in vain."

When Mr. Hull went to Moscow in October, and when I went to Cairo and Teheran in November, we knew that we were in agreement with our Allies in our common determination to fight and win this war. There were, however, many vital questions concerning the future peace which required most serious discussion.

The questions were discussed in an atmosphere of complete candor and harmony. We did not attempt to arrive at all the answers. We knew, for example, that this is not the time to take an enormous map of the world and outline every frontier for the future.

We sought agreement on basic principles and we arrived at agreement, [and great progress was made].

Let us remember that in the last war such discussions did not even begin until the shooting had stopped and the delegates began to assemble at the peace table. There had been no previous opportunities for real meetings of minds, and the result was a peace which was not a peace.

That was a mistake which we are not repeating in this war.

And right here I want to address a word or two to some
suspicious souls who are fearful that Mr. Hull or I have made "commitments"
for the future which might pledge this Nation to secret treaties, or to
enacting the role of Santa Claus, or that we otherwise violated our oaths
to support and uphold the Constitution of the United States.

To such suspicious souls — and picayune politicians — I wish
to say that Mr. Churchill, and Marshal Stalin, and the Generalissimo,
Chiang Kai-shek are all thoroughly conversant with the provisions of our
Constitution. And so is Mr. Hull. And so am I.

Of course we made some commitments. We most certainly committed
ourselves to certain specific military plans to employ all our forces to
bring about the defeat of our enemies at the earliest possible time. We
committed ourselves also, for example, to recognition of the rights of
China to regain the territories stolen from her by Japan. That is as
obvious as our own right to regain Wake Island and Guam.

But there were no secret treaties. There were no promises of
largetse. There was only frank talk about just what it is that each
Nation wants to achieve for itself and its neighbors after this war.

The answer in every case was the same. It can be summed up
in one word: Security.

And that means not only physical security — safety from attacks
by aggressors; it means also economic security, social security, moral
security.
The attitude of the British has been well known to us because, with them, we have been able to maintain much closer communication. The British seek no territorial aggrandizement. They are, of course, concerned primarily with the reestablishment and the further development of world trade and commerce. They are therefore profoundly interested in raising the standards of living in all areas where standards have been low.

In this, the interests of Great Britain and the United States do not conflict — they complement each other.

In talking at Cairo to the Generalissimo, and at Teheran to Marshal Stalin — and we indulged in plain, down-to-earth — I was intensely interested to observe that both China and Russia today face problems and opportunities very similar to those forced by our own country in the past century.

Both China and Russia have emerged, within living memory, from the darkness of ancient tyrannies.

Both have vast, undeveloped resources.

Both nations have been struggling to increase education and individual opportunity and to raise the standards of living of their own peoples.
It is my conviction that after this war both China and Russia will stand much where we Americans stood after the war between the States. They will look forward to an era of vast industrial and cultural development — and both nations have learned by bitter experience that such development will not be possible if they are to be diverted from their purpose by repeated wars or even threats of war.

Therefore, China and Russia are truly united with Britain and America in recognition of this essential fact:

The best interests of each nation, large and small, demand that all nations shall join together in a just and durable system of peace. And the one basic guarantee of that peace is inevitably identified with the standard of living in all individual men and women and children in all nations.
A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE FIRST PARAGRAPH ON PAGE #7

It is my conviction that after this war both Russia and China in internal economic development will stand much where we Americans stood after the War Between the States -- vast voids or vacuums calling loudly to be filled. Like us, they have the brains and the will to accomplish it.
A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE FIRST PARAGRAPH ON PAGE 47

It is my conviction that after this war both Russia and China in internal economic development will stand much where we Americans stood after the War Between the States — vast voids or vacuums calling loudly to be filled. Like us, they have the brains and the will to accomplish it.

**************************
What are they after? They are against taxes according to ability to pay. They cut down a ten billion dollar tax bill to a two billion dollar one. They are against price ceilings which limit their profits. They are against inflation-controls which cut down their sales. They are against renegotiation of war contracts which would set a decent roof to war profits.

Over there you have a handful of farm leaders. They do not represent the great mass of patriotic, hard working farmers who have produced the greatest supply of food for war ever recorded in history. Yet here they are, clamoring for higher food prices to consumers, for the removal of food ceilings which now protect the American standard of living, for the abolition of rationing which has brought about fairness in dividing the nation's food supply. They are busy lobbying against a system of food subsidies which has been successful — not only in the United States but in every nation at war — in keeping the cost of food down, and in giving the farmer at the same time, a fair enough price to assure adequate production of food. It all adds up to special privilege and special consideration and special treatment for their own particular groups.

Here you have a handful of labor leaders. They, too, do not represent decent American labor — which has made war production records to amaze the world. Yet they are willing to call strikes aimed at the
They scream against appropriations for the enforcement of Blue Sky laws, or the checking of crop and animal pests, while, at the same time, they oppose efforts to renegotiate war contracts -- conveniently overlooking the fact that the Administration, through such renegotiations, has already saved the taxpayers five billion dollars.
They scream against appropriations for the enforcement of Blue Sky laws, or the checking of crop and animal pests, while, at the same time, they oppose efforts to renegotiate war contracts -- conveniently overlooking the fact that the Administration, through such renegotiations, has already saved the taxpayers five billion dollars.
I well remember not many months ago a farm organization leader who, on being asked whether he was not in favor of inflation, indignantly denied that he was; but as an after-thought added "Well, a little inflation would not do us any harm". There is not much different between saying that and remarking at once o'clock in the morning "Well, another little will not do us any harm".
I well remember not many months ago a farm organization leader who, on being asked -- after demanding large increases in food prices -- whether he was not in favor of inflation, indignantly denied that he was but as an after-thought added "Well, a little inflation would not do us any harm". There is not much different between saying that and remarking at once o'clock in the morning "Well, another little drink will not do us any harm".
very heart of a nation at war, in order to get advantages to which
they are not entitled under the law of the land.

Here are some oil producers trying to get the Congress to
raise the price of oil although they and the Congress know that what they
are urging is contrary to the stabilization program, that it has led the
coal operators to make similar demands, that it will serve as an example
to still other business groups and that it is a big step along the
ruinous road to inflation.

Over there are some railroad workers' lobbyists trying to get
the Congress to give them special privilege in the form of pay increases
which have already been turned down by the duly constituted administrative
officials. And it was an interesting spectacle to see certain United
States Senators who have been most denunciatory of this Administration
for its so-called "coddling" of labor, doing handsprings at the command
of this lobby and rushing to hand out wage increases. These labor leaders
and the Congressmen who yielded to their pressure know full well that
railroad wage increases will crack the stabilization formula and lead
immediately to similar demands for other labor groups.

Whenever crisis has come to the American people they have been
able and willing to forget individual and selfish and partisan interest
and to unite in a national unity of purpose and direction. They have
learned time and again how interdependent upon each other are all groups and sections of the population of America. No one group can obtain special consideration without hurting the others — and ultimately hurting themselves. Increased farm prices, for example, will hurt all fixed-income groups; will bring new demands for wage increases from all war workers, which will in turn raise all prices of all things including those things which the farmers themselves have to buy. Increased wages or prices or profits will each in turn produce the same dire results.

If ever there was a time to subordinate individual or group selfishness to the national good, that time is now. In all theatres of war there are now being prepared offensive operations which will require every thing we can give in trained manpower, fighting equipment, courage, stamina and morale. Disunity at home — bickerings, self-seeking, partisanship, stoppages of work, inflation — these are the influences which undermine the brave men ready to die at the front for us here. We cannot let them down. **

A nation which is torn by continued squabbling and dissension over personal profit and advantages cannot bring its full resources to bear upon the enemy. It certainly can not assume a place of leadership in the world for building a sound structure for peace. And I can assure
you that the boys on our fighting fronts who expect us all here at home
to be laying solid bricks for the foundations of the future are dismayed
and disheartened at the spectacle of Americans throwing those bricks at
each other.

This can be changed. This must be changed — this year. For
it is the year in which our fighting men are going to meet the most crucial
tests of battle. We shall have to meet a crucial test at home — the test
of our ability to serve wholeheartedly and unselfishly the historic interests
of this nation. We must and we shall meet that test successfully. The con-
science of America will tolerate nothing else.

Partisanship and prejudice have prevented the enactment of legisla-
tion which would preserve for our soldiers and sailors and marines the
fundamental prerogative of citizenship — the right to vote. No amount of
constitutional argument can cloud the issue in the eyes of these eleven
million American citizens. They know that they simply will be deprived
of their right to vote if it is left exclusively to the States under
existing state laws — and that there is no likelihood of these laws being
changed before the next election. They know that unless a Federal Statute
is passed, the next President and Members of the Congress are going to be
elected without giving them a voice in the selection. It is the duty of
There can be no strong, unified system of peace with justice unless there is a strong, unified America.

In this war we have given to the world and to ourselves a magnificent demonstration of strength and unity, we will not permit this to disintegrate into a state of internal discord and weakness after the war, and we shall will have. Of course, we have our political differences. But Americans of all shades of political opinion must march forward in this peace, as they have marched forward together in the war, toward objectives which are common to all of us.

This is the challenge which we now face, we must meet it with the same courage and vision that has been displayed by this nation in meeting the tremendous challenges of this war.

We must go forward in the building of an America which is secure - secure from the enemy, from within and its enemies - secure from within - poverty, unemployment, sickness, bigotry and ignorance.
the Congress to remove this unjustifiable discrimination against the
men and women in our armed forces — as quickly as possible.

The war has demonstrated how vast is our productive capacity,
how powerful are the resourcefulness, the ingenuity, the drive of
American enterprise. We now know that if we can harness our vast
productive energies to the purposes of peace we can provide a general
standard of living far beyond anything hitherto known.

An expanding economy means opportunity — opportunity for
everyone.

It means freedom — freedom for everyone — since freedom
cannot live in the absence of opportunity.

We must see to it that it means security as well, security
for everyone.

We cannot be content, no matter how high the American standard
of living may be in general, if some fraction of our people — whether
it be one-third or one-fifth or one-tenth — is ill fed, ill clothed,
illy housed, and insecure.

There are some who will say of all this that sufficient unto
the day are the problems thereof — that the task before us now is the
winning of the war. That is true. Our first energies and our first
We should seek to provide for our rural populations good schools, as good hospitals, as good public utilities, as good roads, as good recreational facilities, and as good housing as men and women in our cities.

We must continue to trend away from farm tenancy and toward farm ownership which we began in 1932. We should extend the benefits of the Social Security Act to all agricultural people.

We must continue -- especially after the war -- to conserve our soil and our water; we must continue to make adequate credit available to farmers at reasonable rates; we must see that our sub-marginal land does not remain in hopeless farming and those who are now vainly trying to make a living on it are helped to earn their living elsewhere or in another way.
thoughts must be devoted to winning the war. But we should not forget that it was last year that we laid the plans, and determined the strategy, which will this year win the war. Therefore it is this year we must lay the plans and determine the strategy for the winning of a lasting peace.

This Republic had its beginning, and grew to its modern strength, under the protection of certain inalienable political rights — among them the right of free speech, of free worship, of trial by jury, of freedom from searchers and seizures. They were our rights to life and liberty.

As we grew in size and stature, however, — as our industrial economy expanded — these political rights proved inadequate to assure us all equality in the pursuit of happiness. Economic inequalities began to replace the old political tyranny. Through the last century our internal history has been largely an evolution of the economic rights of men in a free economy of private enterprise and initiative.

We have come to a clear realization of the fact that true individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence. "Necessitous men are not free men." People who are hungry and out of a job are the stuff of which dictatorships are made.

In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-
evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all — regardless of station, race or creed.

Foremost and first among these rights is the right to work at a good job under decent conditions and at a salary adequate for decent living and leisure. It must be sufficient to purchase insurance with the help of government against the hazards of disease, accident, old age, and unemployment, and to provide a living for dependent survivors after death. War has shown us how to harness our full manpower to the task of building the weapons of war. We shall be counted failures if we prove unable to put all our people to work in full production and distribution of peacetime goods.

The second right is the right of the farmer to sell his products at a price which will give him and his family a decent living.

The farm depression after the last war lasted nearly a generation. At one time the average farm family income fell down to $500 per year. The average today is four times that figure. We must give assurance to those who raise our food supply that they will never have to
Everything in the post-victory world holds hope for an expanding economy which can provide jobs for all; new potential markets at home and abroad for business and agriculture; piling up of needs for all the things we have denied ourselves during this war which used to go into the highest standard of living in the world; the new technological and scientific developments — in plastics, in electricity, in communication, in transportation.
go back to those "good old days on the farm". To continue to give the farmer a fair share of the nation's income and purchasing power is one of the major tasks to which the Congress must give its immediate attention. A beginning has been accomplished, on my recommendation, by placing a floor under farm prices for a short period after the war to prevent sudden collapse. But this is only a beginning — and was only so intended. Long range policies must follow to prevent disastrous cycles of farm depressions.

Our goal for American agriculture should be: that everyone who produces food should be economically secure.

The unprecedented demand we have had for food during the war shows that if every American were on a Class A diet and had enough money to pay for it we could keep every farmer busy and prosperous forever.

The third right is the right of every American family to a decent home — judged by American standards of living. At present a fifth of our city dwellers live in slums. More than one-third of our farm dwellings are below minimum standards of health and decency.

When the war is over, we must resume in full vigor our progress toward the American housing goal — good housing for every family in the
land. Conservative estimates indicate that there will be need for at least ten million new homes during the first decade of peace.

It is only common sense that a housing program of this size will be primarily and predominately a job for private enterprise. Most of the housing legislation recommended by this Administration and enacted by the Congress has been directed toward the stimulation and encouragement of that kind of home building. Methods should be sought whereby the Government might enable private enterprise to help clear the slums, and enlarge its market by serving families of lower income than it has served before. New modes of government cooperation with business in this field may enable business to come nearer toward providing full employment, so that direct government expenditures will be correspondingly reduced.

Of course, if experience continues to show that the job of clearing the slums and providing suitable housing for families of low income cannot be accomplished otherwise, public funds should be made available to fill this gap. Not even a minority of our people can be suffered to live indefinitely in rural or urban slums, if we are to achieve the standards of living which are the promise and the prospect of postwar America. I am hopeful that, with improvements in technology,
a larger national income after the war than before the war, and appropriately designed legislation, our traditional home building industry may be able to serve an ever-increasing portion of the total housing need. It is toward these ends, as well as toward the end of winning the war, that the housing policies and activities of the Government have been consolidated into a single agency — equipped with the tools and dominated by the intent to help American enterprise achieve the American housing goal.

The fourth right of every American is the right to good health and reasonable medical care. In 1940 two out of every five counties in the United States had no hospitals. More than a quarter million babies were born that year without medical attendance. More than one-fourth of all our young men examined for Selective Service were below minimum physical standards. Almost one-third had never visited a dentist. By modern health standards, almost half of all our men, women and children were undernourished.

Here is a job which challenges our conscience and our intelligence. The United States of America cannot fail in its duty to raise our standards of health, and provide medical care on a basis of reasonable need rather than solely on ability to pay.
The fifth right of every American is the right to a good education. Our great nation — the strongest and richest in the world — must face the fact that more than one-half of our people have not attended school after the age of thirteen, that five American citizens out of every hundred can neither read nor write, that only one out of twenty have ever attended college. The rural areas of America — particularly those counties whose taxable land values are low — must be afforded the opportunity of a good, free education. We must not delay placing within the grasp of any boy and girl, whose school record and native ability warrant it, the chance of a college education.

The way is being pointed by the legislation now being considered in the Congress at my recommendation for the education of veterans of this war. I have recommended that adequate federal funds be appropriated to assure every man and woman of our armed forces and of our merchant marine the opportunity of at least one year at a school or trade school or actual industrial training, with the government paying not only the tuition but also an allowance to the veteran for maintenance. For those veterans who are shown to be qualified, an additional one, two or three years may be similarly provided at school, or college, or pro-
fessional institution. While the Federal Government supplies the funds
for these new opportunities, the choice of institution remains with each
individual veteran; and, of course, the respective states supervise their
own schools and colleges without interference from the Federal Government.

I hope that this will be the beginning of a new day in the his-
tory of education when the Federal Government begins to assume a fair
share of the responsibility for the education of all Americans. We have
too long tolerated a system where the youth in some parts of our nation —
the richer parts — get a decent schooling but those in the poorer regions
got none.

The sixth right is the right of every business man to operate his
business free from the threat of monopoly, international cartels and un-
fair competition. There is no greater assurance to American business than
adequate purchasing power in the great mass of the American people and in
the people of our markets overseas. American business has already learned
that when agriculture is broke, when the wage earner has no money to spend,
the factories and shops and stores are idle.

America's own position of leadership in the family of nations de-
PENDS IN large part upon how fully these rights have been carried into
practice for our citizens. For unless there is security at home there
cannot be lasting peace in the world.
To implement these rights in the future will call upon the best thinking of all our citizens and their representatives here in the halls of Congress — regardless of party or politics. There may be disagreement as to details; I am sure there should be none as to objectives.

I ask the Congress to explore these problems and to develop a program for meeting them — for it is definitely the responsibility of the Congress to do so. In the event that no such program is evolved, I shall consider it my duty to make recommendations from time to time.

These are the things which should engage our attention and thought in these desperate days rather than the whining demands of selfish pressure groups who beseech us to help them line their pockets while young Americans are dying.

[Peroration]
Out the Federal Government is allowed by the Congress to do very little planning. A Town Supervisor, a Mayor of a City, The Governor of a State, a Federal Cabinet officer, or the President himself can do little planning themselves. It requires the hiring of full-time experts to plan all kinds of things that relate, not merely to local and state and federal government, but also to report on needs of the whole population. No member of the Congress in their branch, with its complicated committee system, has the time or the knowledge to plan a whole national program. They often try manfully to bring in a program on one particular subject, but we do not get efficient planning in that way. All subjects that need planning have got to be coordinated with each other. Our own history proves this very clearly. Therefore, I hope that the Congress will set up some method of obtaining a rounded national planning, remembering always that the final appropriation for all national planning is made by the Congress itself.

***************
Do not be afraid of that word "planning". Every up-
and-coming community does some planning. The States do planning.
But the Federal Government is allowed by the Congress to do
very little planning. A Town Supervisor, a Mayor of a City,
The Governor of a State, a Federal Cabinet officer, or the
President himself can do little planning themselves. It
requires the hiring of full-time experts to plan all kinds of
things that relate, not merely to local and state and federal
government, but also to report on needs of the whole population.
No member of the Congress in their branch, with its complicated
committee system, has the time or the knowledge to plan a whole
national program. They often try manfully to bring in a program
on one particular subject, but we do not get efficient planning
in that way. All subjects that need planning, have got to be
coordinated with each other. Our own history proves this very
clearly. Therefore, I hope that the Congress will set up some
method of obtaining a rounded national planning, remembering
always that the final appropriation for all national planning
is made by the Congress itself.

**************
There are within our nation a group of people, called "moles" who circulate constantly in the dirty darkness, who insist that if outside nations are encouraged to raise their standards of living our American standards of living must of necessity go downhill. (All history teaches, of course, that such "moles", born in the darkness of ignorance or partisanship, are wholly wrong.)

The fact has always been, on the contrary, that if any given nation with a low standard of living on the part of its population, finds methods by which that standard of living can be raised, almost automatically the raising of it improves and raises the already high standard of living of some neighboring group.

I want, for example, to Iran -- what we used to call Persia in the old days. It is a nation which has an amazing history -- great empires, great civilizations, great heroes.

But for many centuries Iran has made little material progress in this world -- and the standard of living of its people is, from our point of view, amazingly low.
There are within our nation a group of people called "moles" who, circulating constantly in the dirty darkness, insist that if outside nations are encouraged to raise their standards of living our own American standards of living must of necessity go downhill. All history teaches, of course, that such "moles", born in the darkness of ignorance or partisanship, are wholly wrong.

The fact of it has always shown, on the contrary, that if any given nation, with a low standard of living on the part of its population, finds methods by which that standard of living can be raised, almost automatically the raising of it improves and raises the already high standard of living of some neighbor.

I want, for example, to Iran -- what we used to call Persia in the old days. It is a nation which has an amazing history -- great empires, great civilizations, great heroes.

But for many centuries Iran has made little material progress in this world -- and the standard of living of its people is, from our point of view, amazingly low.
Persia needs irrigation and afforestation, mining and the making of simple manufactures; and especially health and general education.

For development along such lines means a higher standard of living for Iran, but it means also that the people there can ship to us many things which we ourselves have not got within our own borders; and in return will buy from us thousands of articles which they do not make themselves.

Most certainly that process does not pull down our standard of living.

The "moles" under our feet should accept the fact that the raising of living standards in far away places does not pull ours down, but makes it more possible to help and improve what we like to think of as the American standard of living.

I use the example of Iran because it is a large nation which in its aspirations can, in the immediate future, develop into a nation which will take its place on the side of modern civilization.
Persia needs irrigation and aorestation, mining and the
making of simple manufactures; and especially health and general
education.

For development along such lines means a higher standard
of living for Iran, but it means also that the people there can
send to us many things which we ourselves have not got within
our own borders, and in return will buy from us thousands of
articles which they do not make themselves.

Most certainly that process does not pull down our
standard of living.

The "moles" under our feet should accept the fact
that the raising of living standards in far away places does
not pull ours but makes it more possible to help and improve
what we like to think of as the American standard of living.

(I use the example of Iran because it is a large
nation which in its aspirations can, in the immediate future,
develop into a nation which will take its place on the side
of modern civilization).
All over the earth today our men are fighting and suffering to bring about a world in which peace may prevail — a world secure for their loved ones and for themselves. I have talked with many of these men. They have no illusions about what lies ahead for them in this war. They know, from personal experience and from what they have learned in training, that they have a long, difficult, and tragic road to travel to victory — a road lined with hardship and pain and disease and death. And yet they face that road almost cheerfully — knowing that the sooner they strike, the sooner will come victory — the sooner they can return to their homes and to their jobs.

I wish that many more of our people could see these men and get the same inspiration that I did from visiting the scenes of their recent triumphs, from talking to them about what they had done to the enemy — and were expecting to do.

It would give those people the same sense of "let-down", of disappointment, almost of shame — that everyone feels who leaves the battlefront and returns to Washington.

For I find in Washington too little of realization that the worst days of the war lie ahead of us, too little of determination to sacrifice for the sake of victory, and too much of a scramble to get
something special and selfish out of the crisis which now faces our nation and the world.

On the whole the jobs we have had to do here at home have been done with substantial efficiency — at least up to now. No one can complain about any of the major items of war production. American industry has already made the "fantastic" goals of production set two years ago seem almost too small. The cost of living has been held within reasonable bounds against almost unbelievable pressures.

But within the last few months there have descended upon the nation's Capital City a swarm of lobbyists, high pressure boys, selfish economic groups and profit grabbers. They are obsessed with only one interest — their own interest. Their last and their least concern is their nation's interest. They, and I am afraid, some of our Congressmen and commentators still think that this war can be won with overwhelming supplies of hot air and no casualties. They have come to look upon the war primarily as a chance to make profits for themselves at the expense of their neighbors.

Here, for example, you have a handful of industrialists and financiers. They do not represent the great mass of decent American business men, but they do clamor in the papers, over the air, and in the corridors of the Congress, as if they speak for all American business.
And by "profits" I do not mean bank accounts only -- I mean social position and plenty of what they call "fun", and political clout, and their names in the papers; and the opportunity to talk a great deal and say very little.
And by "profits" I do not mean bank accounts only -- I mean social position and plenty of what they call "fun", and political cudos, and their names in the papers; and the opportunity to talk a great deal and say very little.
This nation in the past two years has produced the greatest effort in its history.

America was presented with an historic challenge. America accepted that challenge and met it.

However, we make a mistake if we attempt to compute our national war effort in terms of statistics of war production alone.

This great story must be told primarily in terms of the human element — all the sacrifice and the devotion that have been poured into this war by men and women and children who have placed the service of their country above all other considerations. It has been a gigantic out-pouring of human energy and ingenuity and determination.

When this war started, in 1939, __________ thousands of Americans were in our armed forces, and __________ millions were employed in industry or on the farm.

That meant that approximately __________% of our population was gainfully employed.

Today, nearly eleven million Americans are in our armed forces, and __________ million more are gainfully employed in industry or on the farm. That means __________% of our population — in addition to the millions who are working and working hard in the Red Cross, Civilian Defense, the OPA and Selective Service Boards and all the other essential war activities in which our citizens participate voluntarily and without pay.
OUR enemies knew plenty of the facts about America. In 1941, before Pearl Harbor, they had all the statistics about our population, our resources, our political system, and so forth. They had knowledge—but they did not have understanding. They had no conception of the latent power—material and human—which, in the past two years, has been mobilized and which has enabled us to stand today, with our Allies, on the threshold of victory.

All of this vast effort has been necessary if we as a Nation are to survive in a world that has been gravely threatened with gangster rule. But I do not think that any of us Americans can be content with mere survival. The sacrifices that have been made impose upon us a sacred obligation to see to it that out of this war we gain something better than mere survival.

The words of Gettysburg are engraved in the hearts of all of us: "We here highly resolve that these honored dead shall not have died in vain."

When Mr. Hull went to Moscow in October, and when I went to Cairo and Teheran in November, we knew that we were in agreement with our Allies in our common determination to fight and win this war. There were, however, many vital questions concerning the future peace which required most serious discussion.
The questions were discussed in an atmosphere of complete
candor and harmony. We did not attempt to arrive at all the answers.
We knew, for example, that this is not the time to take a map of the
world and outline every frontier for the future.

We did seek agreement on basic principles and we arrived at
agreement.

In the last war such discussions, such meetings, did not
even begin until the shooting had all stopped and the delegates began
to assemble at the peace table. There had been no previous opportunities
for real meetings of minds, and the result was a peace which was not a
peace,

That was a mistake which we are not repeating in this war.

And right here I want to address a word or two to some
suspicious souls who are fearful that Mr. Hull or I have made "commitments"
for the future which might pledge this Nation to secret treaties, or to
assuming the role of Santa Claus, or that we otherwise violated our oaths
to support and uphold the Constitution of the United States.

To such suspicious souls -- and piquey politicians -- I wish
to say that Mr. Churchill, and Marshal Stalin, and the Generalissimo,

Chiang Kai-shek are all thoroughly conversant with the provisions of our
Constitution. And so is Mr. Hull. And so am I.
Of course we made some commitments. We must certainly committed ourselves to certain specific military plans to employ all our forces to bring about the defeat of our enemies at the earliest possible time. We committed ourselves also, for example, to recognition of the rights of China to regain the territories stolen from her by Japan. That is as obvious as our own right to regain Wake Island and Guam.

But there were no secret treaties or political commitments. There were no promises of largesse. There was only frank talk about what it is that each Nation wants to achieve for itself and its neighbors after this war.

The answer in every case was the same. It can be summed up in one word — Security.

And that means not only physical security — safety from attacks by aggressors; it means also economic security, social security, moral security.

The attitude of the British has been well known to us because, with them, we have been able to maintain much closer communication. The British seek no territorial aggrandizement. They are, of course, concerned primarily with the reestablishment and the further development of world trade and commerce. They are therefore profoundly interested in raising the standards of living in all areas where standards have been low.
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In this, the interests of Great Britain and the United States do not conflict — they complement each other.

In talking at Cairo to the Generalissimo, and at Teheran to Marshal Stalin — and we indulged in plain, down-to-earth talk — I was intensely interested to observe that both China and Russia today face problems and opportunities very similar to those faced by our own country in the past century.

Both China and Russia have emerged, within living memory, from the darkness of ancient tyrannies.

Both have vast, undeveloped resources.

Both nations have been struggling to increase education and individual opportunity and to raise the standards of living of their own peoples.

It is my conviction that after this war both Russia and China in internal economic development will stand much where we Americans stood after the war between the States — with vast vacuums calling loudly to be filled. Like us, they have the brains and the will to accomplish it. Both nations have learned by bitter experience that such development will not be possible if they are to be diverted from their purpose by repeated wars or even threats of war.
Therefore, China and Russia are truly united with Britain and America in recognition of this essential fact.

The best interests of each nation, large and small, demand that all nations shall join together in a just and durable system of peace. And the one basic guarantee of that peace is inevitably identified with the standard of living in all individual men and women and children in all nations.

There are within our nation a group of people, circulating constantly like moles in the dirty darkness, who insist that if outside nations are encouraged to raise their standards of living our own American standards of living must of necessity go downhill.

The fact has always been shown, on the contrary, that if any given nation with a low standard of living raises its standard of living, almost automatically the already high standard of living of some neighbor will go up too.

I went, for example, to Iran — what we used to call Persia in the old days. It is a nation which has an amazing history — great empires, great civilizations, great heroes,

But for many centuries Iran has made little material progress in this world — and the standard of living of its people is, from our point of view, amazingly low.
Persia needs irrigation and reforestation, mining and
simple manufactures; and especially health and general education.

Development along such lines means a higher standard of
living for Iran. It means also that the people there can ship
many things to us which we ourselves do not have within our own
borders; and that in return they will have enough money to buy
from us thousands of articles which they do not make themselves.

The "molos" under our feet should accept the fact that
the raising of living standards in far away places does not pull
ours down, but on the contrary makes it possible to help and improve
the American standard of living.
All over the earth today our men are fighting and suffering to bring about a world in which peace may prevail — a world secure for their loved ones and for themselves. I have talked with many of these men on my recent journeys. They have no illusions about what lies ahead for them in this war. They know, from personal experience and from what they have learned in training, that they have a long, difficult, and tragic road to travel to victory — a road lined with hardship and pain and disease and death. And yet they face that road almost cheerfully — knowing that the sooner they strike, the sooner will come victory — the sooner they can return to their homes and to their jobs.

I wish that many more of our people could see these men and get the same inspiration that I did from visiting the scenes of their recent triumphs, from talking to them about what they had done to the enemy — and were expecting to do.

It would give those people the same sense of "let-down", of disappointment, almost of shame — that everyone feels who leaves the battlefront and returns to Washington.

For I find in Washington too little of realization that the worst days of the war lie ahead of us, too little of determination to sacrifice for the sake of victory, and too much of a scramble to get
something special and selfish out of the crisis which now faces our nation and the world.

On the whole the jobs we have had to do here at home have been done with substantial efficiency — at least up to now. No one can complain about any of the major items of war production. American industry has already made those "fantastic" goals of production set two years ago seem almost too small. The cost of living has been held within reasonable bounds against almost unbelievable pressures.

But within the last few months there have descended upon the nation's Capital City a swarm of lobbyists, high pressure boys, selfish economic groups and profit grabbers. They are obsessed with only one interest — their own interest. Their last and their least concern is their nation's interest. They, and I am afraid, some of our Congressmen and commentators still think that this war can be won with overwhelming supplies of hot air and no casualties. They have come to look upon the war primarily as a chance to make profits for themselves at the expense of their neighbors. And by "profits" I do not mean bank accounts only — I mean social position and getting what they call "fun", and political clout, and seeing their names in the papers; and the opportunity to talk a great deal and say very little.
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Here, for example, you have a handful of industrialists and financiers. They do not represent the great mass of decent American business men, but they do clairor in the papers, over the air, and in the corridors of the Congress, as if they speak for all American business.

that are they after? They are against all taxes according to ability to pay. They persuade the Congress to cut down a ten billion dollar tax bill to a two billion dollar one. They are against price ceiling which limit their profits. They are against inflation-controls which cut down their sales. They are against renegotiation of war contracts which would set a decent roof to war profits.

They scream against appropriations for the enforcement of Blue Sky laws, or the checking of crop and animal pests, while, at the same time, they oppose efforts to renegotiate war contracts — conveniently overlooking the fact that the Administration, through such renegotiations, has already saved the taxpayers five billion dollars.

Over there you have a handful of farm leaders. They do not represent the great mass of patriotic, hard working farmers who have produced the greatest supply of food for war ever recorded in history.

Yet here they are, clamoring for higher food prices to consumers, for the removal of food ceilings which now protect the American standard
of living, for the abolition of rationing which has brought about fairness in dividing the nation's food supply. They are busy lobbying against a system of food subsidies which has been successful — not only in the United States but in every nation at war — in keeping the cost of food down, and in giving the farmer at the same time, a fair enough price to assure adequate production of food. It all adds up to special privilege and special consideration and special treatment for their own particular groups.

I well remember not many months ago a farm organization leader who, after demanding large increases in food prices, was asked by me whether he was not in favor of inflation. Indignantly he denied that he was; but as an after-thought added "Well, a little inflation would not do us any harm". There is not much difference between saying that and remarking at one o'clock in the morning "Well, another little shot of opium will not do me any harm".

Here you have a handful of labor leaders. They, too, do not represent decent American labor — which has made war production records to amaze the world. Yet they are willing to call strikes aimed at the
very heart of a nation at war, in order to get advantages to which
they are not entitled under the law of the land.

Here are some oil producers trying to get the Congress to
raise the price of oil although they and the Congress know that what they
are urging is contrary to the stabilization program, that it has led the
coal operators to make similar demands, that it will serve as an example
to still other business groups and that it is a big step along the
ruinous road to inflation.

Over there are some railroad workers' lobbyists trying to get
the Congress to give them special privileges in the form of pay increases
which have already been turned down by the duly constituted administrative
officials. And it was an interesting spectacle to see certain United
States Senators who have been most demure in this Administration
for its so-called "coddling" of labor, doing hand springs at the command
of this lobby and rushing to hand out wage increases. These labor leaders
and the Congressmen who yielded to their pressure know full well that
railroad wage increases will crack the stabilization formula and lead
immediately to similar demands for other labor groups.

Whenever crisis has come to the American people they have been
able and willing to forget individual and selfish and partisan interest
and to unite in a national unity of purpose and direction. They have
learned time and again how interdependent upon each other are all groups and sections of the population of America. No one group can obtain special consideration without hurting the others — and ultimately hurting themselves. Increased farm prices, for example, will hurt all fixed-income groups; will bring new demands for wage increases from all war workers, which will in turn raise all prices of all things including those things which the farmers themselves have to buy. Increased wages or prices or profits will each in turn produce the same dire results.

If ever there was a time to subordinate individual or group selfishness to the national good, that time is now. In all theatres of war there are now being prepared offensive operations which will require every thing we can give in trained manpower, fighting equipment, courage, stamina and morale. Discipline at home — bickering, self-seeking, partisanship, stoppages of work, inflation — these are the influences which undermine the brave men ready to die at the front for us here. We cannot let them down.

A nation which is torn by continued squabbling and dissension over personal profit and advantages cannot bring its full resources to bear upon the enemy. It certainly can not assume a place of leadership in the world for building a sound structure for peace. And I can assure
you that the boys on our fighting fronts who expect us all here at home to be laying solid bricks for the foundations of the future are dismayed and disheartened at the spectacle of Americans throwing those bricks at each other.

This can be changed. This must be changed — this year. For it is the year in which our fighting men are going to meet the most crucial tests of battle. We shall have to meet a crucial test at home — the test of our ability to serve wholeheartedly and unselfishly the historic interests of this nation. We must and we shall meet that test successfully. The conscience of America will tolerate nothing else.

Partisanship and prejudice have prevented the enactment of legislation which would preserve for our soldiers and sailors and marines the fundamental prerogative of citizenship — the right to vote. No amount of constitutional argument can cloud the issue in the eyes of these eleven million American citizens. They know that they simply will be deprived of their right to vote if it is left exclusively to the States under existing state laws — and that there is no likelihood of these laws being changed before the next election. They know that unless a Federal Statute is passed, the next President and Members of the Congress are going to be elected without giving them a voice in the selection. It is the duty of
the Congress to remove this unjustifiable discrimination against the
men and women in our armed forces — as quickly as possible.

There can be no strong, unified system of peace with justice
unless there is a strong, unified America.

In this war we have given to the world and to ourselves a
magnificent demonstration of strength and unity. We will not permit
this to disintegrate into a state of internal discord and weakness after
the war.

Of course, we have, and we always will have, our political
differences. But Americans of all shades of political opinion must march
forward together in the peace, as they have marched forward together in
the war, toward objectives which are common to all of us.

We must go forward in the building of an America which is secure —
secure from its enemies from without and its enemies from within —poverty,
unemployment, sickness, bigotry and ignorance.

This is the challenge which we now face, we must meet it with
the same courage and vision that has been displayed by this nation in
meeting the tremendous challenges of this war.

The war has demonstrated how vast is our productive capacity,
how powerful are the resourcefulness, the ingenuity, the drive of
American enterprise. We now know that if we can harness our vast
productive energies to the purposes of peace we can provide a general
standard of living far beyond anything hitherto known.

An expanding economy means opportunity — opportunity for
every one.

It means freedom — freedom for everyone — since freedom
cannot live in the absence of opportunity.

We must see to it that it means security as well, security
for everyone.

We cannot be content, no matter how high the American standard
of living may be in general, if some fraction of our people — whether
it be one-third or one-fifth or one-tenth — is ill fed, ill clothed,
ill housed, and insecure.

There are some who will say of all this that sufficient unto
the day are the problems thereof — that the task before us now is the
winning of the war. That is true. Our first energies and our first
thoughts must be devoted to winning the war. But we should not forget
that it was last year that we laid the plans, and determined the strategy,
which will this year win the war. Therefore it is this year we must lay
the plans and determine the strategy for the winning of a lasting peace.
This republic had its beginning, and grew to its modern strength, under the protection of certain inalienable political rights — among them the right of free speech, of free worship, or trial by jury, of freedom from search and seizures. They were our rights to life and liberty.

As we grew in size and stature, however, — as our industrial economy expanded — these political rights proved inadequate to assure us all equality in the pursuit of happiness. Economic inequalities began to replace the old political tyranny. Through the last century our internal history has been largely an evolution of the economic rights of man in a free economy of private enterprise and initiative.

We have come to a clear realization of the fact that true individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence. "Vaccinated men are not free men". People who are hungry and out of a job are the stuff of which dictatorships are made.

In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all — regardless of station, race or creed.

Foremost and first among these rights is the right to work at a good job under decent conditions and at a salary adequate for decent living and leisure. It must be sufficient to purchase insurance
with the help of government against the hazards of disease, accident, old age, and unemployment, and to provide a living for dependent survivors after death. War has shown us how to harness our full manpower to the task of building the weapons of war. We shall be counted failures if we prove unable to put all our people to work in full production and distribution of peacetime goods.

Everything in the post-victory world holds hope for an expanding economy which can provide jobs for all; new potential markets at home and abroad for business and agriculture; piling up of needs for all the things we have denied ourselves during this war which used to go into the highest standard of living in the world; the new technological and scientific developments -- in plastics, in electricity, in communication, in transportation.

The second right is the right of the farmer to sell his products at a price which will give him and his family a decent living.

The farm depression after the last war lasted nearly a generation. At one time the average farm family income fell down to $500 per year. The average today is four times that figure. We must give assurance to those who raise our food supply that they will never have to go back to those "good old days on the farm". To continue to give the farmer a fair share of the nation's income and purchasing power is one of the major tasks to which the Congress must give its immediate
attention. A beginning has been accomplished, on my recommendation, by placing a floor under farm prices for a short period after the war—
to prevent sudden collapse. But this is only a beginning—and was only so intended. Long range policies must follow to prevent disas-
trous cycles of farm depressions.

Our goal for American agriculture should be: that everyone who produces food should be economically secure.

The unprecedented demand we have had for food during the war shows that if every American were on a Class A diet and had enough money to pay for it we could keep every farmer busy and prosperous forever.

We should seek to provide for our rural population as good schools, as good hospitals, as good public utilities, as good roads, as good recreational facilities, and as good housing as men and women in our cities.

We must continue to trend away from farm tenancy and toward farm ownership which we began in 1932. We should extend the benefits of the Social Security Act to all agricultural people.

We must continue — especially after the war — to conserve our soil and our water; we must continue to make adequate credit available to farmers at reasonable rates; we must see that our sub-marginal land does not remain in hopeless farming and those who are now vainly
trying to make a living on it are helped to earn their living elsewhere
or in another way.

The third right is the right of every American family to a
decent home — judged by American standards of living. At present a
fifth of our city dwellers live in slums. More than one-third of our
minimum
farm dwellings are below standards of health and decency.

Then the war is over, we must resume in full vigor our progress
toward the American housing goal — good housing for every family in the
land. Conservative estimates indicate that there will be need for at
least ten million new homes during the first decade of peace.
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It is only common sense that a housing program of this size will be primarily and predominately a job for private enterprise. Most of the housing legislation recommended by this Administration and enacted by the Congress has been directed toward the stimulation and encouragement of that kind of home building. Methods should be sought whereby the Government might enable private enterprise to help clear the slums, and enlarge its market by serving families of lower income than it has served before. New modes of government cooperation with business in this field may enable business to come nearer toward providing full employment, so that direct government expenditures will be correspondingly reduced.

Of course, if experience continues to show that the job of clearing the slums and providing suitable housing for families of low income cannot be accomplished otherwise, public funds should be made available to fill this gap. Not even a minority of our people can be suffered to live indefinitely in rural or urban slums, if we are to achieve the standards of living which are the promise and the prospect of postwar America. I am hopeful that, with improvements in technology, a larger national income after the war than before the war, and appropriately designed legislation, our traditional home building industry may be able to serve an ever-increasing portion of the total housing need. It is toward these ends, as well as toward the end of winning
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the war, that the housing policies and activities of the Government
have been consolidated into a single agency — equipped with the tools
and dominated by the intent to help American enterprise achieve the
American housing goal.

The fourth right of every American is the right to good health
and reasonable medical care. In 1940 two out of every five counties
in the United States had no hospitals. More than a quarter million
babies were born that year without medical attendance. More than one-
fourth of all our young men examined for Selective Service were below
minimum physical standards. Almost one-third had never visited a den-
tist. By modern health standards, almost half of all our men, women
and children were undernourished.

Here is a job which challenges our conscience and our intelli-
gence. The United States of America cannot fail in its duty to raise
our standards of health, and provide medical care on a basis of reason-
able need rather than solely on ability to pay.

The fifth right of every American is the right to a good
education. Our great nation — the strongest and richest in the
world — must face the fact that more than one-half of our people
have not attended school after the age of thirteen, that five American
citizens out of every hundred can neither read nor write, that only one
out of twenty have ever attended college. The rural areas of America —
particularly those counties whose taxable land values are low — must be afforded the opportunity of a good, free education. We must not delay placing within the grasp of any boy and girl, whose school record and native ability warrant it, the chance of a college education.

The way is being pointed by the legislation now being considered in the Congress at my recommendation for the education of veterans of this war. I have recommended that adequate federal funds be appropriated to assure every man and woman of our armed forces and of our merchant marine the opportunity of at least one year at a school or trade school or actual industrial training, with the government paying not only the tuition but also an allowance to the veteran for maintenance.

For those veterans who are shown to be qualified, an additional one, two or three years may be similarly provided at school, or college, or professional institution. While the Federal Government supplies the funds for these new opportunities, the choice of institution remains with each individual veteran; and, of course, the respective States supervise their own schools and colleges without interference from the Federal Government.

I hope that this will be the beginning of a new day in the history of education when the Federal Government begins to assume a fair share of the responsibility for the education of all Americans. We have too long tolerated a system where the youth in some parts of our nation — the richer parts — get a decent schooling but those in the poorer regions
The sixth right is the right of every business man to operate his business free from the threat of monopoly, international cartels and unfair competition. There is no greater assurance to American business than adequate purchasing power in the great mass of the American people and in the people of our markets overseas. American business has already learned that when agriculture is broke, when the wage earner has no money to spend, the factories and shops and stores are idle.

America's own position of leadership in the family of nations depends in large part upon how fully these rights have been carried into practice for our citizens. For unless there is security at home there cannot be lasting peace in the world.

To implement these rights in the future will call upon the best thinking of all our citizens and their representatives here in the halls of Congress — regardless of party or politics. There may be disagreements as to details; I am sure there should be none as to objectives.

I ask the Congress to explore these problems and to develop a program for meeting them — for it is definitely the responsibility of the Congress to do so. In the event that no such program is evolved, I shall consider it my duty to make recommendations from time to time.

These are the things which should engage our attention and time and thought in these desperate days rather than the whining demands of
selfish pressure groups who beseech us to help them line their pockets while young Americans are dying.

The Congress will be helped in this if they will set up a regular planning agency. Do not be afraid of that word "planning." Every up-and-coming community does some planning. The States do planning. But the Federal Government is allowed by the Congress to do very little planning.

A Town Supervisor, a Mayor of a City, the Governor of a State, a Federal Cabinet officer, or the President himself can do little planning themselves. It requires the hiring of full-time experts to plan all kinds of things that relate, not merely to local and state and federal government, but also to report on needs of the whole population. No member of the Congress in their branch, with its complicated committee system, has the time or the knowledge to plan a whole national program. They often try manfully to bring in a program on one particular subject, but we do not get efficient planning in that way. All subjects that need planning have got to be coordinated with each other. Our own history proves this very clearly. Therefore, I hope that the Congress will set up some method of obtaining a rounded national planning, remembering always that the final appropriation for all national planning is made by the Congress itself.
This Nation in the past two years has produced the greatest effort in its history.

America was presented with an historic challenge. America accepted that challenge and is meeting it.

We cannot compute our national war effort in terms of statistics of war production alone. This great story must be told primarily in terms of the human element — all the sacrifice and the devotion that have been poured into this war by men and women and children who have placed the service of their country above all other considerations. It has been a gigantic outpouring of human energy and ingenuity and determination.

All of this vast effort has been necessary if we as a Nation are to survive in a world that has been gravely threatened with gangster rule. But I do not think that any of us Americans can be content with mere survival. The sacrifices that have been made impose upon us a sacred obligation to see to it that out of this war we gain something better than mere survival.

The words of Gettysburg are engraved in the hearts of all of us:

"We here highly resolve that these honored dead shall not have died in vain."
It is our determination to gain total victory in this war against Germany and Japan as quickly as we can and at the smallest possible loss of the lives of our sons. Every sacrifice that we here at home can make toward that end must be and will be made. Every need will be met today.

It is also our determination to see to it that this war will not be followed by another era which ends in new disaster. We cannot repeat the tragic errors of attempted isolationism. We cannot repeat the excesses of the wild twenties when this Nation went for a joy-ride on a roller coaster which ended in a tragic crash. And the fulfillment of this determination requires also/special, selfish interests must be subordinated to the interests of the Nation as a whole.

When Mr. Hull went to Moscow in October, and when I went to Cairo and Teheran in November, we knew that we were in agreement with our Allies in our common determination to fight and win this war. There were, however, many vital questions concerning the future peace which required most serious discussion.

The questions were discussed in an atmosphere of complete candor and harmony. We did not attempt to arrive at all/the answers. We knew that this is not the time to take a map of the world and outline every future frontier in precise detail.
We did, however, seek agreement on basic principles — and we arrived at agreement.

In the last war such discussions, such meetings, did not even begin until the shooting had stopped and the delegates began to assemble at the peace table. There had been no previous opportunities for man-to-man discussions which lead to meetings of minds. The result was a peace which was not a peace.

That was a mistake which we are not repeating in this war.

And right here I want to address a word or two to some suspicious souls who are fearful that Mr. Hull or I have made "commitments" for the future which might pledge this Nation to secret treaties, or to enacting the role of Santa Claus, or that we otherwise violated our oaths to support and uphold the Constitution of the United States.

To such suspicious souls — and picayune politicians — I wish to say that Mr. Churchill, and Marshal Stalin, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek are all thoroughly conversant with the provisions of our Constitution. And so is Mr. Hull. And so am I.

Of course we made some commitments. We most certainly committed ourselves to very large and very specific military plans to employ all our forces to bring about the defeat of our enemies at the earliest possible
time. We committed ourselves also, for example, to recognition of the rights of China to regain the territories stolen from her by Japan. That is as obvious as our own right to regain Wake Island and Guam.

But there were no secret treaties or political commitments.

There were no promises of largesse. There was only frank talk about just what it is that each Nation wants to achieve for itself and its neighbors after this war. The answer in every case was the same. It can be summed up in one word: Security.

And that means not only physical security — safety from attacks by aggressors. It means also economic security, social security, moral security — in a family of nations.

The attitude of the British has been well known to us because, with them, we have been able to maintain such closer communication. The British seek no territorial aggrandizement. In addition to the continued maintenance of peace in the world — by force if necessary — the British are, of course, concerned just as we and other nations are with the re-establishment and the further development of world trade and commerce.

They are therefore interested as we are in raising the standards of living for their own people and throughout the world, particularly in those areas
where standards have been relatively low.

We know that for the future peace, as for the present war, the interests of Great Britain and the United States do not conflict — they complement each other.

Before the recent conferences we knew less about the attitude of the Russians and the Chinese toward the future of their own countries and the world.

IIn the plain旧-to-earth talks that I had with the Generalissimo and Marshal Stalin, it was abundantly clear that they are most deeply interested in the resumption of peaceful progress by their own peoples — progress toward a better life. Russia and China insist, as we, on the return of stolen property. But they seek no conquests. They need no new territory. They want to develop their own resources — reclaim the enormous wastelands.

In fact, it is apparent that both China and Russia today face problems and opportunities very similar to those faced by our own country in the past century.

Both China and Russia have emerged, within living memory, from the darkness of ancient tyrannies.

Both have vast, undeveloped resources.
Both nations have been struggling to increase education and individual opportunity and to raise the standards of living of their own peoples.

It is my conviction that after this war both Russia and China will stand in internal economic development much where we Americans stood after the War Between the States — with vast vacuums calling loudly to be filled. They have the brains and the enterprise and the will to accomplish it. Both nations have learned by bitter experience that such development will not be possible if they are to be diverted from their purpose by repeated wars — or even threats of war.

Therefore, China and Russia are truly united with Britain and America in recognition of this essential fact.

The best interests of each nation, large and small, demand that all freedom-loving nations shall join together in a just and durable system of peace. And the one basic guarantee of that peace is a decent standard of living for all individual men and women and children in all nations.

There is within our nation a group of people, circulating constantly like unseeing moles, who insist that if outside nations are encouraged to raise their standards of living our own American standards of living must of necessity go downhill.
The fact is the very contrary. It has been shown time and again that if the standard of living of any country goes up, so does its purchasing power; and that, in turn, affects a better standard of living in neighboring countries with whom it trades. That is just plain common sense.

All over the earth today our men are fighting and suffering to bring about a world in which peace may prevail — a world secure for their loved ones and for themselves. I have talked with many of these men on my recent journey.

I wish that many more of our people could see these men and get the same inspiration that I did from visiting the scenes of their recent triumphs, from talking to them about what they had done to the enemy — and were expecting to do.

It would give those people the same sense of "let-down", of disappointment, almost of shame — that everyone feels who leaves the battlefront and returns to Washington.

For I find in certain circles in Washington too little of realization that the worst days of the war lie ahead of us, too little of determination to sacrifices for the sake of victory, and too much of a scramble to get something special and selfish out of the crisis which now faces our Nation and the world.
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Today, I am afraid, some of our politicians, columnists, and commentators still think that this war can be won with overwhelming supplies of hot air and no casualties. Within the last few months there have descended upon the Nation's Capital City a swarm of lobbyists, high pressure boys, selfish economic groups and profit grabbers. They swarm through the corridors of the Congress and all the cocktail bars in Washington. They are obsessed with only one interest — their own interest. Their last and their least concern is their Nation's interest. They have come to look upon the war primarily as a chance to make profits for themselves at the expense of their neighbors — profits in money or in terms of political or social position.

Here, for example, you have a handful of industrialists and financiers. They do not represent the great mass of decent American business men, but they clamor in the papers and over the air, and in Congressional committee rooms, as if they speak for all American business. That are they after? They are against all taxes levied in accordance with ability to pay. They persuade the Congress to cut down a ten billion dollar tax bill to a two billion dollar one. They are against price ceilings which limit their profits. They are against inflation—controls which cut down their sales. They are against renegotiation of war contracts which would set a decent roof to war profits — conveniently concealing the
fact that the Administration, through such renegotiations, has already
saved the taxpayers two billion dollars.

And here in Washington, you have a handful of farm leaders.

They do not represent the great mass of patriotic, hard-working farmers
who have produced the greatest supply of food for war ever recorded in
history. Yet here they are, clamoring for higher food prices to con-
sumers, for the removal of food ceilings which now prevent poorer people
to pay the same for the same food as the rich man. They clamor for
the abolition of rationing which has brought about fairness in dividing
the Nation's food supply. They are busy lobbying against a system of
food subsidies which has been successful — not only in the United States
but in every nation at war — in keeping the cost of food down, and in
giving the farmer at the same time, a fair enough price to assure adequate
production of food. It all adds up to special privilege and special con-
consideration and special treatment for their own particular groups.

I well remember not many months ago a farm organization leader

who, after demanding large increases in food prices, was asked whether he
was not in favor of inflation. Indignantly he denied that he was; but as
an after-thought added "Well, a little inflation would not do us any harm".
There is not much difference between that and saying, "Well, another little shot of opium will not do me any harm."

Here you have a handful of labor leaders. They, too, do not represent decent American labor — which has made war production records to amaze the world. Yet they are willing to call strikes aimed at the very heart of a nation at war, in order to get advantages to which they are not entitled under the law of the land.

Here are some railroad workers' lobbyists trying to get the Congress to give them special privileges in the form of pay increases which have already been turned down by the duly constituted administrative officials. And it was an interesting spectacle to see certain United States Senators who have been most denunciatory of this Administration for its so-called "meddling" of labor, doing handsprings at the command of this lobby and rushing to.hand out wage increases. These labor leaders and the Congressmen who yielded to their pressure know full well that railroad wage increases will cramp the stabilization formula and lead immediately to similar demands for other labor groups.

Here are some oil producers trying to get the Congress to raise the price of oil. They and the Congress know that what they are urging is contrary to the stabilization program, that it has led the coal operators
to make similar demands, that it will serve as an example to still other
business groups — that it is a big step along the ruinous road to infla-
tion.

I think it only fair to the American people to give them certain
simple statistics in relation to the profits which have been made by some
of these groups recently.

In the case, for instance, of American corporations. After
they had paid their additional taxes, caused by the war, their net profits
in the year 1942 were _____ billion dollars greater than their net profits
in 1941. And, while the figures are not yet wholly complete, it is be-
lieved that in 1943 they will have made net profits of _____ billion dollars
greater than in 1942. Another way of putting it is this: Dividends paid
cut by corporations to their stockholders were _____ in 1941; _____ in 1942;
and it is estimated _____ in 1943. I am in no way depreciating the
splendid work in the war effort, for which nearly all of them can be proud,
but I cannot help feeling that they have been adequately rewarded.

In the case of the farmers, we are proud of the splendid produc-
tion they have turned out, but the figures show that in 1941 farm profits
were approximately seven and a half billion dollars; in 1942 ten billion
dollars; and in 1943 fourteen billion dollars. I asked a farm bloc
leader a few weeks ago if he had any limit in mind. He answered, "Of
course not. My organization is after all it can get. There ain't no
limit."

The farmers have performed a miracle in food production; but
I cannot help feeling that they have been adequately rewarded.

The story among the industrial wage earners is not very differ-
ent. The total wages received, as judged by total factory payrolls,
was___billion in 1941; ___billion in 1942; and ___billion in 1943.

Resolving that into a per capita percentage throughout America, it means
that that average was___dollars in the year 1941; ___dollars in the
year 1942; and ___dollars in the year 1943. The workers of the Nation
have rolled up a great record of production; but I cannot help feeling
that they have been adequately rewarded.

Whenever crisis has come to the American people they have been
able and willing to forget individual and selfish and partisan interest
and to unite in a national unity of purpose and direction. They have
learned time and again how interdependent upon each other are all groups
and sections of the population of America. No one group can obtain
special consideration without hurting the others — and ultimately hurting
themselves. Increased farm prices, for example, will bring new demands
for wage increases from all war workers, which will in turn raise all
prices of all things including those things which the farmers themselves
have to buy. Increased wages or prices or profits will each in turn
produce the same dire results. They all have a disastrous result on
all fixed income groups.

And I hope you will remember that as President of the United
States I represent them just as much as I represent the business owner,
the worker and the farmer. This group of fixed-income people includes

teachers, clergy, clerks, employees in small stores, workers in hospitals,
policemen, firemen, stenographers, domestic servants, widows and minors
on fixed incomes, war pensioners or old age pensioners. These groups
add up to nearly a third of our one hundred and thirty million people.

They have little or no lobbies or high pressure representatives at the
Capitol. In a period of gross inflation their lot will be the unhappiest
lot that any Americans can have. That has been the history in every
country that has had the misfortune to go through a period of inflation.

If ever there was a time to subordinate individual or group
selfishness to the national good, that time is now. In all theatres of
war there are now being prepared offensives which will require everything
we can give in trained manpower, fighting equipment, courage, stamina
and morale. Discord at home — bickering, self-seeking, partisanship,
stoppages of work, inflation — these are the influences which undermine
the brave men ready to die at the front for us here.

I can assure you that the boys on our fighting fronts who expect
us all here at home to be laying solid bricks for the foundations of the
future are dismayed and disheartened at the spectacle of Americans throwing
those bricks at each other.

The argument is offered that the time is past when we must make
prodigious sacrifices — that the war is already won and we can begin to
slacken off. But that argument will not have any validity until United
Nations' forces are marching through the streets of Berlin and Tokyo.

In the meantime, over-confidence and complacency are among our
deadliest enemies. Last Spring — after notable victories at Stalingrad
and in Tunisia and against the U-boats on the high seas — over-confidence
became so pronounced that war production fell off. In two months,
June and July, 1943, more than a thousand airplanes that could have been
made and should have been made were not made. Those who failed to make them
were not on strike. They were merely saying, "The war's in the bag — so
let's go out to the local juke-joint and relax."
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That attitude on the part of management or labor can lengthen this war. It can kill American boys.

Let us remember the lessons of 1918. In the summer of 1918 the tide turned in favor of the Allies. But this Government did not relax. In fact, our national effort was stepped up. In August, 1918, the draft age was enlarged from 21-31 to 16-45. President Wilson called for "force to the utmost" and his call was heeded. And in November Germany surrendered.

That is the way to fight and win a war — all-out — and not with half-an-eye on the battle fronts abroad and the other eye-and-a-half on personal interests here at home.

(Here would come Project 35 if you decide to use it).

Partisanship and prejudice have prevented the enactment of legislation which would preserve for our soldiers and sailors and marines the fundamental prerogative of citizenship — the right to vote. No amount of constitutional argument can beside the issue in the eyes of these eleven million American citizens. They know that they simply will be deprived of their right to vote if it is left exclusively to the States under existing state laws — and that there is no likelihood of these laws being changed before the next election. They know that unless a Federal
Statute is passed, the next President and Members of the Congress are going
to be elected without giving them a voice in the selection. It is the
duty of the Congress to remove this unjustifiable discrimination against
the men and women in our armed forces — as quickly as possible.

The war has demonstrated how vast is our productive capacity,
how powerful are the resourcefulness, the ingenuity, the drive of American
enterprise. We now know that if we can harness our vast productive ener-
gies to the purposes of peace we can provide a general standard of living
far beyond anything hitherto known.

We cannot be content, no matter how high the American standard
of living may be in general, if some fraction of our people — whether it
be one-third or one-fifth or one-tenth — is ill fed, ill clothed, ill
housed, and insecure.

There are some who will say of all this that sufficient unto the
day are the problems thereof — that the task before us now is the winning
of the war. That is true. Our first energies and our first thoughts
must be devoted to winning the war. But we should not forget that it was
last year that we laid the plans, and determined the strategy, which will
this year win important victories in this war. Therefore it is this year
we must lay the plans and determine the strategy for the winning of a last-
ing peace.

This Republic had its beginning, and grew to its modern strength, under the protection of certain inalienable political rights — among them the right of free speech, of free worship, or trial by jury, of freedom from searches and seizures. They were our rights to life and liberty.

As we grow in size and stature, however, — as our industrial economy expanded — these political rights proved inadequate to assure us all equality in the pursuit of happiness. Economic inequalities began to replace the old political tyranny. Through the last century our internal history has been largely an evolution of the economic rights of man in a free economy of private enterprise and initiative.

We have come to a clear realization of the fact that true individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence.

"Hungerous men are not free men". People who are hungry and out of a job are the stuff of which dictatorships are made.

In our day those economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a Second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all — regardless of station, race or creed.

These are: the right to do useful and creative work in the industries or shops or on the farms of the Nation; the right to earn
adequate food, clothing, shelter, recreation and medical care; the right to conduct business in a system of free enterprise without fear of monopoly and unfair competition; the right to an education; the right to protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident and unemployment.

All of these rights spell security.

Certainly to insure the security of this Nation our workers must have the opportunity to work under decent conditions and at wages adequate for decent living, saving and pleasure.

War has shown us how to harness our full manpower to the task of building the weapons of war. We shall be counted failures if we prove unable to put all our people to work in full production and distribution of peace-time goods.

Certainly, in order to insure the security of this Nation, our farmers must be able to sell their products at a price which will give them and their families a decent living.

The farm depression after the last war lasted nearly a generation. At one time the average farm family income fell down to $500 per year. The average today is four times that figure. To continue to live...
The farmer a fair share of the nation's income and purchasing power is one of the major tasks to which the Congress must give its immediate attention. A beginning has been accomplished, on my recommendation, by placing a floor under farm prices for a short period after the war — to prevent sudden collapse. But this is only a beginning — and was only so intended. Long range policies must follow to prevent disastrous cycles of farm depressions.

Our goal for American agriculture should be: that everyone who produces food should be economically secure.

The unprecedented demand we have had for food during the war shows that if every American were on a Class A diet and had enough money to pay for it, we could keep every farmer busy and prosperous forever.

Certainly, in order to insure the security of this nation every American family should have a decent home, in accordance with American standards of living. At present a fifth of our city dwellers live in slums. More than one-third of our farm dwellings are below minimum standards of health and decency.

When the war is over, we must resume in full vigor our progress toward the American housing goal — good housing for every family in the land. Conservative estimates indicate that there will be need for at least ten million new homes during the first decade of peace.
It is only common sense that a housing program of this size will be primarily and predominately a job for private enterprise.]

But, if experience continues to show that the job of clearing the slums and providing suitable housing for families of low income cannot be accomplished otherwise, public funds should be made available to fill this gap. Not even a minority of our people can be suffered to live indefinitely in rural or urban slums, if we are to achieve the standards of living which are the promise and the prospect of postwar America.

Certainly, in order to insure the security of this Nation, every American is entitled to medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health. In 1940 two out of every five counties in the United States had no hospitals. More than a quarter million babies were born that year without medical attendance. More than one-third of all our young men examined for Selective Service were below minimum physical standards. Almost one-third had never visited a dentist. By modern health standards, almost half of all our men, women, and children were undernourished.

Here is a job which challenges our conscience and our intelligence. The United States of America cannot fail in its duty to raise our standards of health, and provide medical care on a basis of reasonable need rather than solely on ability to pay.
Certainly, in order to insure the security of this nation, every American must have the opportunity to gain a good education. We must face the unpleasant fact that more than one-half of our people have not attended school after the age of thirteen, that five American citizens out of every hundred can neither read nor write, that only one out of twenty has ever attended college. The rural areas of America—particularly those counties whose taxable land values are low—must be afforded the opportunity of a good, free education. We must not delay placing within the grasp of any boy and girl, whose school record and native ability warrant it, the chance of a college education.

The way is being pointed by the legislation now being considered in Congress at my recommendation for the education of veterans of this war. I have recommended that adequate federal funds be appropriated to assure every man and woman of our armed forces and of our merchant marine the opportunity of at least one year at a school or trade school or actual industrial training, with the government paying not only the tuition but also an allowance to the veteran for maintenance. For those veterans who are shown to be qualified, an additional one, two or three years may be similarly provided at school, or college, or professional institution. While the Federal Government supplies the funds for these new opportunities, the choice of institution remains with each individual.
veterans; and, of course, the respective States supervise their own schools and colleges without interference from the Federal Government.

I hope that this will be the beginning of a new day in the history of education when the Federal Government begins to assume a fair share of the responsibility for the education of all Americans. We have too long tolerated a system where the youth in some parts of our nation—the richer parts—get a decent schooling but those in the poorer regions get none. And certainly, to insure the security of this nation, every American business must have the opportunity to operate his business free from the threats of monopoly, international cartels and unfair competition.

There is no greater assurance to American business than adequate purchasing power in the great mass of the American people and in the masses of people with whom we conduct our trade overseas. American business has already learned that when agriculture is broke, when the wage earner has no money to spend, the factories and shops and stores are idle.

America's own position of leadership in the family of nations depends in large part upon how fully these rights have been carried into practice for our citizens. For unless there is security at home there cannot be lasting peace in the world.
To implement these rights in the future will call upon the best thinking of all our citizens and their representatives here in the halls of Congress — regardless of party or politics. There may be disagreements as to details; I am sure there should be none as to objectives.

I ask the Congress to explore these problems and to develop a program for meeting them — for it is definitely the responsibility of the Congress to do so. In the event that no such program is evolved, I shall consider it my duty to make recommendations from time to time.

These are the things which should engage our attention and time and thought in these desperate days rather than the whining demands of selfish pressure groups who beseech us to help them line their pockets while young Americans are dying.

************
This Nation in the past two years has produced the greatest
effort in its history.

This was necessary in order to guarantee the survival of
this Nation in a world that has been gravely threatened with gangster
rule. But I do not think that any of us Americans can be content with
mere survival. The sacrifices that have been made impose upon us a
sacred obligation to see to it that out of this war we gain something
better than mere survival.

The words of Gettysburg are engraved in the hearts of all of
us: "We here highly resolve that these honored dead shall not have died
in vain."

It is our determination to gain total victory in this war
against Germany and Japan as quickly as we can and at the smallest
possible loss of the lives of our men. Every sacrifice that we here
at home can make toward that end must be and will be made. Every
needful sacrifice is not being made today.

It is also our determination to see to it that this war will
not be followed by another era which leads to new disaster — that we
do not put our heads into the sands of isolationism and that we
shall not repeat the tragic errors of attempted isolationism — that we
shall not repeat the excesses of the wild twenties when this Nation went
for a joy-ride on a roller coaster which ended in a tragic crash. And
the fulfillment of this determination requires that special, selfish
interests must be subordinated to the interests of the Nation as a whole.

Today, the representatives of these selfish interests are
flouting the national interest. In an orgy of exhibitionism, they are
pushing their special claims to special privilege.

This I consider the most serious factor in our home situation
as we face our biggest task in this bitter war.

When Mr. Hull went to Moscow in October, and when I went to
Cairo and Teheran in November, we knew that we were in agreement with
our Allies in our common determination to fight and win this war. But
many vital questions concerning the future peace required most serious
discussion; and they were discussed in an atmosphere of complete candor
and harmony.

We did not attempt to arrive at the details of all the answers.

We did, however, seek agreement on basic principles for the
prevention of war for as long as we now living can look ahead.

In the last war such discussions, such meetings, did not even
begin until the shooting had stopped and the delegates began to assemble
at the peace table. There had been no previous opportunities for man-to-man
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discussions which lead to meetings of minds. The result was a peace which was not a peace.

That was a mistake which we are not repeating in this war.

And right here I want to address a word or two to some suspicious souls who are fearful that Mr. Bull or I have made "commitments" for the future which might pledge this Nation to secret treaties, or to enacting the role of Santa Claus, [or that we otherwise violated our oaths to support and uphold the Constitution of the United States.]

To such suspicious souls — and picayune politicians — I wish to say that Mr. Churchill, and Marshal Stalin, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek are all thoroughly conversant with the provisions of our Constitution. And so is Mr. Bull. And so am I.

Of course we made some commitments. We most certainly committed ourselves to very large and very specific military plans to employ all our forces—military and civilian—to bring about the defeat of our enemies at the earliest possible time. We committed ourselves also, for example, to recognition of the rights of China to regain the territories stolen from her by Japan. That is as obvious as our own right to regain Wake Island and Guam and to eject the Japanese from the Philippines.

But there were no secret treaties or political or financial commitments.
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The one supreme objective for the future, which we discussed for each nation individually, and of all four nations together, can be summed up in one word: Security.

And that means not only physical security — safety from attacks by aggressors. It means also economic security, social security, moral security — in a family of nations.

We know that for the future peace, as for the present war, the interests of Great Britain, and Russia, and China, and the United States, in the broad sense of that term, do not conflict — they complement each other.

In the plain down-to-earth talks that I had with the Generalissime and Marshal Stalin, it was abundantly clear that they are most deeply interested in the resumption of peaceful progress by their own peoples — progress toward a better life. They want to develop their own resources — reclaim the land as did our own pioneers.

In fact, both China and Russia today face problems and opportunities very similar to those faced by our own country in the past century. They have both emerged, within living memory, from the darkness of ancient tyrannies. Both nations have been struggling to increase education and individual opportunity, and to raise the standards of living of their own peoples.
It is my conviction that after this war both Russia and China, with respect to internal economic development, will stand much where we Americans stood after the War Between the States — with vast vacuums calling loudly to be filled. They have the brains and the enterprise and the will to accomplish it. Both nations have learned by bitter experience that such development will not be possible if they are to be diverted from their purpose by repeated wars — or even threats of war.

Therefore, China and Russia are truly united with Britain and America in recognition of this essential fact.

The best interests of each nation, large and small, demand that all freedom-loving nations shall join together in a just and durable system of peace. And, in addition to unquestioned military control as protection against any and all aggressors, a basic essential of that peace is a decent standard of living for all individual men and women and children in all nations.

There are people who burrow through our Nation like unseeing moles. They attempt to spread the fear that if outside nations are encouraged to raise their standards of living, our own American standard of living must of necessity be depressed.
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The fact is the very contrary. It has been shown time and again that if the standard of living of any country goes up, so does its purchasing power; and that, in turn, encourages a better standard of living in neighboring countries with whom it trades. That is just plain common sense — and it is the kind of plain common sense that provided the basis for our discussions with the representatives of Great Britain, Russia and China.

All over the earth today our men are fighting and suffering to bring about a world in which peace may prevail — a world secure for their loved ones and for themselves. I have talked with many of these men on my recent journeyings.

I wish that many more of our people could see them and get the same inspiration that I did from visiting the scenes of their recent triumphs, from talking to them about what they had done to the enemy — and were expecting to do.

It would give those people the same sense of "let-down" of disappointment, almost of shame — that everyone feels who leaves the battlefront and returns to Washington.

Today, I am afraid, some of our politicians, columnists, and commentators still think that this war can be won with overwhelming supplies of hot air and no casualties.
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Within the last few months there have descended upon the Nation's Capital City a swarm of promoters, lobbyists, high pressure boys, selfish economic groups and profit grabbers. They swarm through the corridors of the Congress and all the cocktail bars in Washington.

They are obsessed with only one interest — their own interest. Their last and least concern is their Nation's interest. They have come to look upon the war primarily as a chance to make profits for themselves at the expense of their neighbors — profits in money or in terms of political or social advancement.

Here, for example, you have a handful — a minority — of industrialists and financiers. They do not represent the great mass of decent American business men, but they clamor in the papers and over the air, and in Congressional committee rooms, as if they speak for all American business. What are they after? They are against all taxes levied in accordance with ability to pay. They persuade the Congress to cut down a ten billion dollar tax bill to a two billion dollar one. They are against price ceilings which limit their profits. They are against inflation-controls which cut down their sales. They are against renegotiation of war contracts which would set a decent roof to war profits — conveniently concealing the
fact that the Administration, through such renegotiations, has already saved the taxpayers two billion dollars, and, if left alone, will save many billion dollars more.

And here in Washington, you have a handful of farm lobbyists. They do not represent the great mass of patriotic, hard-working farmers who have produced the greatest supply of food ever recorded in history. Yet here they are, clamoring for higher food prices to consumers, for the removal of food ceilings which now enable poorer people to pay the same for the same food as the rich man. They clamor for the abolition of rationing which has brought about fairness in dividing the Nation's food supply. They are busy lobbying against a system of food subsidies — not only in the United States but in every nation at war — which has been successful in keeping the cost of food down, and in giving the farmer at the same time a fair enough price to assure adequate production of food at a profit.

Here you have a handful of labor lobbyists. They, too, do not represent decent American labor — which has made war production records to amaze the world. Yet they are willing to call strikes aimed at the very heart of a nation at war, in order to get advantages to which they are not entitled under the law of the land. For instance, we have
seen them trying to get the Congress to give by legislation special
privilege to railroad workers in the form of pay increases which have
already been turned down by the administrative officials acting under
Congressional mandate. And it was an interesting spectacle to see
some who have been most denunciatory of this Administration for its
so-called "coddling" of labor, doing handsprings at the command of
this lobby and rushing to hand out wage increases.

Here are some oil producers trying to get the Congress to raise the price of oil. They and the Congress know that what they
are urging is contrary to the stabilization program, that it has led
the coal operators to make similar demands, that it will serve as an
d example to still other business groups — that it goes far along the
ruinous road to inflation.

I think it only fair to the American people to give them
certain simple statistics in relation to the profits which have been
made by some of these groups recently.

In the case, for instance, of American corporations. After
they had paid their additional taxes, caused by the war, their net
profits in the year 1942 were _____ billion dollars greater than
their net profits in 1941. And, while the figures are not yet
wholly complete, it is believed that in 1943 they will have made
net profits of _____ billion dollars greater than in 1942. Another
way of putting it is this: Dividends paid out by corporations to
their stockholders were _____ in 1941; _____ in 1942; and, it is
estimated, _____ in 1943.

I am no way depreciating their splendid work in the
war effort, for which nearly all of them can be proud, but I cannot
help feeling that they have been adequately rewarded.

In the case of the farmers, we are proud of the splendid produc-
tion they have turned out, but the figures show that in 1941 farm profits
were approximately seven and a half billion dollars; in 1942 ten billion
dollars; and in 1943 fourteen billion dollars.
FOURTH DRAFT

The farmers have performed a miracle in food production; but I cannot help feeling that they, too, have been adequately rewarded.

The story among the industrial wage earners is not very different. The total wages received, as judged by total factory payrolls, was _____ billion in 1941; _____ billion in 1942; and _____ billion in 1943. Resolving that into a per capita percentage throughout America, based on a greatly increased total of industrial workers, it means that the average was _____ dollars in the year 1941; _____ dollars in the year 1942; and _____ dollars in the year 1943.

The workers of the Nation have rolled up a great record of production; but I cannot help feeling that they, too, have been adequately rewarded.

Whenever crisis has come to the American people they have been able and willing to forget individual and selfish and partisan interest and to unite in a national unity of purpose and direction. They have learned time and again how interdependent upon each other are all groups and sections of the population of America. No one group can obtain special consideration without hurting the others—and ultimately hurting themselves. Increased farm prices, for
example, will bring new demands for wage increases from all war workers, which will in turn raise all prices of all things including those things which the farmers themselves have to buy. Increased wages or prices or profits will each in turn produce the same dire results. They all have a disastrous result on all fixed income groups.

And I hope you will remember that as President of the United States I represent the fixed income group just as much as I represent the business owner, the worker and the farmer. This group of fixed-income people includes teachers, clergy, clerks, employees in small stores, workers in hospitals, policemen, firemen, stenographers, domestic servants, widows and minors on fixed incomes, wives and dependents of our soldiers and sailors, or old age pensioners. These groups add up to nearly a third of our one hundred and thirty million people. They have little or no lobbies or high pressure representatives at the Capitol. In a period of gross inflation their lot will be the unhappiest lot that any Americans can have. That has been the history in every country that has had the misfortune to go through a period of inflation.

If ever there was a time to subordinate individual or group selfishness to the national good, that time is now. In all theatres of war there are now being prepared offensives which will require everything
we can give in trained manpower, fighting equipment, courage, stamina and morale. Disunity at home — bickerings, self-seeking, partisanship, stoppages of work, inflation — these are the influences which undermine the brave men ready to die at the front for us here.

I can assure you that the boys on our fighting fronts who expect us all here at home to be laying solid bricks for the foundations of the future are dismayed and disheartened at the spectacle of Americans throwing those bricks at each other.

A recent writer has said:

"What is going on in the minds of our soldiers will bear directly on their behavior in the war, and it also will influence their political behavior when they get home. Many of them are very young and the war has been the decisive experience of their lives, forming their whole attitude toward American society. Physicians tending wounded soldiers tell me that, reading the papers, they are becoming bitterly anti-labor, even denouncing their own laboring fathers. At the same time, in such hospitals as those at Atlantic City and Miami,
they are outraged by the display of luxury amongst vacationers and
infuriated by the war profiteering."

The fact is that the lobbyists and profiteers are not de-
liberately striving to sabotage the national war effort. They are
laboring under the delusion that the time is past when we must make
prodigious sacrifices — that the war is already won and we can begin
to slacken off. But that argument will not have any validity until
United Nations' forces are marching through the streets of Berlin and
Tokyo.

In the meantime, over-confidence and complacency are among
our deadliest enemies. Last Spring — after notable victories at
Stalingrad and in Tunisia and against the U-boats on the high seas —
over-confidence became so pronounced that war production fell off.

In two months, June and July, 1945, more than a thousand
airplanes that could have been made and should have been made were not
made. Those who failed to make them were not on strike. They were
merely saying, "The war's in the bag — so let's relax". 
That attitude on the part of government or management or labor can lengthen this war. It can kill American boys.

Let us remember the lessons of 1918. In the summer of 1918 the tide turned in favor of the Allies. But this Government did not relax. In fact, our national effort was stepped up. In August, 1918, the draft age was enlarged from 21-31 to 18-45. The President called for "force to the utmost" and his call was heeded. And in November Germany surrendered.
That is the way to fight and win a war — all-but — and not with half-an-eye on the battle fronts abroad and the other eye-and-a-half on personal, selfish interests here at home.

(Here would come Project CS8 if you decide to use it).

Partisanship and prejudice have prevented the enactment of legislation which would preserve for our soldiers and sailors and marines the fundamental prerogative of citizenship — the right to vote. No amount of constitutional argument can cloud this issue in the eyes of these eleven million American citizens. They know that they simply will be deprived of their right to vote if it is left exclusively to the States under existing state laws — and that there is no likelihood of these laws being changed before the next election. They know that unless a Federal Statute is passed, the next President and Members of the Congress are going to be elected without giving the eleven million a voice in the selection.

The Army has reported that it will be impossible to administer forty-eight different soldier-voting laws. It is the duty of the Congress to remove this unjustifiable discrimination against the men and women in our armed forces — as quickly as possible.

Our first energies and our first thoughts must be devoted to winning the war. But we should not forget that it was last year that we laid the plans, and determined the strategy, which will this year win important victories in this war. Therefore in this year we must lay the plans and
determine the strategy for the winning of a lasting peace and the establish
ishment of an American standard of living higher than ever before known.
We cannot be content, no matter how high the American standard of living
may be in general, if some fraction of our people — whether it be one-third
or one-fifth or one-tenth — is ill fed, ill clothed, ill housed, and insecure.

This Republic had its beginning, and grew to its modern strength,
under the protection of certain inalienable political rights — among them
the right of free speech, of free press, of free worship, of trial by jury,
of freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures. They were our rights
to life and liberty.

As we grew in size and stature, however, — as our industrial
economy expanded — these political rights proved inadequate to assure us
all equality in the pursuit of happiness. Economic inequalities began to
replace the old political tyranny. Through the last century our internal
history has been largely an evolution of the economic rights of man in a
free economy of private enterprise and initiative.

We have come to a clear realization of the fact that true indi
vidual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence.

"Necessary men are not free men". People who are hungry and out of a
job are the stuff of which dictatorships are made.
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In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all — regardless of station, race or creed.

These are: the right to do useful work in the industries or shops or on the farms of the Nation; the right to earn adequate food, clothing, shelter, recreation and medical care; the right to conduct business in a system of free enterprise without fear of monopoly and unfair competition; the right to an education; the right to protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident and unemployment.

All of these rights spell security. And after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward, in the implementation of these rights, to new goals of human happiness and well-being.

Certainly, in order to insure the security of this Nation our workers must have the opportunity to work under decent conditions and at wages adequate for decent living and saving and leisure.

War has shown us how to harness our full manpower to the task of building the weapons of war. We shall be counted failures if we prove unable to put all our people to work in full production and distribution of peacetime goods by private enterprise with the Government, wherever necessary, filling in gaps with such essential public works as the construction of highways, hospitals, schools, water-power and irrigation projects.
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Certainly, in order to insure the security of this Nation,
our farmers must be able to sell their products at a price which will
give them and their families a decent living.

The farm depression after the last war lasted nearly a genera-
tion. At one time the average farm family income fell down to $500 per
year. The average today is four times that figure. Sudden post-war
collapse has been prevented by the action of the Congress, on my recom-
mendation, placing a floor under farm prices for a short period after
the war. But this is only a beginning — and was only so intedded.
Long range policies must follow to prevent disastrous cycles of farm
depressions.

Our goal for American agriculture should be: that everyone
who consumes food shall be well-nourished and that everyone who produces
food shall be economically secure.

The unprecedented demand we have had for food during the war
shows that if every American were on a Class A diet and had enough money
to pay for it, every farmer would be kept busy and prosperous.

Certainly, in order to insure the security of this nation,
every American family should have a decent home, in accordance with
American standards of living. At present a fifth of our city dwellers
live in slums. More than one-third of our farm dwellings are below
minimum standards of health and decency.
When the war is over, we must resume in full vigor our progress
toward the American housing goal — good housing for every family in the
land. This is primarily a job for private enterprise — using public funds
only for families of very low income for whom private industry cannot
profitably build.

Certainly, in order to insure the security of this Nation,
every American is entitled to medical care and the opportunity to achieve
and enjoy good health. In 1940 two out of every five counties in the
United States had no hospitals. More than a quarter million babies were
born that year without medical attendance. More than one-third of all
our young men examined were rejected by our armed forces as below minimum
physical standards. Almost one-third had never visited a dentist.

By modern health standards, almost half of all our men, women and
children were undernourished.

Here is a job which challenges our conscience and our intel-
ligence.

Certainly, in order to insure the security of this nation,
every American must have the opportunity to gain a good education.

We must face the unpleasant fact that more than one-half of our people
have not attended school after the age of thirteen, that five American
citizens out of every hundred can neither read nor write.
The children in all sections of America — even in those counties whose taxable land values are low — must be afforded the opportunity of a good, free education. The Federal Government must assume a fair share of the responsibility and cost of the education of all Americans. We have too long tolerated a system where the youth in the richer sections of the Nation get a good schooling, while those in the less developed sections get none.

And certainly, in order to insure the security of the Nation, American business — and especially small business — must flourish in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and threats of monopoly at home and abroad. The greatest stimulus to American business must come obviously from adequate purchasing power in the great mass of the American people and in the masses of people with whom we conduct our trade overseas.

America's own rightful place in the family of nations depends in large part upon how fully these and similar rights have been carried into practice for our citizens. For unless there is security at home there cannot be lasting peace in the world.

To implement these rights in the future will call upon the best thinking of all our citizens and their representatives here in the
halls of the Congress — regardless of party or politics. There may be disagreements as to details; I am sure there should be none as to objectives.

I ask the Congress to explore these problems and to develop a program for meeting them — for it is definitely the responsibility of the Congress to do so. In the event that no such program is evolved, I am certain that the Nation will be conscious of the fact.

These are the things which should engage our attention and time and thought in these desperate days rather than the whining demands of selfish pressure groups who beseech us to help them line their pockets while young Americans are dying.

**********
TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

This Nation in the past two years has become an active partner in the world's greatest war against human slavery.

We have joined with like-minded people in order to defend ourselves in a world that has been gravely threatened with gangster rule.

But I do not think that any of us Americans can be content with mere survival. Sacrifices that we and our allies are making impose upon us all a sacred obligation to see to it that out of this war we and our children will gain something better than mere survival.

The words of Gettysburg are engraved in the hearts of all of us: "We here highly resolve that these honored dead shall not have died in vain."

It is our determination to gain total victory in this war against Germany and Japan as quickly as we can and at the smallest possible loss of the lives of our men. Every sacrifice that we here at home can make toward that end must be and will be made.

Every needful sacrifice is not being made today.

It is also our determination to see to it that this war will not be followed by another era which leads to new disaster — that we shall not repeat the tragic errors of ostrich isolationism — that we shall not repeat the excesses of the wild twenties when this Nation went for a
joy-ride on a roller coaster which ended in a tragic crash. And
the fulfillment of this determination requires that special or group
interests must be subordinated to the interests of the Nation as a
whole.

Today, the representatives of these selfish interests are
flouting the national interest. In an orgy of exhibitionism, they
are pushing their claims.

This I consider the most serious factor in our home situa-
tion as we face our biggest task in this bitter war.

When Mr. Hull went to Moscow in October, and when I went
to Cairo and Teheran in November, we knew that we were in agreement
with our Allies in our common determination to fight and win this war.
But there were many vital questions concerning the future peace, and
they were discussed in an atmosphere of complete candor and harmony.

In the last war such discussions, such meetings, did not even
begin until the shooting had stopped and the delegates began to assemble
at the peace table. There had been no previous opportunities for man-to-man
discussions which lead to meetings of minds. The result was a peace
which was not a peace.

That was a mistake which we are not repeating in this war.

And right here I want to address a word or two to some suspicious
souls who are fearful that Mr. Hull or I have made "commitments" for the
future which might pledge this Nation to secret treaties, or to enacting
the role of Santa Claus.

To such suspicious souls — and pious politicians — I wish
to say that Mr. Churchill, and Marshal Stalin, and Generalissimo Chiang
Kai-shek are all thoroughly conversant with the provisions of our Constitu-
tion. And so is Mr. Hull. And so am I.

Of course we made some commitments we most certainly committed
ourselves to very large and very specific military plans which require the
use of all allied forces to bring about the defeat of our enemies at the
earliest possible time. We committed ourselves also, for example, to
recognition of the rights of China to regain the territories stolen from
her by Japan. That is as obvious as our own right to regain Wake Island
and Guam and to eject the Japanese from the Philippines.

But there were no secret treaties or political or financial
commitments.
The one supreme objective for the future, which we discussed for each nation individually, and for all four nations together, can be summed up in one word: Security.

And that means not only physical security which provides safety from attacks by aggressors. It means also economic security, social security, moral security — in a family of nations.

We know that for the future peace, as for the present war, the interests of Great Britain, and Russia, and China, and the United States, in the broad sense of that term, do not conflict — they complement each other.

In the plain down-to-earth talks that I had with the Generalissimo and Marshal Stalin, it was abundantly clear that they are most deeply interested in the resumption of peaceful progress by their own peoples — progress toward a better life. They want to develop their own resources — build up industry and reclaim the land as did our own pioneers.

In fact, both China and Russia today face problems and opportunities very similar to those faced by our own country in the past century. They have both emerged, within living memory, from the darkness of ancient tyrannies. Both nations have been struggling to increase education and individual opportunity, and to raise the standards of living of their own peoples.
The peoples of Russia and China have the courage and the skill and the enterprise which will be required for the development of their great countries. Both nations have learned by bitter experience that real development will not be possible if they are to be diverted from their purpose by repeated wars — or even threats of war.

Therefore, China and Russia are truly united with Britain and America in recognition of this essential fact.

The best interests of each nation, large and small, demand that all freedom-loving nations shall join together in a just and durable system of peace. And, in addition to unquestioned military control as protection against any and all thugs, a basic essential of that peace is a decent standard of living for all individual men and women and children in all nations. Freedom from fear is eternally linked with freedom from want.

There are people who burrow through our Nation like unseeing moles. They attempt to spread the suspicion that if other nations are encouraged to raise their standards of living, our own American standard of living must of necessity be depressed.
The fact is the very contrary. It has been shown time and again that if the standard of living of any country goes up, so does its purchasing power — and that such a rise encourages a better standard of living in neighboring countries with whom it trades. That is just plain common sense — and it is the kind of plain common sense that provided the basis for our discussions at Moscow, Cairo and Teheran.

All over the earth today our men are fighting and suffering to bring about a world in which peace may prevail — a world secure for their loved ones and for themselves. I have talked with many of these men — enlisted men and officers — on my recent journeyings.

I wish that many more of our people could see them and get the same inspiration that I did from visiting the scenes of their recent triumphs, from talking to them about what they had done to the enemy — and were expecting to do.

It would give those people the same sense of "let-down", of disappointment, almost of shame, that everyone feels who leaves the battlefront and returns to Washington.

Today, I am afraid, some of our politicians, columnists, and commentators still think that this war can be won with overwhelming supplies of hot air and no casualties.
Within the last few months there have descended upon the
Nation's Capital City hordes of predatory animals in more or less human
They are
form. promoters, lobbyists, high pressure boys, profit grabbers,
saugmented by those quadrennial political foxes who "lay low and say
nothin'" in times of real national crisis but who become very active in
each campaign year. All of them are now swarming through the corridors
of the Congress and all the cocktail bars of Washington. Their sole
intent is plunder.

They are obsessed with only one interest — their own interest.
Their last and their least concern is their Nation's interest. They have
come to look upon the war primarily as a chance to make profits for them-
selves at the expense of their neighbors — profits in money or in terms
of political or social advancement.

What are they after? They want to do away with price ceil-
ings and inflation-controls and renegotiation of contracts — all of which
place proper wartime limits on prices and profits; they are looking for
higher food prices and higher oil and coal prices, and for higher wages
for particular groups; they seek to prevent taxation levied in accordance
with ability to pay and designed to tax high war profits — industrial and
corporate; they want to abolish rationing and the fair distribution of
goods among our citizens; they are urging strikes aimed at the very heart of a nation at war. And above all, in the grave crisis which faces our Nation, they seek to make political capital in this election year out of every incident in our national life, even at the risk of dividing us from our allies and prolonging the war.

To listen to the arguments of the politicians and lobbyists, one would think that the people of this Nation were poverty-stricken and starving. The facts hardly support this contention.

The national income of the United States was about seventy billion dollars in 1939. In 1943 it was about one hundred and fifty billion dollars — an increase of nearly over 100%. During the same time, the cost of living, including the rent and food and clothing, went up only 25%.

In that same time the income of American corporations increased from ___ to ___.

The net income of farm operators rose in those years from ___ to ___. The average earnings of Americans who were engaged as industrial workers went up from ___ in 1938 to ___ in 1943.

Whenever crisis has come to the American people they have been able and willing to forget individual and selfish and partisan interest and to unite in a national unity of purpose and direction.
They have learned time and again how interdependent upon each other are all groups and sections of the population of America. Increased food costs, for example, will bring new demands for wage increases from all war workers, which will in turn raise all prices of all things including those things which the farmers themselves have to buy. Increased wages or prices will each in turn produce the same dire results. They all have a disastrous result on all fixed income groups.

And I hope you will remember that all of us in this Government represent the fixed income group just as much as we represent business owners, workers and farmers. This group of fixed-income people includes teachers, clergy, clerks, employees in small stores, workers in hospitals, policemen, firemen, stenographers, domestic servants, widows and minors on fixed incomes, wives and dependents of our soldiers and sailors, and old age pensioners. They and their families add up to nearly a third of our one hundred and thirty million people. They have few or no high pressure representatives at the Capitol. In a period of gross inflation they would be the worst sufferers in a generally bankrupt nation. That has been the history in every country that has had the misfortune to go through a period of inflation.

If ever there was a time to subordinate individual or group
selfishness to the national good, that time is now. In all theatres of
war there are now being prepared offensives which will require everything
we can give in trained manpower, fighting equipment, courage, stamina and
morale. Disunity at home — bickering, self-seeking, partisanship,
stoppages of work, inflation — these are the influences which undermine
the brave men ready to die at the front for us here.

I can assure you that the boys on our fighting fronts who ex-
pect us all here at home to be laying solid bricks for the foundations of
the future are dismayed and disheartened at the spectacle of Americans
throwing those bricks at each other.

All of us who have come in the service, particularly overseas
service, know from the letters we receive that our boys are deeply troubled
by reports that come to them of strikes and political bickering and other
evidences of dissension and disunity and greed here at home. They do not
like to hear of a prevailing attitude of business as usual, politics as
usual, luxury as usual.

Nor is it easy for us to give them real reassurance. We can
only tell them the truth — that many of the conditions which worry them
are due to stupidity rather than to downright disloyalty.
they are outraged by the display of luxury amongst vacationers and
infuriated by the war profiteering.

The fact is that the predatoryhipperts of whom I have spoken
are not deliberately striving to sabotage the national war effort. They
are laboring under the delusion that the time is past when we must make
prodigious sacrifices — that the war is already won and we can begin
to slacken off. But the dangeris fully of that point of view can be
measured by the distance that separates our troops from their ultimate
objectives in Berlin and Tokyo — and by the sum of all the perils that
lie along the way.

In the meantime, over-confidence and complacency are among
our deadliest enemies. Last Spring — after notable victories at
Stalingrad and in Tunisia and against the U-boats on the high seas —
over-confidence became so pronounced that war production fell off. In
two months, June and July, 1943, more than a thousand airplanes that
could have been made and should have been made were not made. Those
who failed to make them were not on strike. They were merely saying,
"The war's in the bag — so let's relax."
That attitude on the part of anyone — Government or management or labor — can lengthen this war. It can kill American boys.

Let us remember the lessons of 1918. In the summer of that year the tide turned in favor of the Allies. But this Government did not relax. In fact, our national effort was stepped up. In August, 1918, the draft age limits were enlarged from 21-31 to 18-45. The President called for "force to the utmost" and his call was heeded.

And in November, only three months later, Germany surrendered.

That is the way to fight and win a war — all-out — and not with half-an-eye on the battlefronts abroad and the other eye-and-a-half on personal, selfish, or political interests here at home.

(Sure would come Project Q58 if you decide to use it).

Partisanship and prejudice have prevented the enactment of legislation which would preserve for our soldiers and sailors and marines the fundamental prerequisite of citizenship — the right to vote. No amount of legalistic argument can blandish this issue in the eyes of these ten million American citizens. They know that the overwhelming majority of them will be deprived of the opportunity to vote, if the voting machinery is left exclusively to the States under existing state laws —
and that there is no likelihood of these laws being changed in time to enable them to vote at the next election. They know that unless a Federal Statute is passed, the next President and the Members of the next Congress are going to be elected without giving the ten million a fair voice in the selection. The Army and Navy have reported that it will be impossible effectively to administer forty-eight different soldier-voting laws. It is the duty of the Congress to remove this unjustifiable discrimination against the men and women in our armed forces — and to do it as quickly as possible.

Our first energies and our first thoughts must be devoted to winning the war. But we should not forget that it was last year that we laid the plans, and determined the strategy, which will this year win important victories in this war. Therefore in this year we must begin to lay the plans and determine the strategy for the winning of a lasting peace and the establishment of an American standard of living higher than ever before known. We cannot be content, no matter how high that standard of living may be in general, if some fraction of our people — whether it be one-third or one-fifth or one-tenth — is ill fed, ill clothed, ill housed, and insecure.

This Republic had its beginning, and grew to its present
strength, under the protection of certain inalienable political rights — among them the right of free speech, of free press, of free worship, of trial by jury, of freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures. They were our rights to life and liberty.

As we grew in size and stature, however, — as our industrial economy expanded — these political rights proved inadequate to assure us equality in the pursuit of happiness. Economic inequalities began to replace the old political tyranny. Through the last century our internal history has been largely an evolution of the economic rights of men in a free economy of private enterprise and initiative.

We have come to a clear realization of the fact that true individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence. "Dictatorship men are not free men". People who are hungry and out of a job are the stuff of which dictatorships are made.

In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all—regardless of station, race or creed.
These are:

The right to a useful and recreative job in the industries, or shops or farms of the nation;

The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;

The right of every business man to flourish in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

The right of every family to a decent home in accordance with American standards of living;

The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

The right of every American to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident and unemployment;

The right to a good education.

All of these rights spell security. And after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward, in the implementation of these rights, to new goals of human happiness and well-being.
America's own rightful place in the world depends in large part upon how fully these and similar rights have been carried into practice for our citizens. For unless there is security at home there cannot be lasting peace in the world.

One of the great American industrialists of our day — a man who has rendered yeoman service to his country in this crisis — recently emphasized the grave dangers of "rightist reaction" in this Nation. All clear-thinking Americans share his concern. Indeed, if reaction should develop here — if history were to repeat itself and we were to return to the so-called "normalcy", national and international, of the 1920's — then it is certain that Nazis and Fascists, even though temporarily defeated on the battlefield, will have won a far-reaching victory in this war.

To implement this economic bill of rights in the future will call upon the best thinking of all our citizens and their representatives here in the halls of the Congress — regardless of party or politics.

There may be disagreements as to details; I am sure there can be none as to objectives. These are the objectives which should engage our attention and time and thought in these desperate days — rather than the whining demands of selfish pressure groups who beseech us to help them to feather their nests while young Americans are dying.
I ask the Congress to explore these problems and to develop a program for meeting them — for it is definitely the responsibility of the Congress so to do. Many of these, in the form of proposed legislation, are already before committees of the Congress. I shall from time to time communicate with the Congress with respect to these and further proposals. In the event that no adequate progressive progress is evolved, I am certain that the nation will be conscious of the fact.

Our fighting men abroad — and their families at home — expect such a program and have the right to insist upon it.

The foreign policy that we have been following — the policy that guided us at Moscow, Cairo and Teheran — is based on the common sense principle which was best expressed by old Ben Franklin: if we don't hang together, we'll all hang separately.

And even in the normal American conflicts of our election year, this is also a good policy to follow at home. We have our political differences, and will always have them, and I for one am glad of it. Having spent most of my life in public service, I have relished an occasional good old-fashioned knock-down-drag-out fight on local political issues.

But — there can be no major issues in this war and in the peace that is to follow between American patriots, — whether Republican or
Democratic, — for their major objectives are the same.

I have often said that there are no two fronts for America in this war. There is only one front. There is one line of unity which extends from the hearts of the people at home to the men of our attacking forces in our farthest outposts. When we speak of our total effort, we speak of the factory and the field and the mine as well as of the battleground — we speak of the soldier and the civilian, of the citizen and his government.

Each and every one of us has a solemn obligation under God to serve this Nation in its most critical hour — to keep this Nation great — to make this Nation greater in a better world.
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TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

This Nation in the past two years has become an active partner in the world's greatest war against human slavery.

We have joined with like-minded people in order to defend ourselves in a world that has been gravely threatened with gangster rule.

But I do not think that any of us Americans can be content with mere survival. Sacrifices that we and our allies are making impose upon us all a sacred obligation to see to it that out of this war we and our children will gain something better than mere survival.

It is our determination to see to it that this war will not be followed by another era which leads to new disaster — that we shall not repeat the tragic errors of ostrich isolationism — that we shall not repeat the excesses of the wild twenties when this Nation went for a joy-ride on a roller coaster which ended in a tragic crash.

When Mr. Hull went to Moscow in October, and when I went to Cairo and Teheran in November, we knew that we were in agreement with our Allies in our common determination to fight and win this war.

But there were many vital questions concerning the future peace, and they were discussed in an atmosphere of complete candor and harmony.
In the last war such discussions, such meetings, did not even begin until the shooting had stopped and the delegates began to assemble at the peace table. There had been no previous opportunities for man-to-man discussions which lead to meetings of minds. The result was a peace which was not a peace.

That was a mistake which we are not repeating in this war.

And right here I want to address a word of two to some suspicious souls who are fearful that Dr. Hull or I have made "commitments" for the future which might pledge this Nation to secret treaties, or to enacting the role of Santa Claus.

To such suspicious souls -- and pious politicians -- I wish to say that Mr. Churchill, and Marshal Stalin, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek are all thoroughly conversant with the provisions of our Constitution. And so is Mr. Hull. And so am I.

Of course we made some commitments. We most certainly committed ourselves to very large and very specific military plans which require the use of all allied forces to bring about the defeat of our enemies at the earliest possible time.

But there were no secret treaties or political or financial commitments.
The one supreme objective for the future, which we discussed for each nation individually, and for all four nations together, can be summed up in one word: Security.

And that means not only physical security which provides safety from attacks by aggressors. It means also economic security, social security, moral security -- in a family of nations.

We know that for the future peace, as for the present war, the interests of Great Britain, and Russia, and China, and the United States, in the broad sense of that term, do not conflict -- they complement each other.

In the plain down-to-earth talks that I had with the Generalissimo and Marshal Stalin, it was abundantly clear that they are most deeply interested in the resumption of peaceful progress by their own peoples -- progress toward a better life. Russia and China want freedom to develop their own resources, build up industry, and reclaim the land as did our own pioneers.

Both nations have emerged, within living memory, from the darkness of ancient tyrannies. Both nations have been struggling to increase education and individual opportunity, and to raise the standards of living of their own peoples.
The peoples of Russia and China have the courage and the skill and the enterprise which will be required for the development of their great countries. They have learned by bitter experience that real development will not be possible if they are to be diverted from their purpose by repeated wars — or even threats of war.

Therefore, China and Russia are truly united with Britain and America in recognition of this essential fact:

The best interests of each nation, large and small, demand that all freedom-loving nations shall join together in a just and durable system of peace. And, in addition to unquestioned military control over any and all thugs, a basic essential of that peace is a decent standard of living for all individuals, men and women and children in all nations. Freedom from fear is eternally linked with freedom from want.

There are people who burrow through our Nation like unseeing moles, and attempt to spread the suspicion that if other nations are encouraged to raise their standards of living, our own American standard of living must of necessity be depressed.

The fact is the very contrary. It has been shown time and again that if the standard of living of any country goes up, so does its
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purchasing power — and that such a rise encourages a better standard
of living in neighboring countries with whom it trades. That is just
plain common sense — and it is the kind of plain common sense that pro-
vided the basis for our discussions at Moscow, Cairo and Teheran.

Returning from my journeyings, the same sense of "let-down,"
of disappointment, almost of shame, that everyone feels who leaves the
battleront and returns to Washington.

Within the last few months there have descended upon the
Nation's Capital City hordes of predatory animals in more or less
human form. They are promoters, lobbyists, high pressure boys, profit
grabbers — augmented by those quadrupedal political foxes who "lay low
and say nothin'" in times of real national crisis but who become very
active in each campaign year. All of them are now swarming through
the corridors of the Congress and all the cocktail bars of Washington.
Their sole intent is plunder.

They are obsessed with only one interest — their own interest.

Their last and their least concern is their Nation's interest. They
have come to look upon the war primarily as a chance to make profits
for themselves at the expense of their neighbors — profits in money
or in terms of political or social advancement.
What are they after? They want to do away with price ceilings and inflation-controls and renegotiation of contracts — all of which place proper wartime limits on prices and profits; they are looking for higher food prices and higher oil and coal prices, and for higher wages for particular groups; they seek to prevent taxation designed to tax high war profits — industrial and corporate; they want to abolish rationing and the fair distribution of goods among our citizens, they are urging strikes aimed at the very heart of a nation at war. And above all, in the grave crisis which faces our Nation, they seek to make political capital in this election year out of every incident in our national life, even at the risk of dividing us from our Allies and prolonging the war.

Whenever crisis has come to the American people they have been able and willing to forget individual and selfish and partisan interest and to unite in a national unity of purpose and direction. They have learned time and again how interdependent upon each other are all groups and sections of the population of America. Increased food costs, for example, will bring new demands for wage increases from all war workers, which will in turn raise all prices of all things including those things which the farmers themselves have to buy. Increased wages
or prices will each in turn produce the same results. They all
have a particularly disastrous result on all fixed income groups.

And I hope you will remember that all of us in this Government
represent the fixed income group just as much as we represent business
owners, workers and farmers. This group of fixed-income people includes:
teachers, clergy, clerks, employees in small stores, workers in hospitals,
policemen, firemen, stenographers, domestic servants, widows and minors on
fixed incomes, wives and dependents of our soldiers and sailors, and old
age pensioners. They and their families add up to nearly a third of our
one hundred and thirty million people. They have few or no high pressure
representatives at the Capital. In a period of gross inflation they would
be the worst sufferers in a generally bankrupt nation.

If ever there was a time to subordinate individual or group
selfishness to the national good, that time is now. Disunity at
home -- bickering, self-seeking partieship, stoppages of work, inflation,
business as usual, politics as usual, luxury as usual -- these are
the influences which can undermine the morale of the brave men ready
to die at the front for us here.
The predatory bipeds of whom I have spoken are not deliberately striving to sabotage the national war effort. They are laboring under the delusion that the time is past when we must make prodigious sacrifices — that the war is already won and we can begin to wind it up. But the dangerous folly of that point of view can be measured by the distance that separates our troops from their ultimate objectives in Berlin and Tokyo — and by the sum of all the perils that lie along the way.

Over-confidence and complacency are among our deadliest enemies. Last spring — after notable victories at Stalingrad and in Tunisia and against the U-boats on the high seas — over-confidence became so pronounced that war production fell off. In two months, June and July, 1943, more than a thousand airplanes that could have been made and should have been made were not made. Those who failed to make them were not on strike. They were merely saying, "The war's in the bag — so let's relax."

That attitude on the part of anyone — Government or management or labor — can lengthen this war. It can kill American boys.

Let us remember the lessons of 1918. In the summer of that year the tide turned in favor of the Allies. But this Government did
not relax. In fact, our national effort was stepped up. In August, 1918, the draft age limits were enlarged from 21-31 to 18-45. The President called for "force to the utmost" and his call was heeded.

And in November, only three months later, Germany surrendered.

That is the way to fight and win a war — all-out — and not with half-an-eye on the battlefronts abroad and the other eye-and-a-half on personal, selfish, or political interests here at home.

(Here would come Project Q39 if you decide to use it).

Partisanship and prejudice have prevented the enactment of legislation which would preserve for our soldiers and sailors and marines the fundamental prerogative of citizenship — the right to vote. No amount of legalistic argument can cloud this issue in the eyes of these ten million American citizens. Surely the signers of the Constitution did not intend a document which even in wartime would be construed to take away the franchise of any of those who are fighting to preserve the Constitution itself.

Our soldiers and sailors and marines know that the overwhelming majority of them will be deprived of the opportunity to vote, if the voting machinery is left exclusively to the States under existing state laws — and that there is no likelihood of these laws being changed in time to enable them to vote at the next election. The Army and Navy
have reported that it will be impossible effectively to administer
forty-eight different soldier-voting laws. It is the duty of the Congress
to remove this unjustifiable discrimination against the men and women in
our armed forces — and to do it as quickly as possible.

We must begin to lay the plans and determine the strategy for
the winning of a lasting peace and the establishment of an American
standard of living higher than ever before known. We cannot be content,
no matter how high that standard of living may be in general, if some
fraction of our people — whether it be one-third or one-fifth or one-tenth —
is ill fed, ill clothed, ill housed, and insecure.

This Republic had its beginning, and grew to its present
strength, under the protection of certain inalienable political rights —
among them the right of free speech, of free press, of free worship, of
trial by jury, of freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures. They
were our rights to life and liberty.

As we have grown in size and stature, however, — as our indus-
trial economy expanded — these political rights proved inadequate to
assure us equality in the pursuit of happiness.

We have come to a clear realization of the fact that true
individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence.

"Necesitous men are not free men." People who are hungry and out of a
job are the stuff of which dictatorships are made.
In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all -- regardless of station, race or creed.

Among these are:

The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries, shops or farms or mines of the nation;

The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

The right of every farmor to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;

The right of every business man to flourish in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

The right of every family to a decent home in accordance with American standards of living;

The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

The right of every American to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident and unemployment;
The right to a good education.

All of these rights spell security. And after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward, in the implementation of these rights, to new goals of human happiness and well-being.

America's own rightful place in the world depends in large part upon how fully these and similar rights have been carried into practice for our citizens. For unless there is security here at home there cannot be lasting peace in the world.

One of the great American industrialists of our day -- a man who has rendered yeoman service to his country in this crisis -- recently emphasized the grave dangers of "rightist reaction" in this Nation. All clear-thinking business men share his concern. Indeed, if such reaction should develop -- if history were to repeat itself and we were to return to the so-called "normalcy" of the 1920's -- then it is certain that even though we have conquered our enemies on the battlefields abroad, we shall have yielded to the spirit of fascism here at home.
I ask the Congress to explore the means for implementing this economic bill of rights — for it is definitely the responsibility of the Congress so to do. Many of these problems are already before committees of the Congress in the form of proposed legislation. I shall from time to time communicate with the Congress with respect to these and further proposals. In the event that no adequate progressive program is evolved, I am certain that the Nation will be conscious of the fact.

Our fighting men abroad — and their families at home — expect such a program and have the right to insist upon it. It is to their demands that this government should pay heed rather than to the whining demands of selfish pressure groups who seek to feather their nests while your Americans are dying.

The foreign policy that we have been following — the policy that guided us at Moscow, Cairo and Tehran — is based on the common sense principle which was best expressed by old Ben Franklin: if we don’t hang together, we’ll all hang separately.

And even in the normal American conflicts of our election year, this is also a good policy to follow at home. We have our political differences, and will always have them, and I for one am glad of it.
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Having spent most of my life in public service, I have relished an occasional good old-fashioned knock-down-drag-out fight on local political issues.

But there can be no major issues concerning this war and the peace that is to follow, between American patriots, — whether Republican or Democratic, — for their major objectives are the same.

I have often said that there are no two fronts for America in this war. There is only one front. There is one line of unity which extends from the hearts of the people at home to the men of our attacking forces in our farthest outposts. When we speak of our total effort, we speak of the factory and the field and the mine as well as of the battleground — we speak of the soldier and the civilian, of the citizen and his government.

Each and every one of us has a solemn obligation under God to serve this Nation in its most critical hour — to keep this Nation great — to make this Nation greater in a better world.
TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

This Nation in the past two years has become an active partner in the world's greatest war against human slavery.

We have joined with like-minded people in order to defend ourselves in a world that has been gravely threatened with gangster rule.

But I do not think that any of us Americans can be content with mere survival. Sacrifices that we and our Allies are making impose upon us all a sacred obligation to see to it that out of this war we and our children will gain something better than mere survival.

We are united in determination that this war shall not be followed by another interlude which leads to new disaster -- that we shall not repeat the tragic errors of ostrich isolationism -- that we shall not repeat the excesses of the wild twenties when this Nation went for a joy-ride on a roller coaster which ended in a tragic crash.

When Mr. Hull went to Moscow in October, and when I went to Cairo and Teheran in November, we knew that we were in agreement with our Allies in our common determination to fight and win this war. But there were many vital questions concerning the future peace, and they were discussed in an atmosphere of complete candor and harmony.
In the last war such discussions, such meetings, did not even begin until the shooting had stopped and the delegates began to assemble at the peace table. There had been no previous opportunities for man-to-man discussions which lead to meetings of minds. The result was a peace which was not a peace.

That was a mistake which we are not repeating in this war.

And right here I want to address a word or two to some suspicious souls who are fearful that Mr. Hull or I have made "commitments" for the future which might pledge this Nation to secret treaties, or to enacting the role of Santa Claus.

To such suspicious souls -- using a polite terminology -- I wish to say that Mr. Churchill, and Marshal Stalin, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek are all thoroughly conversant with the provisions of our Constitution. And so is Mr. Hull. And so am I.

Of course we made some commitments. We most certainly committed ourselves to very large and very specific military plans which require the use of all allied forces to bring about the defeat of our enemies at the earliest possible time.

But there were no secret treaties or political or financial commitments.
The one supreme objective for the future, which we discussed for each nation individually, and for all the United Nations, can be summed up in one word: Security.

And that means not only physical security which provides safety from attacks by aggressors. It means also economic security, social security, moral security — in a family of nations.

In the plain down-to-earth talks that I had with the Generalissimo and Marshal Stalin and Prime Minister Churchill, it was abundantly clear that they are all most deeply interested in the resumption of peaceful progress by their own peoples — progress toward a better life. All our Allies want freedom to develop their lands and resources, build up industry, increase education and individual opportunity, and raise standards of living.

All our Allies have learned by bitter experience that real development will not be possible if they are to be diverted from their purpose by repeated wars — or even threats of war.

China and Russia are truly united with Britain and America in recognition of this essential fact:
The best interests of each nation, large and small, demand that all freedom-loving nations shall join together in a just and durable system of peace. In the present world situation, evidenced by the actions of Germany, Italy and Japan, unquestioned military control over disturbers of the peace is as necessary among nations as it is among citizens in a community. And an equally basic essential to peace is a decent standard of living for all individual men and women and children in all nations. Freedom from fear is eternally linked with freedom from want.

There are people who burrow through our Nation like unseeing moles, and attempt to spread the suspicion that if other nations are encouraged to raise their standards of living, our own American standard of living must of necessity be depressed.

The fact is the very contrary. It has been shown time and again that if the standard of living of any country goes up, so does its purchasing power -- and that such a rise encourages a better standard of living in neighboring countries with whom it trades. That is just plain common sense -- and it is the kind of plain common sense that provided the basis for our discussions at Moscow, Cairo and Teheran.
Returning from my journeyings, I must confess to a sense of "let-down" when I found many evidences of faulty perspectives here in Washington. The faulty perspective consists in over-emphasizing lesser problems and thereby under-emphasizing the first and greatest problem.

The overwhelming majority of our people have met the demands of this war with magnificent courage and understanding. They have accepted inconveniences; they have accepted hardships; they have accepted tragic sacrifices. And they are ready and eager to make whatever further contributions are needed to win the war as quickly as possible — if only they are given the chance to know what is required of them.

However, while the majority goes on about its great work without complaint, a noisy minority maintains an uproar of demands for special favors for special groups. There are pests who swarm through the lobbies of the Congress and the cocktail bars of Washington, representing these special groups as opposed to the basic interests of the nation as a whole. They have come to look upon the war primarily as a chance to make profits for themselves at the expense of their neighbors — profits in money or in terms of political or social preferment.
Such selfish agitation can be highly dangerous in wartime. It creates confusion. It damages morale. It hampers our national effort. It muddies the waters and therefore prolongs the war.

If we analyze American history impartially, we cannot escape the fact that in our past we have not always forgotten individual and selfish and partisan interests in time of war -- we have not always been united in purpose and direction. We cannot overlook the serious dissensions and the lack of unity in our war of the Revolution, in our War of 1812, or in our War between the States, when the survival of the Union itself was at stake.

In the first World War we came closer to national unity than in any previous war. But that war lasted only a year and a half, and increasing signs of disunity began to appear during the final months of the conflict.

In this war, we have been compelled to learn how interdependent upon each other are all groups and sections of the population of America.
Increased food costs, for example, will bring new
demands for wage increases from all war workers, which will in
turn raise all prices of all things including those things which
the farmers themselves have to buy. Increased wages or prices
will each in turn produce the same results. They all have a
particularly disastrous result on all fixed income groups.

And I hope you will remember that all of us in this
Government represent the fixed income group, just as much as we
represent business owners, workers and farmers. This group of
fixed-income people include: teachers, clergy, policemen, firemen,
widows and minors on fixed incomes, wives and dependents of our
soldiers and sailors, and old age pensioners. They and their
families add up to one quarter of our one hundred and thirty
million people. They have few or no high pressure representatives
at the Capitol. In a period of gross inflation they would be
the worst sufferers.
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If ever there was a time to subordinate individual or group selfishness to the national good, that time is now. Disunity at home -- bickerings, self-seeking partisanship, stoppages of work, inflation, business as usual, politics as usual, luxury as usual -- these are the influences which can undermine the morale of the brave men ready to die at the front for us here.

Those who are doing most of the complaining are not deliberately striving to sabotage the national war effort. They are laboring under the delusion that the time is past when we must make prodigious sacrifices -- that the war is already won and we can begin to slacken off. But the dangerous folly of that point of view can be measured by the distance that separates our troops from their ultimate objectives in Berlin and Tokyo -- and by the sum of all the perils that lie along the way.

Over-confidence and complacency are among our deadliest enemies. Last Spring -- after notable victories at Stalingrad and in Tunisia and against the U-boats on the high seas -- over-confidence became so pronounced that war production fell off.

In two months, June and July, 1943, more than a thousand airplanes that could have been made and should have been made were not made. Those who failed to make them were not on strike. They were merely saying, "The war's in the bag -- so let's relax."
That attitude on the party of anyone -- Government or management or labor -- can lengthen this war. It can kill American boys.

Let us remember the lessons of 1918. In the Summer of that year the tide turned in favor of the Allies. But this Government did not relax. In fact, our national effort was stepped up. In August, 1918, the draft age limits were broadened from 21-31 to 18-45. The President called for "force to the utmost", and his call was heeded. And in November, only three months later, Germany surrendered.

That is the way to fight and win a war -- all out -- and not with half-an-eye on the battlefronts abroad and the other eye-and-a-half on personal, selfish, or political interests here at home.

Therefore, in order to concentrate all our energies and resources on winning the war, and to maintain a fair and stable economy at home, I recommend that the Congress adopt:

(1) A realistic tax law -- which will tax all unreasonable profits, both individual and corporate, and reduce the ultimate cost of the war to our sons and daughters. The tax bill now under consideration by the Congress does not begin to meet this test.
(2) A continuation of the law for the renegotiation of war contracts -- which will prevent exorbitant profits and assure fair prices to the Government. For two long years I have pleaded with the Congress to take undue profits out of war.

(3) A cost of food law -- which will enable the Government
(a) to place a reasonable floor under the prices the farmer may expect for his production; and (b) to place a ceiling on the prices a consumer will have to pay for the food he buys. This should apply to necessities only; and will require public funds to carry out. It will cost in appropriations about one per cent of the present annual cost of the war.

(4) Early reenactment of the stabilization statute of October 1942. This expires June 30th, 1944, and if it is not extended well in advance, the country might just as well expect price chaos by summer.

We cannot have stabilization by wishful thinking. We must take positive action to maintain the integrity of the American dollar.
(5) A national service law -- which, for the duration of the war, will prevent strikes, and, with certain appropriate exceptions, will make available for war production or for any other essential services every able-bodied adult in this nation.

These five measures together form a just and equitable whole. I would not recommend a national service law unless the other laws were passed to keep down the cost of living, to share equitably the burdens of taxation, to hold the stabilization line, and to prevent undue profits.

The Federal Government already has the basic power to draft capital and property of all kinds for war purposes on a basis of just compensation.

As you know, I have for three years hesitated to recommend a national service act. Today, however, I am convinced of its necessity. Although I believe that we and our Allies can win the war without such a measure, I am certain that nothing less than total mobilization of all our resources of manpower and capital will guarantee an earlier victory, and reduce the toll of suffering and sorrow and blood.
I have received a joint recommendation for this law from the heads of the War Department, the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission. These are the men who bear responsibility for the procurement of the necessary arms and equipment, and for the successful prosecution of the war in the field. They say:

"When the very life of the nation is in peril the responsibility for service is common to all men and women. In such a time there can be no discrimination between the men and women who are assigned by the Government to its defense at the battlefront and the men and women assigned to producing the vital materials essential to successful military operations. A prompt enactment of a National Service Law would be merely an expression of the universality of this responsibility."

I believe the country will agree that those statements are the solemn truth.
National service is the most democratic way to wage a war. Like selective service for the armed forces, it rests on the obligation of each citizen to serve his nation to his utmost where he is best qualified.

It does not mean reduction in wages. It does not mean loss of retirement and seniority rights and benefits. It does not mean that any substantial numbers of war workers will be disturbed in their present jobs. Let these facts be wholly clear.

Experience in other democratic nations at war — Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand — has shown that the very existence of national service makes unnecessary the widespread use of compulsory power. National service has proven to be a unifying moral force — based on an equal and comprehensive legal obligation of all people in a nation at war.

There are millions of American men and women who are not in this war at all. It is not because they do not want to be in it. But they want to know where they can best do their share. National service provides that direction. It will be a means by which every man and woman can find that inner satisfaction which comes from making the fullest possible contribution to victory.
I know that all civilian war workers will be glad

to be able to say many years hence to their grandchildren: "Yes,
I, too, was in service in the great war. I was on duty in an
airplane factory, and I helped make hundreds of fighting planes.
The Government told me that in doing that I was performing my
most useful work in the service of my country."

It is argued that we have passed the stage in the
war where national service is necessary. But our soldiers and
sailors know that this is not true. We are going forward on a
long, rough road — and, in all journeys, the last miles are the
hardest. And it is for that final effort — for the total defeat
of our enemies — that we must mobilize our total resources.
The national war program calls for the employment of more people
in 1944 than in 1943.

It is my conviction that the American people will
welcome this win-the-war measure which is based on the eternally
just principle of "fair for one, fair for all."

It will give our people at home the assurance that
they are standing four-square behind our soldiers and sailors.
And it will give our enemies demoralizing assurance that we mean
business — that we, 155,000,000 Americans, are on the march to
Rome, Berlin and Tokyo.
I hope that the Congress will recognize that, although this is a political year, national service is an issue which transcends politics. Great power must be used for great purposes.

As to the machinery for this measure, the Congress itself should determine its nature — but it should be wholly non-partisan in its make-up.

Our armed forces are valiantly fulfilling their responsibilities to our country and our people. Now the Congress faces the responsibility for taking those measures which are essential to national security in this the most decisive phase of the nation's greatest war.

Several alleged reasons have prevented the enactment of legislation which would preserve for our soldiers and sailors and marines the fundamental prerogative of citizenship — the right to vote. No amount of legalistic argument can cloud this issue in the eyes of these ten million American citizens. Surely the signers of the Constitution did not intend a document which, even in wartime, would be construed to take away the franchise of any of those who are fighting to preserve the Constitution itself.
Our soldiers and sailors and marines know that the overwhelming majority of them will be deprived of the opportunity to vote, if the voting machinery is left exclusively to the States under existing state laws -- and that there is no likelihood of these laws being changed in time to enable them to vote at the next election. The Army and Navy have reported that it will be impossible effectively to administer forty-eight different soldier-voting laws. It is the duty of the Congress to remove this unjustifiable discrimination against the men and women in our armed forces -- and to do it as quickly as possible.

It is our duty now to begin to lay the plans and determine the strategy for the winning of a lasting peace and the establishment of an American standard of living higher than ever before known. We cannot be content, no matter how high that general standard of living may be, if some fraction of our people -- whether it be one-third or one-fifth or one-tenth -- is ill-fed, ill clothed, ill housed, and insecure.

This Republic had its beginning, and grew to its present strength, under the protection of certain inalienable political rights — among them the right of free speech, free
press, free worship, trial by jury, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures. They were our rights to life and liberty.

As our nation has grown in size and stature, however -- as our industrial economy expanded -- these political rights proved inadequate to assure us equality in the pursuit of happiness.

We have come to a clear realization of the fact that true individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence. "Necessitous men are not free men." People who are hungry and out of a job are the stuff of which dictatorships are made.

In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all -- regardless of station, race or creed.

Among them are:

The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries, or shops or farms or mines of the nation;

The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;
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The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;

The right of every business man, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

The right of every family to a decent home;

The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident and unemployment;

The right to a good education.

All of these rights spell security. And after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward, in the implementation of these rights, to new goals of human happiness and well-being.

America's own rightful place in the world depends in large part upon how fully these and similar rights have been carried into practice for our citizens. For unless there is security here at home there cannot be lasting peace in the world.
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One of the great American industrialists of our day — a man who has rendered yeoman service to his country in this crisis — recently emphasized the grave dangers of "rightist reaction" in this Nation. All clear-thinking business men share his concern. Indeed, if such reaction should develop -- if history were to repeat itself and we were to return to the so-called "normalcy" of the 1920's -- then it is certain that even though we shall have conquered our enemies on the battlefields abroad, we shall have yielded to the spirit of fascism here at home.

I ask the Congress to explore the means for implementing this economic bill of rights -- for it is definitely the responsibility of the Congress so to do. Many of these problems are already before committees of the Congress in the form of proposed legislation. I shall from time to time communicate with the Congress with respect to these and further proposals. In the event that no adequate program of progress is evolved, I am certain that the Nation will be conscious of the fact.

Our fighting men abroad — and their families at home — expect such a program and have the right to insist upon it. It is to their demands that this Government should pay heed rather than to the whining demands of selfish pressure groups who seek to feather their nests while young Americans are dying.
The foreign policy that we have been following -- the policy that guided us at Moscow, Cairo and Teheran -- is based on the common sense principle which was best expressed by Benjamin Franklin on July 4, 1776: "We must all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately."

I have often said that there are no two fronts for America in this war. There is only one front. There is one line of unity which extends from the hearts of the people at home to the men of our attacking forces in our farthest outposts. When we speak of our total effort, we speak of the factory and of the field and the mine as well as, the battleground -- we speak of the soldier and the civilian, the citizen and his Government.

Each and every one of us has a solemn obligation under God to serve this Nation in its most critical hour -- to keep this Nation great -- to make this Nation greater in a better world.
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