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

Series 3: “The Four Freedoms” and FDR in World War II

File No. 1544

1944 October 21

Address to the Foreign Policy Association

SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT
FOREIGN POLICY DINNER
WALDORF ASTORIA
OCTOBER 21, 1944.

Tonight I am speaking as a guest of the Foreign Policy Association -- a distinguished organization composed of Americans of all shades of political opinion.

I am going to talk about our American foreign policy.

I am talking without rancor or snap judgment.

I am speaking without losing my temper or losing my head.

When the first World War was ended, I believed -- I believe now -- that enduring peace in the world has not a chance unless this nation is willing to cooperate in winning it and maintaining it. I thought then -- I know now -- that we have to back our words with deeds.

A quarter of a century ago we helped to save our freedom but we failed to organize the kind of world in which future generations could live in freedom. Opportunity knocks again. There is no guarantee that it will knock a third time.

Today, Hitler and the Nazis continue the fight -- desperately, inch by inch, and may continue to do so all the way to Berlin.

And we have another important engagement in Tokyo. No matter how long or hard the road we must travel, our forces will fight their way there under the leadership of MacArthur and Nimitz.

All of our thinking about foreign policy in this war must be conditioned by the fact that millions of our American boys are today fighting, many thousands of miles from home, for the defense of our country and the perpetuation of our American ideals. And there are still many hard and bitter battles to be fought.

The leaders of this nation have always held that concern for our national security does not end at our borders. President Monroe and every American President following him were prepared to use force, if necessary, to assure the independence of other American nations threatened by aggressors from across the seas.

The principle has not changed, though the world has. Wars are no longer fought from horseback, or from the decks of sailing ships.

It was with recognition of that fact that in 1933 we took, as the basis for our foreign relations, the Good Neighbor policy -- the principle of the neighbor who, resolutely respecting himself, equally respects the rights of others.

We and the other American republics have made the Good Neighbor policy real in this hemisphere. It is my conviction that this policy can be, and should be, made universal.

At inter-American conferences, beginning at Montevideo in 1933, and continuing down to date, we have made it clear to this hemisphere that we practice what we preach.

Our action in 1934 with respect to Philippine independence was another step in making good the same philosophy which animated the Good Neighbor policy.

As I said two years ago: "I like to think that the history of the Philippine Islands in the last forty-four years provides in a very real sense a pattern for the future of other small nations and peoples of the world. It is a pattern of what men of good will look forward to in the future".

I cite another early action in the field of foreign policy of which I am proud. That was the recognition in 1933 of Soviet Russia.

For sixteen years before then the American people and the Russian people had no practical means of communicating with each other. We re-established those means. And today we are fighting with the Russians against common foes -- and we know that the Russian contribution to victory has been, and will continue to be, gigantic.

However, certain politicians, now very prominent in the Republican Party, have condemned our recognition.

I am impelled to wonder how Russia would have survived against German attack if these same people had had their way.

After the last war -- in the political campaign of 1920 -- the isolationist Old Guard professed to be enthusiastic about international cooperation.

While campaigning for votes in 1920, Senator Harding said that he favored with all his heart an Association of Nations "so organized and so participated in as to make the actual attainment of peace a reasonable possibility".

However, after President Harding's election, the Association of Nations was never heard of again.

One of the leading isolationists who killed international cooperation in 1920 was Senator Hiram Johnson. In the event of Republican victory in the Senate this year -- 1944 -- that same Senator Johnson would be Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I know the American voters will bear that in mind.

During the years which followed 1920, the foreign policy of the Republican Administrations was dominated by the heavy hand of isolationism.

Much of the strength of our Navy was scuttled; -- and some of the Navy's resources were handed over to friends in private industry -- as in the unforgettable case of Teapot Dome.

Tariff walls went higher and higher -- blocking international trade.

There was snarling at our former Allies and at the same time encouragement was given to American finance to invest two and one-half billion dollars in Germany, our former enemy.

All petitions that this nation join in the World Court were rejected or ignored.

After this Administration took office, Secretary Hull and I replaced high tariffs with a series of reciprocal trade agreements under a statute of the Congress. The Republicans opposed these agreements -- and tried to stop the extension of the law every three years.

In 1935 I asked the Congress to join the World Court. The Democrats in the Senate voted for it forty-three to twenty. The Republicans voted against it fourteen to nine. Thus we were prevented from obtaining the necessary two-thirds majority.

935

In 1937 I asked that aggressor nations be quarantined -- and for this I was branded by isolationists in and out of public office as an "alarmist" and "war-monger."

From that time on, as you well know, I made clear by repeated messages to the American Congress and by repeated statements to the American people the danger threatening from abroad -- and the need of rearming to meet it.

In July, 1939, I tried to obtain a repeal of the Arms Embargo provisions in the Neutrality Law which tied our hands against selling arms to the European democracies for defense against Hitler.

The late Senator Borah told a group, which I called together in the White House, that his own private information from abroad was better than that of the State Department -- and that there would be no war in Europe.

And it was made plain to Mr. Hull and me that, because of the isolationist vote, we could not possibly hope to attain the desired revision of the Neutrality Law.

This fact was also made plain to Adolf Hitler. A few weeks later he brutally attacked Poland -- and the second World War had begun.

In 1941, this Administration proposed and the Congress passed, in spite of isolationist opposition, the Lend-Lease Law -- a practical and dramatic notice to the world that we intended to help those nations resisting aggression.

These days -- and I am now speaking of October, 1944 -- I hear voices on the air attacking me for my "failure" to prepare this nation for this war and to warn the American people of the approaching tragedy.

These same voices were not so very audible five years ago -- or even four years ago -- giving warning of the grave peril which we then faced.

9.40

There have been, and there still are, in the Republican Party distinguished men and women of vision and courage, both in and out of public office, who have vigorously supported our aid to our Allies and all the measures that we took to build up our national defense. And many of these Republicans have rendered magnificent services to our country in this war as members of this Administration. I am happy that one of these distinguished Americans is sitting here at this table tonight -- our great Secretary of War -- Henry Stimson.

Let us remember that this very war might have been averted if Mr. Stimson's views had prevailed when, in 1931, the Japanese ruthlessly attacked Manchuria.

The majority of the Republican members of the Congress voted against the Selective Service Law in 1940; they voted against repeal of the Arms Embargo in 1939; they voted against the Lend-Lease Law in 1941 and they voted in August, 1941, against extension of Selective Service -- which meant ^{voting} against keeping our army together -- four months before Pearl Harbor.

I am quoting history to you. I am going by the record. And I am giving you the whole story and not merely a phrase here and half a phrase there picked out of context in such a way that they distort the facts.

I happen to believe that, even in a political campaign, we should all obey that ancient injunction -- Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

The question of the men who will formulate and carry out the foreign policy of this country is in issue in this election -- very much in issue. It is in issue not in terms of partisan application, but in terms of sober, solemn facts -- the facts that are on the record.

If the Republicans were to win control of the Congress in this election, inveterate isolationists would occupy positions of commanding influence and power.

I have already spoken of the ranking Republican member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Hiram Johnson.

One of the most influential members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee -- a man who would also be the chairman of the powerful Senate Committee on Appropriations -- is Senator Gerald P. Nye.

In the House of Representatives, the man who is the present leader of the Republicans there, and who undoubtedly would be Speaker, is Joseph W. Martin. He voted against the Repeal of the Arms Embargo, against the Lend-Lease Bill, against the extension of the Selective Service law, against the arming of merchant ships, and against the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and their extensions.

The Chairman of the powerful Committee on Rules would be none other than Hamilton Fish.

There are many others like them in the Congress of the United States -- and every one of them is now actively campaigning for the national Republican ticket this year.

Can anyone really suppose that these isolationists have changed their minds about world affairs? Politicians who embraced the policy of isolationism -- or who never raised their voices against it in our days of peril -- are not reliable custodians of the future of America.

There have been Democrats in the isolationist camp but they have been few and far between, and they have not attained positions of leadership.

And I am proud of the fact that this Administration does not have the support of the isolationist press -- and I mean specifically the McCormick-Patterson-Hearst-Gannett press.

The American people have gone through great national debates in the recent critical years. They were soul-searching debates. They reached from every city to every village and to every home.

9.45

We debated our principles and our determination to aid those fighting for freedom.

Obviously, we could have come to terms with Hitler, and accepted a minor role in his totalitarian world. We rejected that!

We could have compromised with Japan, and bargained for a place in a Japanese-dominated Asia by selling out the heart's blood of the Chinese people. And we rejected that!

The decision not to bargain with the tyrants rose from the hearts and souls and sinews of the American people. They faced reality; they appraised reality; and they knew what freedom meant.

The power which this nation has attained -- the moral, the political, the economic and the military power -- has brought to us the responsibility, and with it the opportunity, for leadership in the community of nations. In our own best interest, and in the name of peace and humanity, this nation cannot, must not, and will not shirk that responsibility.

There are some who hope to see a structure of peace, completely set up immediately, with all the apartments assigned to everyone's satisfaction, with the telephones in, the plumbing complete, the heating system and the electric ice boxes functioning perfectly, all furnished with linen and silver -- and with the rent pre-paid.

The United Nations have not yet produced such a comfortable dwelling place. But we have achieved a very practical expression of a common purpose on the part of four great nations, who are now united to wage this war, that they will embark together after the war on a greater and more difficult enterprise -- that of waging peace. We will embark on it with all the peace-loving nations of the world -- large and small.

Our objective, as I stated ten days ago, is to complete the organization of the United Nations without delay and before hostilities actually cease.

Peace, like war, can succeed only where there is a will to enforce it, and where there is available power to enforce it.

The Council of the United Nations must have the power to act quickly and decisively to keep the peace by force, if necessary. A policeman would not be a very effective policeman if, when he saw a felon break into a house, he had to go to the Town Hall and call a town meeting to issue a warrant before the felon could be arrested.

It is clear that, if the world organization is to have any reality at all, our representative must be endowed in advance by the people themselves, by constitutional means through their representatives in the Congress, with authority to act.

If we do not catch the international felon when we have our hands on him, if we let him get away with his loot because the Town Council has not passed an ordinance authorizing his arrest, then we are not doing our share to prevent another World War.

The people of the Nation want their Government to act, and not merely to talk, whenever and wherever there is a threat to world peace.

We cannot attain our great objectives by ourselves. Never again, after cooperating with other nations in a world war to save our way of life, can we wash our hands of maintaining the peace for which we fought.

The Dumbarton Oaks Conference did not spring up overnight. It was called by Secretary Hull and me after years of thought, discussion, preparation and consultation with our Allies. Our State Department did a splendid job in preparing for the Conference and leading it to a successful termination. It was another chapter in the long process of cooperation with other peace-loving nations — beginning with the Atlantic Charter Conference, and continuing through Conferences at Casablanca, Moscow, Cairo, Teheran, Quebec and Washington.

950

It is my profound conviction that the American people as a whole have a very real understanding of these things.

The American people know that Cordell Hull and I are thoroughly conversant with the Constitution of the United States and know that we cannot commit this Nation to any secret treaties or any secret guarantees which are in violation of that Constitution.

After my return from Teheran, I stated officially that no secret commitments had been made. The issue then is between my veracity and the continuing assertions of those who have no responsibility in the foreign field -- or, perhaps I should say, a field foreign to them.

The peace structure which we are building must depend on foundations that go deep into the soil of men's faith and men's hearts -- otherwise it is worthless. Only the unflagging will of men can preserve it.

No President of the United States can make the American contribution to preserve the peace without the constant, alert and conscious collaboration of the American people.

Only the determination of the people to use the machinery gives worth to the machinery.

We believe that the American people have already made up their minds on this great issue; and this administration has been able to press forward confidently with its plans.

The very fact that we are now at work on the organization of the peace proves that the great nations are committed to trust in each other. Put this proposition any way you will, it is bound to come out the same way: we either work with the other great nations, or we might some day have to fight them.

The kind of world order which we the peace-loving nations must achieve, must depend essentially on friendly human relations, on acquaintance, on tolerance, on unassailable sincerity and good will and good faith. We have achieved that relationship to a remarkable degree in our dealings with our Allies in this war -- as the events of the war have proved.

It is a new thing in human history for Allies to work together, as we have done -- so closely, so harmoniously and effectively in the fighting of a war, and -- at the same time -- in the building of the peace.

If we fail to maintain that relationship in the peace -- if we fail to expand it and strengthen it -- then there will be no lasting peace.

As for Germany, that tragic nation which has sown the wind and is now reaping the whirlwind -- we and our Allies are entirely agreed that we shall not bargain with the Nazi conspirators, or leave them a shred of control -- open or secret -- of the instruments of government.

We shall not leave them a single element of military power -- or of potential military power.

But I should be false to the very foundations of my religious and political convictions, if I should ever relinquish the hope -- and even the faith -- that in all peoples, without exception, there live some instinct for truth, some attraction toward justice, and some passion for peace -- buried as they may be in the German case under a brutal regime.

We bring no charge against the German race, as such, for we cannot believe that God has eternally condemned any race of humanity. For we know in our own land how many good men and women of German ancestry have proved loyal, freedom-loving, peace-loving citizens.

There is going to be stern punishment for all those in Germany directly responsible for this agony of mankind.

The German people are not going to be enslaved -- because the United Nations do not traffic in human slavery. But it will be necessary for them to earn their way back into the fellowship of peace-loving and law-abiding nations. And, in their climb up that steep road, we shall certainly see to it that they are not encumbered

g.s.b.

by having to carry guns. They will be relieved of that burden -- we hope, forever.

The task ahead of us will not be easy. Indeed it will be as difficult and complex as any task which has ever faced an American administration.

I will not say to you now, or ever, that we of my party know all the answers. I am certain, for myself, that I do not know how all the unforeseeable difficulties can be met. What I can say to you is this -- that I have unlimited faith that the job can be done. And that faith is based on knowledge gained in the arduous, practical and continuing experience of these past eventful years.

I speak to the present generation of Americans with reverent participation in its sorrows and in its hopes. No generation has undergone a greater test, or has met that test with greater heroism and greater wisdom, and no generation has had a more exalted mission.

For this generation must act not only for itself, but as a trustee for all those who fell in the last war -- a part of their mission unfulfilled.

It must act also for all who have paid the supreme price in this war -- lest their mission, too, be betrayed.

And finally it must act for the generations to come -- which must be granted a heritage of peace.

I do not exaggerate that mission. We are not fighting for, and we shall not achieve, Utopia. Indeed, in our own land, the work to be done is never finished. We have yet to realize the full and equal enjoyment of our freedom. So, in embarking on the building of a world fellowship, we have set ourselves to a long and arduous task, which will challenge our patience, our intelligence, our imagination, as well as our faith.

That task requires the judgment of a seasoned and a mature people. And this the American people have become. We shall not again be thwarted in our will to live as a mature nation, confronting limitless horizons. We shall bear our full responsibility, exercise our full influence, and bring our full help and encouragement to all who aspire to peace and freedom.

We now are, and we shall continue to be, strong brothers in the family of mankind -- the family of the children of God.

10.10.10

orig. reading copy

Franklin D. Roosevelt

#1544

ADDRESS Of The President
Before The Foreign Policy Association
After The Dinner Held In The Waldorf Astoria Hotel
In New York City
October 21, 1944, at 9.30 p.m., s.w.t.
Broadcast Nationally

General McCoy, my old friend -- Ladies and Gentle-
men:

Tonight I am speaking as a guest of the Foreign Policy Association -- a nationwide organization, a distinguished organization composed of Americans of every (all) shade(s) of political opinion.

I am going to talk about (our) American foreign policy.

I am going to talk(ing) without rancor, (or) without snap judgment.

And I am going to talk (speaking) without losing my head (temper) or losing my temper (head). (laughter)

When the first World War was ended -- it seems like a long time ago -- I believed -- I believe now -- that enduring peace in the world has not a chance unless this nation -- our America -- is willing to cooperate in winning it and maintaining it. (applause) I thought back in those days of 1918 and 1919 (then) -- and I know now -- that we have to back our American words with American deeds. (applause)

A quarter of a century ago we helped to save our freedom, but we failed to organize the kind of world in which future generations could live (in) -- with freedom.

Franklin D. Roosevelt Library

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

Opportunity knocks again. There is no guarantee that opportunity (it) will knock a third time. (applause)

Today, Hitler and the Nazis continue the fight -- desperately, inch by inch, and may continue to do so all the way to Berlin.

And, by the way, we have another important engagement in Tokyo. (laughter and applause) No matter how (long or) hard, how long the road we must travel, our forces will fight their way (there) under the leadership of MacArthur and Nimitz. (applause)

All of our thinking about foreign policy in this war must be conditioned by the fact that millions of our American boys are today fighting, many thousands of miles from home, for the first objective: defense of our country; and the second objective, the perpetuation of our American ideals. And there are still many hard and bitter battles to be fought.

The leaders of this nation have always held time out of mind that concern for our national security does not end at our borders. President Monroe and every American President following him were prepared to use force, if necessary, to assure the independence of other American nations threatened by aggressors from across the seas.

That (The) principle, we have learned from childhood, has not changed. (,though) The world has. Wars are no longer fought from horseback, or from the decks of sailing ships.

It was with recognition of that fact (that) away back in 1933 we took, as the basis of (for) our foreign relations,

the Good Neighbor policy -- the policy, the principle of the neighbor who, resolutely respecting himself, equally respects the rights of others. (applause)

We and the other American republics have made the Good Neighbor policy real -- real in this hemisphere. And I want to say tonight that it is my conviction that this policy can be, and should be, made universal throughout the world. (applause)

At inter-American conferences, beginning at Montevideo in 1933, and continuing down to date, we have made it clear -- clear to this hemisphere at least, and I think to most of the world, that the United States of America practices what it preaches (we practice what we preach). (applause)

Our action in 1934, for example, with respect to Philippine independence was another step in making good the same philosophy that (which) animated the Good Neighbor policy of the year before.

And, as I said two years ago, "I like to think that the history of the Philippine Islands in the last forty-four years provides in a very real sense a pattern for the future of other small nations, (and) other small peoples in (of) the world. It's (It is) a pattern of what men of good will look forward to in the future to come."

And I cite as an illustration (I cite another early action) in the field of foreign policy (of which) something that I am proud of. That was the recognition in 1933 of Soviet Russia. (applause)

And may I add a personal word. In 1933, a certain

lady -- who sits at this table in front of me -- came back from a trip on which she had attended the opening of a schoolhouse. And she had gone to the history class -- history and geography -- children eight, nine or ten, and she told me that she had seen there a map of the world with a great big white space upon it -- no name -- no information. And the teacher told her that it was blank, with no name, because the school board wouldn't let her say anything about that big blank space. (laughter) Oh, there were only a hundred and eighty to two hundred million people in it, which was called Soviet Russia. And there were a lot of children, and they were told that the teacher was forbidden by the school board even to put the name of that blank space on the map. (more laughter)

For sixteen years before then, the American people and the Russian people had no practical means of communicating with each other. We re-established those means. And today we are fighting with the Russians against common foes -- and we know that the Russian contribution to victory has been, and will continue to be, gigantic. (applause)

However -- and we have to take a lot of things -- certain politicians, now very prominent in the Republican Party -- (laughter) -- have condemned our recognition.

I am impelled to wonder how Russia would have survived -- survived against the German attack if these same people had had their way.

After the last war -- in the political campaign of 1920 -- the isolationist Old Guard professed to be enthusiastic

about international cooperation. And I remember very well, because I was running on the issue at that time.

While campaigning for votes in that year of 1920, Senator Harding said that he favored with all his heart an Association of Nations "so organized (and) so participated in -- I am quoting the language -- as to make the actual attainment of peace a reasonable possibility."

However -- and this is history, too -- (laughter) -- after President Harding's election, the Association of Nations was never heard of again.

However, we have got to look at people -- this is a human world of ours. One of the leading isolationists who killed international cooperation in 1920 was an old friend of mine, and I think he supported me two or three times -- I have forgotten which -- Senator Hiram Johnson. Now, in the event of Republican victory in the Senate this year -- 1944 -- that same Senator Johnson -- who is still a friend of mine -- he would be Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. And I hope that (I know) the American voters will bear that in mind.
(laughter and applause)

And it's a fact -- a plain fact -- all you have to do is to go back through the files of the newspapers -- during the years that (which) followed 1920, the foreign policy of the Republican Administrations was dominated by the heavy hand of isolationism.

Much of the strength of our Navy -- and I ought to know it -- was scuttled; and some of the Navy's resources

were handed over to friends in private industry -- as in the unforgettable case of Teapot Dome.

Tariff walls went higher and higher -- blocking international trade.

There was snarling at our former Allies, and at the same time encouragement was given to American finance to invest two and one-half billion dollars in Germany, our former enemy.

All petitions that this nation join (in) the World Court were rejected or ignored.

We know that after this Administration took office, Secretary Hull and I asked replaced high tariffs with a series of reciprocal trade agreements under a statute of the Congress. The Republicans in the Congress opposed those agreements -- and tried to stop the extension of the law every three years. I am just talking about votes.

In 1935 I asked the Congress to join the World Court. It so happens, and I put it that way then, the Democrats in the Senate at that time voted for it forty-three to twenty -- two thirds. The Republicans voted against it fourteen to nine. And the result was that (Thus) we were prevented from obtaining the necessary two-thirds majority. I did my best.

In 1937, I asked that aggressor nations be quarantined. (--- and) For this I was branded by isolationists in and out of public office as an "alarmist" and a "war-monger."

From that time on, as you well know, I made clear by repeated messages to the (American) Congress of the United States, (and) by repeated statements to the American people, the

danger threatening from abroad -- and the need of re-arming to meet it.

Why, for example, in July, (19) '39, I tried to obtain a repeal of the Arms Embargo provisions in the Neutrality Law that (which) tied our hands -- tied us against selling arms to the European democracies in (for) defense against Hitler and Mussolini.

Now I remember very well, I have got my notes on it, somewhere in my memoirs, the late Senator Borah told a group, which I called -- all parties -- together in the White House, that his own private information from abroad was better than that of the State Department of the United States -- and that there would be no war in Europe.

And as it was made plain to Mr. Hull and me (that) -- and it was made plain to us at that time -- that because of the isolationist vote in the Congress of the United States, we could not possibly hope to obtain (attain) the desired revision of the Neutrality Law.

Now this fact was also made plain to Adolf Hitler. A few weeks later, after Borah said that to me, he brutally attacked Poland -- and the second World War began (had begun).

Let's get on. In 1941, this Administration proposed and the Congress passed, in spite of isolationist opposition, a thing called the Lend-Lease Law -- the (a) practical and dramatic notice to the world that we intended -- that we intended to help those nations resisting aggression.

Bringing it down to date -- these days -- and now

I am (now) speaking of October, 1944 -- I hear voices in (on) the air attacking me for my "failure" to prepare this nation for this war, (and) to warn the American people of the approaching tragedy.

It is rather interesting as a side thought that these same voices were not so very audible five years ago -- or even four years ago -- giving warning of the grave peril which we then faced.

There have been, and there still are, in the Republican Party, distinguished men and women of vision and courage, both in and out of public office, men and women who have vigorously supported our aid to our Allies and all the measures that we took to build up our national defense. And many of these Republicans have rendered magnificent services -- services to our country in this war as members of my (this) Administration. (applause) And I am happy that one of these distinguished Americans is sitting here at this table tonight, our great Secretary of War -- Henry Stimson. (prolonged cheers and applause)

And let us always remember that this very war might have been averted if Harry (Mr.) Stimson's views had prevailed when, in 1931, the Japanese ruthlessly attacked and raped Manchuria. (applause)

Let us analyze it a little more. The majority of the Republican members of the Congress voted -- I am just giving you a few figures, not many -- voted against the Selective Service Law in 1940; they voted against repeal of the Arms Embargo in 1939; they voted against the Lend-Lease Law in (19) '41,

and they voted in August, 1941, against extension of the Selective Service -- which meant voting against keeping our Army together, as it was going on then -- four months before Pearl Harbor.

You see, I am quoting history to you. I am going by the record. And I am giving you the whole story and not (merely) a phrase here and half a phrase there. (laughter, and prolonged cheers and applause)

In my reading copy there's another half sentence.
(laughter) You've got the point and I'm not going to use it.
(more laughter)

(picked out of context in such a way that they distort the facts.)

You know, I happen to believe -- I'm sort of old-fashioned, I guess I'm old -- (laughter) -- that, even in a political campaign, we ought to (should all) obey that ancient injunction -- Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor. (cheers and applause)

Now, the question of the men who will formulate and carry out the foreign policy of this country is in issue in this country (election) -- very much in issue. It is in issue not in terms of partisan application, but in terms of sober, solemn facts -- the facts that are on the record.

If the Republicans were to win control of the Congress in this election -- and it is only two weeks from next Tuesday, and I occupy the curious position of being President of the United States, and at the same time a candidate for the

Presidency -- (laughter) -- if the Republicans were to win control of the Congress, inveterate isolationists would occupy positions of commanding influence and power. That is record too.

I have already spoken of the ranking Republican member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Hiram Johnson.

One of the most influential members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee -- a man who would also be the chairman of the powerful Senate Committee on Appropriations -- is Senator Gerald P. Nye. (boos, and laughter)

Well, I am not going back to the old story of the last Presidential campaign: Martin and Barton and Fish -- (laughter, with the audience repeating after him) -- one of them has gone! (more laughter) But, in the House of Representatives, the man who is the present leader of the Republicans there, another friend of mine, and who undoubtedly would be Speaker, is Joseph W. Martin. He voted -- I am just giving you examples-- he voted against the Repeal of the Arms Embargo, he voted against the Lend-Lease Bill, against the extension of the Selective Service Law, against the arming of merchant ships, (and) against the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and their extensions.

The Chairman of the powerful Committee on Rules is the other one and would be none other than Hamilton Fish. (Boos, and laughter)

These (There) are like a lot of (many) others (like them) in the Congress of the United States -- (and) every one of them is now actively campaigning for the national

Republican ticket this year.

Can anyone really suppose that these isolationists have changed their minds about world affairs? That's a real question. Politicians who embraced the policy of isolationism, and (--or) who never raised their voices against it in our days of peril, I don't think they are (not) reliable custodians of the future of America. (cheers and applause)

Let's be fair. There have been Democrats in the isolationist camp, but they have been relatively few and far between, and so far they have not attained great positions of leadership.

And I am proud of the fact that this Administration does not have the support of the isolationist press. (applause) You know, for about a half-century I have been accustomed to naming names. (laughter) (--and) I mean specifically, to take the glaring examples, the McCormick -- (boos) -- Patterson -- (boos) -- (Hearst) -- Gannett -- (boos) -- and Hearst press. (louder boos)

You know, the American people have gone through great national debates in the recent critical years. They were soul-searching debates. They reached from every city to every village and (to) every home.

We have debated our principles, (and) our determination to aid those fighting for freedom.

Obviously, we could have come to terms with Hitler, (and) we could have accepted a minor role in his totalitarian world. We rejected that!

We could have compromised with Japan, and bargained for a place in the (a) Japanese-dominated Asia -- the Japanese-dominated Pacific, by selling out the heart's blood of the Chinese people. And we rejected that! (applause)

As I look back, I am more and more certain that the decision not to bargain with the tyrants rose from the hearts and souls and sinews of the American people. (applause) They faced reality; they appraised reality; (and) they knew what freedom meant.

The power which this nation has attained -- (the moral), the political, the economic, (and) the military, and above all the moral power -- has brought to us the responsibility, and with it the opportunity, for leadership in the community of nations. It is our (In our) own best interest, and in the name of peace and humanity, this nation cannot, must not, and will not shirk that responsibility. (applause)

Now, there are some who hope to see a structure of peace, a structure of peace completely set up -- set up immediately, with all the apartments assigned to everybody's (everyone's) satisfaction, with the telephones in, and the plumbing complete -- (laughter) -- the heating system, (and) the electric ice boxes all functioning perfectly, all furnished with linen and silver -- and with the rent pre-paid. (laughter)

The United Nations have not yet produced such a comfortable dwelling place. But we have achieved a very practical expression of a common purpose on the part of four great nations, who are now united to wage this war, that they will

embark together after the war on a greater and more difficult enterprise, an enterprise (-- that) of waging peace. We will embark on it with all the peace-loving nations of the world -- large and small.

And our objective, as I stated ten days ago, is to complete the organization of the United Nations without delay, (and) before hostilities actually cease. (applause)

You know, peace, like war, can succeed only when there's (where there is) a will to enforce it, and where there's (there is) available power to enforce it.

The Council of the League of Nations -- of the United Nations must have the power to act quickly and decisively to keep the peace by force, if necessary. (applause) I live in a small town, and I always thinkin small town -- that this goes to small towns as well as big towns. A policeman would not be a very effective policeman if, when he saw a felon break into a house, he had to go to the Town Hall and call a town meeting to issue a warrant before the felon could be arrested. (laughter and applause)

So to my simple mind it is clear that, if the world organization is to have any reality at all, our American representative must be endowed in advance by the people themselves, by constitutional means through their representatives in (the) Congress, with authority to act. (applause)

If we do not catch the international felon when we have our hands on him, if we let him get away with his loot because the Town Council has not passed an ordinance authorizing

his arrest, then we are not doing our share to prevent another World War. (applause) I think, and I have had some experience, that the people of this (the) Nation want their Government to work, they want their Government to act, and not merely (to) talk, whenever and wherever there's (there is) a threat to world peace. (applause)

Now, it's obvious that we cannot attain our great objectives by ourselves. Never again, after cooperating with other nations in a world war to save our way of life, can we wash our hands of maintaining the peace for which we fought. (applause)

The Dumbarton Oaks Conference didn't (not) spring up overnight. It was called by Secretary Hull and me after years of thought, discussion, preparation, (and) consultation with our Allies. Our State Department did a grand (splendid) job in preparing for the Conference and leading it to a successful termination. It was just another chapter in the long process of cooperation with other peace-loving nations -- beginning with the Atlantic Charter (Conference) -- that's a long time ago -- and continuing through Conferences at Casablanca, Moscow, Cairo, . Teheran, and Quebec and Washington.

It is my profound conviction that the American people as a whole have a very real understanding of these things. *

The American people know that Cordell Hull and I are thoroughly conversant with the Constitution of the United States -- (laughter) -- and know that we cannot commit this Nation to any secret treaties or any secret guarantees that (which) are in violation of that Constitution.

After my return from Teheran, I stated officially that no secret commitments had been made. The issue then is between my veracity and the continuing assertions of those who have no responsibility in the foreign field -- or, perhaps I should say, a field foreign to them. (laughter, and prolonged applause)

(The peace structure which we are building must depend on foundations that go deep into the soil of men's faith and men's hearts -- otherwise it is worthless. Only the unflagging will of men can preserve it.)

No President of the United States -- there have been quite a lot of them, too -- can or could make the American contribution to preserve the peace without the constant, alert and conscious collaboration of the American people.

Only the determination of the people to use the machinery gives worth to the machinery. Remember that.

We believe that the American people (have) already made up their minds on this great issue; and this Administration has been able to press forward confidently with its plans.

We are seeking to avert and avoid war.

The very fact that we are now at work on the organization of the peace proves that the great nations are committed to trust in each other. Put this proposition any way you want (will), it is bound to come out the same way; we either work with the other great nations, or we might some day have to fight them. And I am against that.

The kind of world order which we the peace-loving nations must achieve, must depend essentially on friendly

human relations, on acquaintance, on tolerance, on unassailable sincerity and good will and good faith. We have achieved that relationship to a very remarkable degree in our dealings with our Allies in this war -- as I think the events of the war have proved. (applause)

It is a new thing in human history for Allies to work together, as we have done -- so closely, so harmoniously, (and) so effectively in the fighting of a war, and at the same time in the building of a (the) peace.

If we fail to maintain that relationship in the peace -- if we fail to expand it and strengthen it -- then there will be no lasting peace.

I digress for a moment. As for Germany, that tragic nation which has sown the wind and is now reaping the whirlwind -- we and our Allies are entirely agreed that we shall not bargain with the Nazi conspirators, or leave them a shred of control -- open or secret -- of the instruments of government. (prolonged applause)

We shall not leave them a single element of military power -- or of potential military power.

But, and I should be false to the very foundations of my religious and political convictions, if I should ever relinquish the hope -- (and) or even the faith -- that in all peoples, without exception, there live some instinct for truth, some attraction toward justice, (and) some passion for peace -- buried as they may be in the German case under a brutal regime.

We bring no charge against the German race, as such,

for we cannot believe that God has eternally condemned any race of humanity. (applause) (For) We know in our own land, in these United States of America, how many good men and women of German ancestry have proved loyal, freedom-loving, and peace-loving citizens. (applause)

But there is going to be a stern punishment for all those in Germany directly responsible for this agony of mankind. (applause)

The German people are not going to be enslaved. Why? Because the United Nations do not traffic in human slavery. (applause) But it will be necessary for them to earn their way back -- earn their way back into the fellowship of peace-loving and law-abiding nations. And, in their climb up that steep road, we shall certainly see to it that they are not encumbered by having to carry guns. (laughter and applause) We hope they will be relieved of that burden (-- we hope) forever. (applause)

No. The task ahead of us will not be easy. Indeed it will be (as) difficult (and), complex, as any task (which) that has ever faced (an) any American administration.

I will not say to you now, or ever, that we of the Democratic (my) party know all the answers. I am certain, for myself, that I do not know how all the unforeseeable difficulties can be met. What I can say to you is this -- that I have unlimited faith that the task (job) can be done. (applause) And that faith -- that faith is based on knowledge -- knowledge gained in the arduous, practical and continuing experience of these past eventful years. (applause)

And so I speak to the present generation of Americans with a reverent participation in its sorrows and in its hopes. No generation has undergone a greater test, or has met that test with greater heroism and I think greater wisdom, and no generation has had a more exalted mission.

For this generation must act not only for itself, but as a trustee for all those who fell in the last war -- a part of their mission unfulfilled.

It must act also for all those who have paid the supreme price in this war -- lest their mission, too, be betrayed.

And finally it must act for the generations to come -- that (which) must be granted a heritage of peace.

I do not exaggerate that mission. We are not fighting for, and we shall not attain a (achieve) Utopia. Indeed, in our own land, the work to be done is never finished. We have yet to realize the full and equal enjoyment of our freedom. So, in embarking on the building of a world fellowship, we have set ourselves (to) a long and arduous task, a task that (which) will challenge our patience, our intelligence, our imagination, as well as our faith.

That task, my friends, calls for (requires) the judgment of a seasoned and (a) mature people. (applause) (And) This, I think, the American people have become. We shall not again be thwarted in our will to live as a mature nation, confronting limitless horizons. We shall bear our full responsibility, exercise our full influence, and bring our full help

and encouragement to all who aspire to peace and freedom.

We now are, and we shall continue to be, strong brothers -- strong brothers in the family of mankind -- the family of the children of God.

(prolonged cheers and applause)

CONFIDENTIAL

HOLD FOR RELEASE

CONFIDENTIAL

HOLD FOR RELEASE

CONFIDENTIAL

HOLD FOR RELEASE

October 21, 1944

CAUTION: The following address of the President, prepared for delivery before the Foreign Policy Association, upon the occasion of the dinner held in the Waldorf Astoria Hotel on the evening of October 21, 1944, is released for all regular editions of SUNDAY MORNING (OCTOBER 22, 1944) NEWSPAPERS.

RELEASE FOR RADIO is simultaneous with delivery of the speech by the President, NOT EARLIER THAN 9:30 o'clock, P.M., E.W.T., Saturday, October 21, 1944.

CARE MUST BE EXERCISED TO PREVENT PREMATURE PUBLICATION.

STEPHEN EARLY
Secretary to the President

Tonight I am speaking as a guest of the Foreign Policy Association -- a distinguished organization composed of Americans of all shades of political opinion.

I am going to talk about our American foreign policy.

I am talking without rancor or snap judgment.

I am speaking without losing my temper or losing my head.

When the first World War was ended, I believed -- I believe now -- that enduring peace in the world has not a chance unless this nation is willing to cooperate in winning it and maintaining it. I thought then -- I know now -- that we have to back our words with deeds.

A quarter of a century ago we helped to save our freedom but we failed to organize the kind of world in which future generations could live in freedom. Opportunity knocks again. There is no guarantee that it will knock a third time.

Today, Hitler and the Nazis continue the fight -- desperately, inch by inch, and may continue to do so all the way to Berlin.

And we have another important engagement in Tokyo. No matter how long or hard the road we must travel, our forces will fight their way there under the leadership of MacArthur and Nimitz.

All of our thinking about foreign policy in this war must be conditioned by the fact that billions of our American boys are today fighting, many thousands of miles from home, for the defense of our country and the perpetuation of our American ideals. And there are still many hard and bitter battles to be fought.

The leaders of this nation have always held that concern for our national security does not end at our borders. President Monroe and every American President following him were prepared to use force, if necessary, to assure the independence of other American nations threatened by aggressors from across the seas.

The principle has not changed, though the world has. Wars are no longer fought from horseback, or from the decks of sailing ships.

It was with recognition of that fact that in 1933 we took, as the basis for our foreign relations, the Good Neighbor policy -- the principle of the neighbor who, resolutely respecting himself, equally respects the rights of others.

We and the other American republics have made the Good Neighbor policy real in this hemisphere. It is my conviction that this policy can be, and should be, made universal.

At inter-American conferences, beginning at Montevideo in 1933, and continuing down to date, we have made it clear to this hemisphere that we practice what we preach.

Our action in 1934 with respect to Philippine independence was another step in making good the same philosophy which animated the Good Neighbor policy.

As I said two years ago: "I like to think that the history of the Philippine Islands in the last forty-four years provides in a very real sense a pattern for the future of other small nations and peoples of the world. It is a pattern of what men of good will look forward to in the future."

I cite another early action in the field of foreign policy of which I am proud. That was the recognition in 1933 of Soviet Russia.

For sixteen years before then the American people and the Russian people had no practical means of communicating with each other. We re-established those means. And today we are fighting with the Russians against common foes -- and we know that the Russian contribution to victory has been, and will continue to be, gigantic.

However, certain politicians, now very prominent in the Republican Party, have condemned our recognition.

I am impelled to wonder how Russia would have survived against German attack if these same people had had their way.

After the last war -- in the political campaign of 1920 -- the isolationist Old Guard professed to be enthusiastic about international cooperation.

While campaigning for votes in 1920, Senator Harding said that he favored with all his heart an Association of Nations "so organized and so participated in as to make the actual attainment of peace a reasonable possibility".

However, after President Harding's election, the Association of Nations was never heard of again.

One of the leading isolationists who killed international cooperation in 1920 was Senator Hiram Johnson. In the event of Republican victory in the Senate this year -- 1944 -- that same Senator Johnson would be Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I know the American voters will bear that in mind.

During the years which followed 1920, the foreign policy of the Republican Administrations was dominated by the heavy hand of isolationism.

Much of the strength of our Navy was scuttled; -- and some of the Navy's resources were handed over to friends in private industry -- as in the unforgettable case of Teapot Dome.

Tariff walls went higher and higher -- blocking international trade.

There was snarling at our former Allies and at the same time encouragement was given to American finance to invest two and one-half billion dollars in Germany, our former enemy.

All petitions that this nation join in the World Court were rejected or ignored.

After this Administration took office, Secretary Hull and I replaced high tariffs with a series of reciprocal trade agreements under a statute of the Congress. The Republicans opposed these agreements -- and tried to stop the extension of the law every three years.

In 1935 I asked the Congress to join the World Court. The Democrats in the Senate voted for it forty-three to twenty. The Republicans voted against it fourteen to nine. Thus we were prevented from obtaining the necessary two-thirds majority.

In 1937 I asked that aggressor nations be quarantined -- and for this I was branded by isolationists in and out of public office as an "alarmist" and "war-monger."

From that time on, as you well know, I made clear by repeated messages to the American Congress and by repeated statements to the American people the danger threatening from abroad -- and the need of reaching to meet it.

In July, 1939, I tried to obtain a repeal of the Arms Embargo provisions in the Neutrality Law which tied our hands against selling arms to the European democracies for defense against Hitler.

The late Senator Borah told a group, which I called together in the White House, that his own private information from abroad was better than that of the State Department -- and that there would be no war in Europe.

And it was made plain to Mr. Hull and me that, because of the isolationist vote, we could not possibly hope to attain the desired revision of the Neutrality Law.

This fact was also made plain to Adolf Hitler. A few weeks later he brutally attacked Poland -- and the second World War had begun.

In 1941, this Administration proposed and the Congress passed, in spite of isolationist opposition, the Lend-Lease Law -- a practical and dramatic notice to the world that we intended to help those nations resisting aggression.

Those days -- and I am now speaking of October, 1944 -- I hear voices on the air attacking me for my "failure" to prepare this nation for this war and to warn the American people of the approaching tragedy.

These same voices were not so very audible five years ago -- or even four years ago -- giving warning of the grave peril which we then faced.

There have been, and there still are, in the Republican Party distinguished men and women of vision and courage, both in and out of public office, who have vigorously supported our aid to our Allies and all the measures that we took to build up our national defense. And many of those Republicans have rendered magnificent services to our country in this war as members of this Administration. I am happy that one of those distinguished Americans is our great Secretary of War -- Henry Stimson.

Let us remember that this very war might have been averted if Mr. Stimson's views had prevailed when, in 1931, the Japanese ruthlessly attacked Manchuria.

The majority of the Republican members of the Congress voted against the Selective Service Law in 1940; they voted against repeal of the Arms Embargo in 1939; they voted against the Lend-Lease Law in 1941 and they voted in August, 1941, against extension of Selective Service -- which meant voting against keeping our army together -- four months before Pearl Harbor.

I am quoting history to you, I am going by the record. And I am giving you the whole story and not merely a phrase here and half a phrase there pieced out of context in such a way that they distort the facts.

I happen to believe that, even in a political campaign, we should all obey that ancient injunction -- Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

The question of the men who will formulate and carry out the foreign policy of this country is in issue in this election -- very much in issue. It is in issue not in terms of partisan application, but in terms of sober, solemn facts -- the facts that are on the record.

If the Republicans were to win control of the Congress in this election, inveterate isolationists would occupy positions of commanding influence and power.

I have already spoken of the ranking Republican member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Hiram Johnson.

One of the most influential members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee -- a man who would also be the chairman of the powerful Senate Committee on Appropriations -- is Senator Gerald P. Nye.

In the House of Representatives, the man who is the present leader of the Republicans there, and who undoubtedly would be Speaker, is Joseph W. Martin. He voted against the Repeal of the Arms Embargo, against the Lend-Lease Bill, against the extension of the Selective Service Law, against the arming of merchant ships, and against the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and their extensions.

The Chairman of the powerful Committee on Rules would be none other than Hamilton Fish.

There are many others like them in the Congress of the United States -- and every one of them is now actively campaigning for the national Republican ticket this year.

Can anyone really suppose that these isolationists have changed their minds about world affairs? Politicians who embraced the policy of isolationism -- or who never raised their voices against it in our days of peril -- are not reliable custodians of the future of America.

There have been Democrats in the isolationist camp but they have been few and far between, and they have not attained positions of leadership.

And I am proud of the fact that this Administration does not have the support of the isolationist press -- and I mean specifically the McCormick-Patterson-Hearst-Gannett press.

The American people have gone through great national debates in the recent critical years. They were soul-searching debates. They reached from every city to every village and to every home.

We debated our principles and our determination to aid those fighting for freedom.

Obviously, we could have come to terms with Hitler, and accepted a minor role in his totalitarian world. We rejected that!

We could have compromised with Japan, and bargained for a place in a Japanese-dominated Asia by selling out the heart's blood of the Chinese people. And we rejected that!

The decision not to bargain with the tyrants rose from the hearts and souls and sinews of the American people. They faced reality; they appraised reality; and they knew what freedom meant.

The power which this nation has attained -- the moral, the political, the economic and the military power -- has brought to us the responsibility, and with it the opportunity, for leadership in the community of nations. In our own best interest, and in the name of peace and humanity, this nation cannot, must not, and will not shirk that responsibility.

There are some who hope to see a structure of peace, completely set up immediately, with all the apartments assigned to everyone's satisfaction, with the telephones in, the plumbing complete, the heating system and the electric ice boxes functioning perfectly, all furnished with linen and silver -- and with the rent pre-paid.

The United Nations have not yet produced such a comfortable dwelling place. But we have achieved a very practical expression of a common purpose on the part of four great nations, who are now united to wage this war, that they will embark together after the war on a greater and more difficult enterprise -- that of waging peace. We will embark on it with all the peace-loving nations of the world -- large and small.

Our objective, as I stated ten days ago, is to complete the organization of the United Nations without delay and before hostilities actually cease.

Peace, like war, can succeed only where there is a will to enforce it, and where there is available power to enforce it.

The Council of the United Nations must have the power to act quickly and decisively to keep the peace by force, if necessary. A policeman would not be a very effective policeman if, when he saw a felon break into a house, he had to go to the Town Hall and call a town meeting to issue a warrant before the felon could be arrested.

It is clear that, if the world organization is to have any reality at all, our representative must be endowed in advance by the people themselves, by constitutional means through their representatives in the Congress, with authority to act.

If we do not catch the international felon when we have our hands on him, if we let him get away with his loot because the Town Council has not passed an ordinance authorizing his arrest, then we are not doing our share to prevent another World War. The people of the Nation want their Government to act, and not merely to talk, whenever and wherever there is a threat to world peace.

We cannot attain our great objectives by ourselves. Never again, after cooperating with other nations in a world war to save our way of life, can we wash our hands of maintaining the peace for which we fought.

The Dumbarton Oaks Conference did not spring up overnight. It was called by Secretary Hull and he after years of thought, discussion, preparation and consultation with our Allies. Our State Department did a splendid job in preparing for the Conference and leading it to a successful termination. It was another chapter in the long process of cooperation with other peace-loving nations -- beginning with the Atlantic Charter Conference, and continuing through Conferences at Casablanca, Moscow, Cairo, Teheran, Quebec and Washington.

It is my profound conviction that the American people as a whole have a very real understanding of these things.

The American people know that Cordell Hull and I are thoroughly conversant with the Constitution of the United States and know that we cannot commit this Nation to any secret treaties or any secret guarantees which are in violation of that Constitution.

After my return from Toboron, I stated officially that no secret commitments had been made. The issue then is between my veracity and the continuing assertions of those who have no responsibility in the foreign field -- or, perhaps I should say, a field foreign to them.

The peace structure which we are building must depend on foundations that go deep into the soil of man's faith and man's hearts -- otherwise it is worthless. Only the unflagging will of man can preserve it.

No President of the United States can make the American contribution to preserve the peace without the constant, alert and conscious collaboration of the American people.

Only the determination of the people to use the machinery gives worth to the machinery.

We believe that the American people have already made up their minds on this great issue; and this administration has been able to press forward confidently with its plans.

The very fact that we are now at work on the organization of the peace proves that the great nations are committed to trust in each other. But this proposition any way you will, it is bound to come out the same way; we either work with the other great nations, or we might some day have to fight them.

The kind of world order which we the peace-loving nations must achieve, must depend essentially on friendly human relations, on acquaintance, on tolerance, on unassailable sincerity and good will and good faith. We have achieved that relationship to a remarkable degree in our dealings with our Allies in this war -- as the events of the war have proved.

It is a new thing in human history for Allies to work together, as we have done -- so closely, so harmoniously and effectively in the fighting of a war, and -- at the same time -- in the building of the peace.

If we fail to maintain that relationship in the peace -- if we fail to expand it and strengthen it -- then there will be no lasting peace.

As for Germany, that tragic nation which has sown the wind and is now reaping the whirlwind -- we and our Allies are entirely agreed that we shall not bargain with the Nazi conspirators, or leave them a shred of control -- open or secret -- of the instruments of government.

We shall not leave them a single element of military power -- or of potential military power.

But I should be false to the very foundations of my religious and political convictions, if I should ever relinquish the hope -- and even the faith -- that in all peoples, without exception, there live some instinct for truth, some attraction toward justice, and some passion for peace -- buried as they may be in the German case under a brutal regime.

We bring no charge against the German race, as such, for we cannot believe that God has eternally condemned any race of humanity. For we know in our own land how many good men and women of German ancestry have proved loyal, freedom-loving, peace-loving citizens.

There is going to be stern punishment for all those in Germany directly responsible for this agony of mankind.

The German people are not going to be enslaved -- because the United Nations do not traffic in human slavery. But it will be necessary for them to earn their way back into the fellowship of peace-loving and law-abiding nations. And, in their climb up that steep road, we shall certainly see to it that they are not encumbered by having to carry guns. They will be relieved of that burden -- we hope, forever.

The task ahead of us will not be easy. Indeed it will be as difficult and complex as any task which has ever faced an American administration.

I will not say to you now, or ever, that we of my party know all the answers. I am certain, for myself, that I do not know how all the unforeseeable difficulties can be met. What I can say to you is this -- that I have unlimited faith that the job can be done. And that faith is based on knowledge gained in the arduous, practical and continuing experience of these past eventful years.

I speak to the present generation of Americans with reverent participation in its sorrows and in its hopes. No generation has undergone a greater test, or has met that test with greater heroism and greater wisdom, and no generation has had a more exalted mission.

For this generation must act not only for itself, but as a trustee for all those who fell in the last war -- a part of their mission unfulfilled.

It must act also for all who have paid the supreme price in this war -- lest their mission, too, be betrayed.

And finally it must act for the generations to come -- which must be granted a heritage of peace.

I do not exaggerate that mission. We are not fighting for, and we shall not achieve, Utopia. Indeed, in our own land, the work to be done is never finished. We have yet to realize the full and equal enjoyment of our freedom. So, in embarking on the building of a world fellowship, we have set ourselves to a long and arduous task, which will challenge our patience, our intelligence, our imagination, as well as our faith.

That task requires the judgment of a seasoned and a mature people. And this the American people have become. We shall not again be thwarted in our will to live as a mature nation, confronting limitless horizons. We shall bear our full responsibility, exercise our full influence, and bring our full help and encouragement to all who aspire to peace and freedom.

We now are, and we shall continue to be, strong brothers in the family of mankind -- the family of the children of God.

FIRST DRAFT

FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION DINNER
WALDORF ASTORIA, NEW YORK
OCTOBER 21, 1944

SOME THOUGHTS

What this nation is learning is that poor neighbors, without buying power, drag down our own economy -- our own standard of living.

I always illustrate this by a story of Warm Springs in Georgia, nearly twenty years ago. For the Foundation -- the doctors, nurses and families of the Infantile Paralysis patients, some recreation had to be provided and I undertook the building of a little nine-hole golf course. An excellent neighboring contractor undertook to build it at cost for the foundation, and the first Saturday he was employing fifteen white men and fifteen colored men on the job. I found that he was paying a little above the local scale of wages -- seventy cents for a ten hour day for the colored men and eighty cents for a ten hour day for the white men. All of these men worked only when it did not rain, and their total earnings per annum averaged less than \$140 a year for the Negroes and \$160 a year for the white men.

It was then that I developed what might be called a home or domestic good neighbor policy. These workers in Georgia, on that scale of wages, could buy practically nothing of the manufactured goods made in the North, and it was practically impossible, at that level, to produce manufactures in the South which could be sold in the South.

Thousands of business men in the manufacturing field agreed with me and long before the war -- partly because of the scale established for WPA workers, and partly because of the minimum wage law, which was enacted at that time -- we managed as a nation to raise the payroll of the South to the point that common labor received a dollar or two dollars and the South began, as I had predicted, to buy goods manufactured in the North, and also to buy new articles which were manufactured in the South itself.

This, it seems to me, is a clear lesson in domestic economy and is, of course, proved by any comparison between the prosperity of the country of twenty years ago and of 1940. I am very carefully leaving out any reference to the economics of the country since this war began.

And I have applied the same thesis to nearby nations which have had individually an annual buying power which would horrify almost all our people if they knew about it. A wage scale in many of the West India islands ten years ago was as low as twenty cents a day.

Could we sell them any of our products? Obviously not. All that this neighboring people of ours earned had to be put into food, with the exception of a small amount for cotton goods.

Many people who have traveled or made tours in the West Indies, for example, or in the Republics south of us, have raved over the picturesque qualities of what they have called the "natives".

I am familiar, for instance, with most of the islands of the West Indies and it is safe to generalize in saying that their standard of living up to the time of the war had increased little or none in the past hundred years. Their buying power was almost nil, and those which were colonies or territories of other nations were a constant drain on the Treasury of the parent country.

The present National Administration has a definite record of building and encouraging free and democratic political institutions, but it is necessary for us to improve the economics of these neighbors of ours. And we are most anxious, day in and day out, to do this, not for humanitarian reasons alone, but that we do it because it will help our own nation in increasing its trade and its own employment and profit.

Tonight I am speaking as a guest of the Foreign Policy Association — ^{an} [an honorable and] distinguished organization composed of [loyal] Americans of all shades of political opinion.

[An acquaintance of many years makes me realize] ^{I know} that your membership is made up of [broad-minded] men and women who take an interest in the ^{principles of the interdependence of all nations —} whole world — who believe the fundamental [truth] that what pulls one nation down, ^{may} pull all the other nations down; and that what brings one nation to ^{more} better things, brings those better things to all other nations.

What I am about to say to you comes from a long experience, and ^{an intimate} a personal acquaintance with the leaders and with the problems of many nations — ^{lands.}

[I must ask you to believe that while I cannot, in half an hour, cover every one of these problems, I want to give you a few thoughts about the over-riding problem of bringing a peace to the world, an end of all the killings and sufferings — an end of war, at least within the foreseeable future of those human beings who make up the population of the world today.]

^{The democracy is conducting} ~~It is a pity that~~ [a Presidential campaign] ~~obtrudes itself into a~~ ^{during the} crucial moment of ~~the~~ crisis of [a war, as the result of which] [most humans believe that] the future of the ^{civilization depends} human family is at stake.]

Free elections are a part of our existence, therefore we do not object to elections in themselves. What we object to is the type of

elections, the conduct of elections.

This election, in the temper of it, has not helped us to victory. If we take and add up all the little incidents of this campaign, we cannot escape the conclusion that it has hurt the winning of the war, that it has slowed up the victory and the return of peace. And one prime reason for that is that there are too many Americans who have forgotten the old-fashioned commandment in which some of us still believe: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

I am going to talk, quite frankly, and bluntly, about the Foreign Policy of the United States, or as I should prefer to call it — the International Policy of the United States. [I am going to talk about the policy which Secretary ^{Hull} and I have consistently championed — and about those who have consistently and violently opposed that policy.]

I am going to talk about the record of the past — the record of both parties — and I am going to talk about our American plans for the future.

[I am going to discuss our position in world affairs — from the Monroe Doctrine to the Chicago Tribune. I am talking without rancor or snap judgment.

I am speaking without losing my temper or losing my head.

And I speak as a proven American.]

Nearly a quarter of a century ago I shared in a presidential campaign dedicated to [a single issue: An international organization for the maintenance of an enduring world peace. Twenty-four years have not changed my convictions [on the major point than at issue.]

I believed then-- I believe now -- that enduring peace in the world has not a chance unless this nation is willing to cooperate in winning it and maintaining it. I thought then -- I know now -- that we have to back our words with deeds.

We are now fighting ^{to save our freedom and to help organize} again for a world in which future generations may live [free from fear.] *in freedom*

[The first and greatest aim of our foreign policy is the establishment of a new international organization for the maintenance of peace and security and justice throughout the world.]

[The United Nations organization must have more authority, more power and more unity than the League of Nations ever had, and it must be capable of future expansion to include, in its membership, the entire human race.]

This year the United Nations have won tremendous victories all over the world. The Allied ~~major~~ plans for the war against Germany and Japan have been magnificently carried out by the commanders of the field and by the fighting men in all the armies, navies and air forces. ~~DX~~

As I speak to you tonight, ~~these~~ ^{our} forces ~~of ours~~ have effected a landing in the Philippine Islands. When General MacArthur left the Philippines in a speed boat, he announced that ~~Our army - our navy - indeed our whole~~ ^{Our army - our navy - indeed our whole} he would be back. ~~and this~~ nation are in the process of fulfilling that pledge.

We all know the tremendous increase in the number of our ^{merchant and}

^{may} fighting ships, but we ~~do~~ not appreciate the tremendous build-up which

has been going on constantly in the ^{Pacific} [Philippines] ^{of} our ground

and air forces. [I cannot disclose the number of ^{we have an immense} ~~our~~ planes now

^{armada of carriers and land based planes} operating all the way from Hawaii to the Philippines and Formosa

and the Southwest Pacific. ^{And tonight that} [But I can tell you our ground forces

in the Pacific, [including Hawaii and Alaska,] now run over two

million men ^{of} all of them taken there and maintained there

by thousands of ships nearly all of which are less than three

years old.] - they are trained to the hilt -

they know how to fight the tremendous
Japs - and MacArthur will take them
to Tokyo. ^{and Minity}

[However, it is] these same fighting men [who] know [best] how [many] hard and bitter battles are still to be fought before our [formidable] enemies are brought to total defeat.

Some people believed that, when Paris was liberated, the war in Europe was just about over. [And some campaign orators are constantly trying to keep that wishful thinking alive. [Unfortunately] this [optimistic] view was not shared by Hitler and his Nazis, *nor for that matter by General Marshall, Admiral King or me.*

Hitler and the Nazis continue the fight -- desperately, inch by inch, and may continue to do so all the way to Berlin. And we have another important engagement to keep -- in Tokyo. We shall keep it no matter how long or hard the road we must travel. ~~X~~

But -- even in the midst of fighting this war, and of winning it -- we look to the peace that will follow it. We plan for that peace, with the determination that it shall not be merely another twenty-five year armistice.

We Americans, quite naturally and properly, think of that peace in our own American terms.

The leaders of this nation have always held that concern for our national security does not end at our borders. President Monroe proclaimed it more than a century ago; and he and every American President following him were prepared to use force, if necessary, to assure the independence of other American nations. Only in that way could the United States be secure to enjoy peace in this hemisphere.

The principle has not changed, though the world has. Wars are no longer fought from horseback, or from the decks of sailing ships.

It was with recognition of that fact that in 1933 we took as the basis for our foreign relations, the Good Neighbor policy -- the principle of the neighbor who because he resolutely respects himself, equally respects the rights of others; the neighbor who respects his obligations and the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors. (D)

We and the other American republics have made the Good Neighbor policy real in this hemisphere. It is our conviction that this policy can be and should be made universal. That is the basis on which Secretary Hull and I have conducted our ^{affairs} [negotiations] with Russia, Britain, China, and other peace-loving nations.

I am a little saddened by those who [even for campaign purposes run down or] pay little attention to the Good Neighbor Policy. Most people, however, think back to 1933. They realize that the United States and its citizens were disliked and feared by a large portion of the Latin American Republics. We were unpopular and we might as well admit it. Under the leadership of Secretary Hull, their attitude toward us changed. He ^{and the American people} ~~was~~ ^{now} so *obviously* ~~patently~~ sincere that the people of the other Republics came to believe in ~~the~~ us.

[I myself had learned much from the time of Woodrow Wilson. It is true that I was partly responsible for sending marines into Santo Domingo and Haiti, but one of the greatest satisfactions in my life was when I took the marines out of Haiti in 1934 and told all our neighbors that we did not propose to occupy any of their territories.]

[People say live and learn while I am glad that I have lived and also learned.]

In Central and South America today I hear only one doubt:
Will future administrations of the United States live up to the
Good Neighbor Policy? That is the only point at which they cross
their fingers. And in the light of what has happened since 1933,
it amuses us just a little when it is intimated that this policy
had its origin under a long list of former Republican [Secretaries
of State.] *Administrations.*

At inter-American conferences beginning at Montevideo in 1933, and continuing down to date we have made it clear to this hemisphere, that we practice what we preach.

Through the policy of joint action in matters of common concern, the safety and security of this hemisphere were preserved in the hour of its greatest danger, and -- God willing -- will be preserved for generations to come.

Our action in 1934 with respect to Philippine independence was another step in making good the same philosophy which animated the Good Neighbor policy. We know how the Filipino people have fought for their freedom in this war, and are proud that we have helped this great people to achieve nationhood.

The Philippines have progressed from the status of territorial possessions to that of a self-governing Commonwealth. When the Japanese have been driven from those Islands, they will become an independent Republic.

As I have said on a previous occasion, the example of the Philippines provides a pattern for handling the problems of other peoples throughout the world, who seek to develop themselves for the

responsibility of self-government.

I cite another early action of this Administration in the field of Foreign Policy which I do not regret. That was the recognition in 1933 of Soviet Russia.

For sixteen years before then the American people and the Russian people had no practical means of communicating with each other. We re-established those means. And today we are fighting with the Russians against common foes — and we know that the Russian contribution to victory has been, and will continue to be, gigantic.

However, certain politicians ^{new} now prominent in the Republican Party have condemned our recognition; and one of them went so far as to state in 1940:

"In so far as the present Administration has adhered to the policies of its predecessors it has met with the general approval of the American people. But it has occasionally strayed from the path. A conspicuous and most unfortunate departure was the recognition by the New Deal of Soviet Russia.

"At last, I think our Administration will stop trying to make deals with Russia. We need no such partnerships. With the world as it is today, we can afford no more fussy-minded departures from the established course of our foreign policy."

I must confess that this Administration made more than one departure from the policies of the three preceding administrations.

It was they who nominated Warren G. Harding in 1920 and murdered the hopes of Woodrow Wilson for a world organization for peace. But then, as now, the ^{isolationist} Old Guard professed to be enthusiastic about international cooperation.

They then assured the American people that they favored an Association of Nations -- which would be stronger and more workable than the League. While campaigning for votes in 1920 Harding said that this Association of Nations should be "so organized and so participated in as to make the actual attainment of peace a reasonable possibility."

And, he added, "Such an Association I favor with all my heart."

However, after Harding's election, the Association of Nations was never heard of again. The ^{isolationists} Old Guard scuttled the whole concept of world organization which had seemed so dear to Harding's heart before Election Day.

One of the leading Republicans who killed international cooperation in 1920 was Senator Miran Johnson. In the event of Republican victory this year -- 1944 -- that same Senator Johnson would, by the seniority rule, be Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

During the twelve years which followed 1921 the foreign policy of the Republican Administrations was dominated by the heavy hand of isolationism.

Much of the strength of our Navy was scuttled - and some of the Navy's resources were handed over to friends in private industry, like Teapot Dome.

Tariff walls went higher and higher, blocking international trade.

There was snarling at our former Allies [because of war debts - which all responsible economists agreed were uncollectible anyway] and at the same time encouragement was given to American finance to invest 2½ billion dollars in Germany, our former enemy.

All petitions that this nation join in the World Court were rejected or ignored.

There were various conferences, to be sure - with expression of good intentions and pious hopes. But there was never a suggestion that this nation would contribute anything more tangible than noncommittal words to the maintenance of world peace.

[After] this Administration came to power in 1933:

Instead of high tariffs, in 1934 we instituted a series of

reciprocal trade agreements under a statute of Congress. The Republicans opposed these agreements and tried to stop the extension of the law every three years.

In 1935 I asked the Congress to join the World Court - but Republican opposition in the Senate prevented us from obtaining the necessary two-thirds majority.

In 1937 I asked that aggressor nations be quarantined -- and for this I was branded by isolationist Republicans in and out of public office as an alarmist and war monger.

From that time on, I made clear by repeated messages to the American Congress and by repeated statements to the American people the danger threatening from abroad and the need of rearming to meet it.

In July 1939 I tried to obtain a repeal of the Arms Embargo in the Neutrality Law which so tied our hands against helping the Allies, that Hitler was relying upon it in starting his war upon Europe. But it was made plain to Mr. Hull and me that, because of the isolationists, we could not possibly hope to attain the desired revision of the Neutrality Law.

This fact was also made plain to Adolf Hitler. Six weeks later

he brutally attacked Poland -- and the second world war had begun.

During those same twelve years, Hitler was rising to power, Mussolini was fortifying his Fascist state and the Japanese were establishing in Asia and on many islands the bases from which to attack China and the Philippines and America itself.

These days -- and I am now speaking of October, 1944 -- I hear many voices on the air shouting accusations against me for my "failure" to prepare this nation for this war -- for my "failure" to warn the American people of the approaching tragedy.

But I cannot forget -- and I do not think that the American people can forget, either -- that these same voices were not audible five years ago -- or even four years ago -- giving warning of the grave peril which we then faced.

start In fact, many of those same voices were then joining in the isolationist chorus, condemning me as "alarmist" and "war monger," and attributing hysteria to those of us who entertained the idea that any totalitarian state, separately or collectively, would attempt to attack the United States.

There have been and there are in the Republican Party distinguished men and women of vision and courage both in and out of public office, who have consistently opposed isolationism. They vigorously supported our aid

to our Allies and all the measures that we took to build up our national defense. And many of these Republicans have rendered distinguished services to our country in this war as members of the Congress and of this Administration. I am happy that one of these distinguished Americans is sitting here at this table tonight - our great Secretary of War - Henry Stimson.

But - it is the plain fact that the leadership of such people has been repudiated by the isolationist Old Guard which is now in control of the Republican Party - just as solidly as it was in control in the days of Harding.

[Perhaps the Old Guard has learned its lesson. Perhaps they are wholehearted in support of a policy which they submerged during the twelve years they were in power and which they bitterly opposed for eight years thereafter and which they spurned when they wrested control of their party from its internationally minded leadership of 1940.]

[However - acceptance of this belated ^{reformation} ~~reformations~~ involves too serious a risk. The security of our own nation and the whole cause of world peace are at stake.]

Politicians who embraced the policy of isolationism -- or who never raised their voices against it in days of peril -- are not reliable custodians of America's future.

While this Administration was trying to point out the dangers

from abroad and trying to arm the United States, what were the present Republican leaders doing?

It seems incredible when we listen to them now — but the record will show that with rare exceptions they fought us — they fought us on the floors of the Congress. They fought us in the columns of the newspapers which they owned or controlled, and they fought us in sponsored programs over the air — they fought us in [practically] every effort which we made for peace, for adequate national defense and for a sound international economic policy.

The majority of the Republican members of the Congress voted against the Selective Service Law in 1940; they voted against the Lend-Lease Law in 1941; they voted against extension of Selective Service — which meant, against keeping our army together — in August, 1941, four months before Pearl Harbor; and they voted against repeal of crippling provisions of the Neutrality Act in November, 1941, when the Japanese were already assembling for their attack on Pearl Harbor.

I am quoting history to you. I am going by the record [the recorded vote.] And I am giving you the whole story and not merely a morsel here and a morsel there picked out of context in such a way that they distort the facts. I am giving you history as it has already been written.

No policy, foreign or domestic, is stronger than the men who put that policy to practice. The question of the men who will bring the foreign policy of this country to practice is in issue in this election — very much

in issue. It is in issue not in terms of partisan application, but in terms of sober, solemn facts - the facts that are on the record.

If the Republicans were to win control of the Congress in this election, inveterate isolationists would occupy positions of great influence and power.

I have already spoken of the ranking Republican member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Hiram Johnson.

Next to Senator Johnson, the most influential member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee would be Gerald P. Nye of North Dakota. He would also in all probability become chairman of the all powerful Senate Committee on Appropriations.

In the House of Representatives the man who is the present leader of the Republicans there, and who would be Speaker -- Joseph Martin of Massachusetts -- voted against the Repeal of the Arms Embargo in 1939, against the Lend-Lease Bill in 1941, against the extension of the Selective Service law in 1941, against the arming of merchant ships in 1941.

The Chairman of the all powerful Committee on Rules would be Hamilton Fish of New York.

These are fair examples of the voting records of important Republicans like Senators Taft of Ohio, Shipstead of Minnesota, Capper of Kansas, Vandenberg of Michigan, Danaher of Connecticut, Tobey of New Hampshire, Davis of Pennsylvania, Brooks of Illinois, Wiley of Wisconsin, Representatives Knutson

and Maas of Minnesota, Short of Missouri, Hoffman of Michigan, Dirksen
of Illinois, Taft and Reed of New York, Hays of Kansas, Wolcott of
Michigan, Halleck of Indiana and several others of their kind.

In other words ^{*majority of the*} the records of the ~~eight~~ ^{*majority of the*} Republicans now on the
Senate Foreign Relations Committee show where the Committee would stand
if the Republican Party were in control.

Invent (A) P15

And every one of these gentlemen
are now campaigning actively
for the Republican ticket in this
historic year of 1944.

[They were against extension of Selective Service 8 to 3.

They were against lifting the Arms Embargo 8 to 3.]

[Of course,] there have been Democrats in the isolationist camp but they have been distinctly in the minority and they have not attained positions of leadership, [as the voting record proves.] (F) P. 22

And I am proud of the fact that this Administration does not have the support of the isolationist press -- and I mean ^{old Guard} ~~specifically~~ the McCormick-Patterson-Hearst-Gannett press -- who have fought and continue

to fight against any form of international cooperation for peace. (S)

Insert (G) Page 22 Despite all the false prophets, the American people have shown great vision and great courage in facing the facts of this war.

Our nation is today the most powerful in the world. It is powerful not only because of its material strength, but because of its moral influences. [It is powerful because of what Mr. Willkie correctly called the reservoir of good will which we have built up for ourselves all over the world. It is powerful because other nations, east and west, trust us as a good neighbor.] large and small, on all continents

The moral, the political, the economic and the military power which this nation has attained has brought to us the responsibility and the opportunity for leadership in the community of nations. In our own best interest and in the name of peace and humanity, this nation cannot

Insert F P22
The

minority

Let us not beat around the bush.
Isolationism in the Democratic Party
is symbolized by ~~such persons as~~ Senator
Burton K. Wheeler, of Montana, and
Senator Robert R. Reynolds, of North
Carolina, and I sincerely hope that
~~neither of these gentlemen and none of~~
~~their supporters is voting for me in~~
~~this election.~~ do not want either
of these gentlemen to vote for me in
this election.

~~But I am not greatly worried about~~
~~the power~~

INSERT

⑧

122

The American people have gone through great national debates in the recent critical years. They were soul-searching debates. They reached from every city to every village and to every home.

In the year before the attack on Pearl Harbor we debated our principles and the challenge to aid those fighting for freedom, and to gird ourselves to defend our own freedom.

Obviously it was open to us not to aid those overwhelmed by the Hitler attack. We could have come to terms with Hitler and accepted a minor role in his totalitarian world. He would have welcomed us.

We could have compromised with Japan, and bargained for a place in a Japanese-dominated Asia by selling out the heart's blood of the Chinese people.

The decision not to bargain with the tyrants was not mine alone. It was a decision that rose from the hearts and souls and sinews of the American people. They faced reality, they appraised reality, and they knew what freedom meant, what it was worth and what, if need be, they were prepared to pay to preserve it.

and must not shirk that ~~role~~ responsibility.

[But despite our power and our influence, we cannot expect other peace-loving nations to give us a blank check to write the peace under which they, as well as we, must live. International cooperation is not a one way street, where the powerful dictate and impose their will on the weaker. Nor can we refuse to continue to cooperate merely because our judgment is not accepted as decisive on all matters.]

There are some ~~impatience-convicts~~ *structure of* who hope to see a ~~peace~~, completely set up ~~as~~ *the* a House of Many Mansions ~~the~~ moment this war ends, *immediately* with all the apartments assigned to everyone's satisfaction, with the telephones in, the plumbing complete *and the electric ice boxes* ~~the~~ frigidaire and the heating system functioning perfectly, all furnished with linen and silver -- and with the rent pre-paid.

The United Nations have not produced such a comfortable dwelling place -- and should not attempt to do so, overnight. But we have achieved expression of a common resolve, on the part of four great powers who are now united to wage this war, that they will embark together after the war on the greater and more difficult

enterprise of waging peace -- that they will embark on it in continuous consultation with the smaller states of the United Nations. It

is a declaration of intention before the world: the intention of the

Great States which must, of necessity, be the pillars of ~~that future~~ *the eternal*

House of Many Mansions, to make themselves its foundation stones.

Peace, like war, can only succeed through power. The peace of the world can only be preserved with the active and united energies of the great powers -- for the simple reason that world peace can only be drastically broken by the acts of one or another of the great powers.

The Council of the United Nations will be no more than a well-intentioned mockery unless it is given real power -- and that means power to act quickly and decisively to keep the peace by force if necessary. A policeman would not be a very effective policeman, if when he saw a felon break into a house, he had to go to the Town Hall and call a ~~Town~~ ^{Town} Meeting to issue a warrant before the felon could be arrested. [The principle is the same in the case of the Council, although of course the problem would not be quite so simple.]

18"

If the United States is represented ~~on~~ the United Nations ^{Council} [organisation] merely by a puppet, [who must report back to the Congress before making any commitment], then the United Nations organisation will fail. [Imagine, for example, the chaos that would result if your representative in the Congress had to report back to your State Legislature before committing himself to a decision.] We shall enter a peace organisation as a sovereign power, and therefore our representative in that organisation cannot legislate for us. Nevertheless, it is clear that, if such an organisation is to have any reality at all, he must be endowed with power to act — and that power must be granted by the people themselves, by constitutional means, through their representatives in the Congress.

[It is not contemplated that the Council should have a right to demand from us the use of any forces except those which we have undertaken to provide by treaty. Although voting arrangements have not been ^{Under no circumstances will we} agreed upon, there is no question that we will not be obligated to furnish forces if our representative votes against the application of force.

But so far as the charter itself is concerned, a vote of the Council to use force, in which the American delegate concurs, would and should commit our government to fulfil its ~~treaty~~ obligations with respect to the supplying of forces, ~~and the employment of force to preserve the peace is not and should not be regarded as an act of war.~~

2
The relation of the American delegate to the government of the United States is not a matter which can properly be dealt with in the treaty. It is a matter to be determined by the Constitution and statutes, present and future, of the United States. The American delegate would be appointed by the President subject to Senate confirmation. Thereafter he should function under the direction of the President within the framework of policy stipulated in the charter.

[Continued] Military cooperation, by itself, will not be enough to put down aggression. There must be continuing cooperation between all nations, large and small to create conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations. There must also be continuing cooperation to promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. [The ground work for such cooperation within the framework of the world organisation has been solidly prepared.]

Invent I

that is really "of the people
by the people, for the people" -

(with other peace-loving nations)

world and their use and conservation.]

The Dumbarton Oaks Conference did not spring up overnight. It was ~~another~~ ^{another} chapter in the long process of discussion and cooperation in which Cordell Hull and I have been engaged for years.

[Of course, for obvious reasons, many of the deliberations of these conferences have had to be surrounded with secrecy. That is ~~unavoidable~~ ^{unavoidable} inevitable in time of war - ~~and~~ ^{and} those who may be elected to guide this nation's destiny had better begin to learn now that there are certain functions of government in wartime which cannot be subject to the same white glare of publicity which descends upon ^{purely} political ~~conventions~~ ^{speech or a party}.

[For example.] When the charge was made in this campaign ^{that} I had neglected to send General MacArthur ^{adequate supplies} for political reasons, I could not answer that ignorant accusation - nor could General MacArthur - by citation of the facts; for had any of us replied with the full truth, we should have revealed information of intense ~~and~~ value to our Japanese enemies. And, in consequence, more American boys would have been killed in the landings on the Philippines.]

~~But~~ ^{But} ~~it is my profound conviction~~ ^{It is my profound conviction} that the American people as a whole have a complete understanding of these things. The American people know that Cordell Hull and I

are thoroughly conversant with the
Commission of the United States and that
we could not [even if we would] - commit
this nation to any secret treaties or any secret
guarantees or even any secret suggestions
which were in violation of that Commission.

And - speaking of our Commission - I ~~have~~
believe that the whole, historic process of its
adoption provides us with a very striking
and legitimate precedent for our present
negotiations.]

Our Commission, in its original form, was
admittedly far from ^{not} perfect. It was a
compact ^{- a compact} between thirteen colonies - and
we must not forget that in those days, in 1789,
New York was farther away in terms of travel
days from Richmond, Virginia, than Chicago
now is from Moscow.

When the [first draft of the] Commission was
submitted to the various States - The original
thirteen States - there was ~~unanimous agreement~~
~~entire unanimity~~ agreement upon fundamental
principles, but considerable argument about
details. [For instance, it was felt that the
Commission was deficient in one important
respect: it did not contain a Bill of Rights.]

[But the Commission, as drafted, was submitted
to the people with the "full faith and confidence"
that ~~it would contain a Bill~~ The ~~power~~ powers
of amendment ~~as~~ as provided would

that the promise was made good -

enable the addition of a Bill of Rights -
and we all know today, ~~after the war~~
~~that nothing is true~~ the Bill of Rights
was ~~actually~~ put into our Constitution.

The American people have repeatedly
displayed a supreme capacity for faith.
And over and over again - in the incredible
years of our American history - That faith
has been justified.

I believe - I have always believed - That
unity can be brought to this world by the
same essential processes which produced
this highly experimental nation.

I know - we all know - That the profound
ideas expressed in the Constitution of the
United States - ideas first expressed by
visionaries - are not mere idealistic dreams.
They are now proved to be among the most
important realizations of human history. They
are the Law - The Law by which 135 million
men, women and children, of many diverse creeds
and racial origins, have organized themselves
into the greatest, and most powerful nation
that the world has ever known.

Now let me say something that should be self-evident about the peace structure. It must depend on foundations that go deep into the soil of men's faith and men's hearts, otherwise it is worthless. There is no organization which because it is well-designed can of itself preserve peace. Only the unflagging will of man can preserve it. No president of the United States can make the American contribution to preserve the peace without the constant, alert and conscious collaboration of the American people. Only the determination of the people to use the machinery gives worth to the machinery. And it is only because the American people already have made up their minds on this great issue that ^{this} ~~the~~ Administration has been able to press forward confidently with its [^] plans. ^{Let} Let me say something else that should be self-evident. Unless the great powers who have worked together for victory continue to work together for the peace, there will be no peace. For if one of them, or more than one, proceeds on a road of expansion and conquest that already spells another world war. And in that event no peace organization can curb such a war. The very fact that we are at work on the organization of the peace proves that the great powers are committed to trust in each other. Put this proposition any way you will, it is bound to come out the same way: we either work with the other great powers, or we must be prepared some day to fight them.

172

We have made progress in developing plans for specialized institutions to cope with special problems. We have created the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization and the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Organization. We have prepared plans for a Monetary Fund and an International Reconstruction and Development Bank. We are about to hold, in Chicago, a conference of the United Nations to consider problems of civil aviation after the war. And we shall certainly extend the good work that has been done through the years by the International Labor Organization. We must also deal with the special problems of international communications.

To secure enduring peace the nations of the world must learn to live and work together so that all may have an opportunity to participate in the higher standards of living to be obtained through increased production, increased employment and increased world trade.

Each of these forward moves -- each of these conferences -- represents the building of another section in the massive structure of world peace -- the House of many Mansions.

It is an entirely new thing in human history that Allies could work together so closely, so harmoniously and effectively, in the fighting of a war and, at the same time, in the building of the peace.

[It would be the greatest tragedy in history if these same Allies were to fall out before the enormous job is done.]

When we think of a world organization for the preservation of peace and justice, we must think of that organization ~~not uni-~~
~~merely in terms of the national interest involved, but in terms~~
of human interests, human aspiration, human rights.

If this organization is cold-blooded and impersonal, it will fail, no matter how efficient its machinery may appear to be in the blueprints. ~~_____~~

The Nazi state, the Fascist state, the Japanese militarist state were all super-efficient. But they were all inhuman and that is why the "new World Order," as they envisaged it, could not possibly succeed, in France, or Norway, or the Philippines, or wherever else they tried to enforce it at the point of a gun.

The kind of world order which we the peace-loving nations must achieve, must depend essentially on friendly human relations, on tolerance, on unassailable sincerity and good will and good faith. We have achieved that relationship to a remarkable degree in our dealings with our allies in this war, as the events of the war have proved. If we fail to maintain that relationship in the peace — and expand it and strengthen it — then there will be no lasting peace.

Men cannot work together effectively in an atmosphere of mutual suspicion, distrust and fear. Such an atmosphere breeds quarrels between individuals and wars between nations.

For a century and a quarter, ever since the Monroe Doctrine, we have lived at peace with Great Britain and her Commonwealth and Empire. At least twice that peace has been threatened by disputes — during the administrations of Abraham Lincoln and Grover Cleveland — which could have developed into wars if representatives of both nations had not dealt with one another as decent, reasonable, reliable human beings who had a common desire to keep the peace.

DRAFT D

- 30 -

We have tried time and again to make the same friendly approach to Germany and Japan. We have failed — because those greedy nations did not want peace — they wanted war. And war is just what they got. (Δ)

In our future relationship with the Soviet Union, we shall be dealing with a nation which, I am firmly convinced, wants peace and needs peace. Russia has millions of untilled acres and vast undeveloped resources. She has suffered terrible loss of life and untold destruction to her cities and industrial centers. Russia has had enough of fighting; she needs to build — to develop — to raise the standard of living for 180 million people. She needs our friendship and our help.

The Chinese people — 450 millions of them — also have a tremendous job of reconstruction and development ahead of them. They also have emerged within living memory from the darkness of ancient tyranny. They also have seen great areas of their homeland overrun and despoiled by the invaders. They also need our friendship and our help.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

INSERT D - PAGE #30 (continue paragraph)

They have sown the wind
and reaped the whirlwind.

DRAFT D

- 31 -

If, by deeds as well as by words, we prove our good will
and our desire to cooperate, ^{the British,} the Russians and the Chinese will continue
to be our friends and our allies twenty years from now ~~— fifty years —~~

~~Second~~ *yes - generations from now.*

The alternative is to help Germany to re-arm as a protection
against Russia in Europe and to help Japan to re-arm as a protection
against China in Asia. Such an alternative, of course, would represent
a policy of suicidal insanity — and that policy cannot even be con-
sidered by the American people or by their government.

Those who would stir up trouble, and promote mistrust and fear,
as between ourselves and our allies, are prolonging this war and are
sowing the seeds of another and even more disastrous war.

Insert 9

As for Germany — that tragic nation which has brought to
mankind and to itself so much suffering and so much death — we and
our Allies are entirely agreed that we shall not bargain with the
Nazi conspirators, or give them a shred of any concession which leaves
them in control, openly or covertly, of the instruments of government.

We shall not leave to them any elements of military power.

Janet
We salute the reborn Republic
of ~~France~~ French Republic -
the our oldest friend and our
first ally. And We have
played our part in driving
the Savals out of France - we
shall play our parts in driving
the Swishings out of all the other
gallant countries ^{which} ~~also~~ have
been occupied ~~by~~ and
dominated by the Nazis. ⁷⁹ ~~With~~
all of these nations we ~~shall~~
pledge our friendships and goodwill.

We shall not leave to them the technical equipment and installations which constitute a part of military power in a technical age.

Nor shall we ~~permit them to rebuild~~ ^{permit them to rebuild} the war plants ~~and installations~~ which the Allied air forces have so largely destroyed.

I should be false to the very foundations of my religious and political convictions, if I should ever relinquish the hope and even the faith that in all peoples, without exception, there live some instinct for truth, some attraction toward justice, and some passion for peace, buried as they may be in the German case under a brutal and alas not unpopular regime. ^{We} ~~I~~ ^{we} bring no charge against the German race, as such, for ~~I~~ ^{we} cannot believe that God has eternally condemned any race of humanity. ^{I am on our own land} ~~For we know how many~~

Many good men and women of German ancestry ~~have amongst us and~~ have proved absolutely loyal, freedom-loving, peace-loving citizens. ~~Unfortunately the best traits of the German race, in the last hundred years, seem to have developed outside of Germany.~~

763

~~[But I am not going to accept anything as a reality merely on hope and faith.]~~ There is going to be stern punishment for those ^{in Germany} directly responsible for this agony of mankind. The German people are not going to be enslaved — because the United Nations do not traffic in human slavery. But they will certainly have to work their way back into the fellowship of peace-loving and law-abiding nations. And in their climb up that steep road, we shall certainly see to it that they are not encumbered by having to carry guns. They will be relieved of that burden — *in hope however.*

Insert K → [And we must realize, too, that the ending of the recurrent German menace depends, above all, upon the continuing solidarity between Great Britain, France, the smaller European States, the Soviet Union, and ourselves. Germany must never again be able to play one off against the other.]

[Are we, the most powerful nation, going to accept this greatest challenge in all history — to do our part to create a better world for ourselves and all mankind? Or are we going to recoil again into a selfish and short-sighted isolationism which will create economic unrest at home and abroad and sow the seeds of future wars?]

Insert
K

If to Dr. Goebbels these words threaten the German people with slavery, then for Dr. Goebbels there is no freedom which is not tyranny over others, and the only freedom he knows is the freedom to wage aggressive war. All the men and women of the world, who have not been touched by the concepts of a master race and made mad by the lusts of domination, are determined to deny that freedom for aggression to the German people, the Japanese people, or any other clique or conspiracy in the family of nations.

It is in this sense that our war aim of unconditional surrender is an essential preliminary to our plans for the future world. I know I express the faith and the wisdom of the American people in

[Oh yes, it is said that the peace is a non-partisan affair.

And so it was said in 1920.]

The task ahead of us will not be easy. Indeed it will be as difficult and complex as any task which has ever faced an American administration.

I will not say to you now or ever that we of my party know all the answers. I am certain, for myself, that I do not know how all the foreseeable difficulties can be met. All I can say to you is this -- that I have unlimited faith that the job can be done -- and that faith is based on knowledge gained in the arduous, practical and continuing experience of these past eventful years.

[I assure you as solemnly as I can that only one consideration moved me to accept the renomination for the Presidency tendered to me last July by my party and that was to omit no effort on my part to see that what happened in 1920 shall not happen again.]

I speak to the present generation of Americans with reverent participation in its sorrows and in its hopes. No generation has undergone a greater test, nor has met the test with greater heroism and greater wisdom, and no generation has had a more exalted mission. For this

generation must act not only for itself, but as a trustee for all those who fell in the last war, their mission tragically unfulfilled. It must act also for all who have paid the supreme price in this war, lest their mission be betrayed. And finally it must act for the generations to come, which must be granted a heritage of peace.

I do not exaggerate that mission. We are not fighting for, and we shall not achieve, ^{Utopia.} ~~perfection~~. Indeed, in our own land, the work to be done is never finished -- that is one of the glories of our country -- and we have yet to realize the full and equal enjoyment of our freedoms. So in embarking on the building of a world fellowship we have set ourselves to a long and arduous task, which will challenge ~~intelligence, imagination, our imagination~~ ^{intelligence}, our patience, our ~~spirit~~ ^{spirit}, our ~~unity~~ ^{unity}, as well as our faith.

That task requires the judgment of a seasoned and a mature people. And this the American people have become. ^{that (P)} We shall not again be thwarted in our will to live as a mature nation, confronting limitless horizons. We shall bear our full responsibility, exercise our full influence, and bring our full help and encouragement to all who aspire to peace and freedom.

DRAFT D

- 36 -

We now are and we shall continue to be strong brothers
in the family of mankind — the family of *the children of* God.

1

Tonight I am speaking as a guest of the Foreign Policy Association -- a distinguished organization composed of Americans of all shades of political opinion.

I know that your membership is made up of men and women who take an interest in the whole world -- who believe the fundamental principle of the interdependence of all nations -- that what pulls one nation down, may pull all the other nations down; and that what brings one nation to better things, may bring those better things to all other nations.

What I am about to say to you comes from a long experience, and an intimate acquaintance with the leaders and with the problems of many lands.

I am going to talk quite frankly about the Foreign Policy of the United States.

I am going to talk about the record of the past -- the record of both parties -- and I am going to talk about our American plans for the future.

Nearly a quarter of a century ago I shared in a presidential campaign dedicated to the maintenance of an enduring world peace. Twenty-four years have not changed my convictions.

SECOND DRAFT

- 2 -

Why to just build the war, and build,

I believed then -- I believe now -- that enduring peace in the world has not a chance unless this nation is willing to cooperate in winning it and maintaining it. I thought then -- I know now -- that we have to back our words with deeds.

We are now fighting again to save our freedom and to help organize a world in which future generations may live in freedom.

This year the United Nations have won tremendous victories all over the world. The Allied plans for the war against Germany and Japan have been magnificently carried out by the commanders of the field and by the fighting men in all the armies, navies and air forces.

As I speak to you tonight, our forces have effected a landing in the Philippine Islands. When General MacArthur left the Philippines in a speed boat, he announced that he would be back. Our army - our navy - indeed our whole nation are in the process of fulfilling that pledge.

We all know the tremendous increase in the number of our merchant and fighting ships, but we may not appreciate the tremendous build-up which has been going on constantly in the Pacific of our ground and air forces. We have an invincible armada of carrier and land base.

- almost from the very beginning ✓

planes operating all the way from Hawaii to the Philippines. And I can tell you tonight that our ground forces in the Pacific, now run over two million men -- they are trained to the hilt -- they know how to fight the treacherous Japs - and MacArthur and Nimitz will take them to Tokyo.

and there was in France and Italy -
 These same fighting men know how hard and bitter battles are still to be fought before our enemies are brought to total defeat.

Some people believed that, when Paris was liberated, the war in Europe was just about over. This view was not shared by Hitler and his Nazis -- nor for that matter by General Marshall, Admiral King or me.

Hitler and the Nazis continue the fight -- desperately, inch by inch, and may continue to do so all the way to Berlin.

And we have another important engagement to keep -- in Tokyo. We shall keep it no matter how long or hard the road we must travel.

But -- even in the midst of fighting this war, and of winning it -- we look to the peace that will follow it. We plan for that peace, with the determination that it shall not be merely another twenty-five year armistice.

We Americans, quite naturally and properly, think of that peace in our own American terms.

how to conduct our foreign policy and check our course to an enduring peace.

The leaders of this nation have always held that concern for our national security does not end at our borders. President Monroe proclaimed it more than a century ago; and he and every American President following him were prepared to use force, if necessary, to assure the independence of other American nations. [Only in that way could the United States be secure to enjoy peace in this hemisphere.]

The principle has not changed, though the world has. Wars are no longer fought from horseback, or from the decks of sailing ships.

It was with recognition of that fact that in 1933 we took as the basis for our foreign relations, the Good Neighbor policy -- the principle of the neighbor who because he resolutely respect himself, equally respects the rights of others; the neighbor who respects his obligations and the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors.

[I am a little saddened by those who pay little attention to the Good Neighbor policy. Most people, however, think back to 1933. They realize that the United States and its citizens were disliked and feared by a large portion of the Latin American Republics. We were unpopular and we might as well admit it. Under the leadership of Secretary Hull, their attitude toward us changed. He and the American people were so obviously sincere that the people of the other Republics came to believe in us.]

In Central and South America today I hear only one doubt: Will future administrations of the United States live up to the Good Neighbor Policy. That is the only point at which they cross their fingers. And in the light of what has happened since 1933, it amuses us just a little when it is intimated that this policy had its origin under a long list of former Republican Administrations.

We and the other American republics have made the Good Neighbor policy real in this hemisphere. It is our conviction that this policy can be and should be made universal. That is the basis on which Secretary Hull and I have conducted our affairs with Russia, Britain, China, and other peace-loving nations.

At inter-American conferences beginning at Montevideo in 1933, and continuing down to date we have made it clear to this hemisphere, that we practice what we preach.

Through the policy of joint action in matters of common concern, the safety and security of this hemisphere were preserved in the hour of its greatest danger, and -- God willing -- will be preserved for generations to come.

Our action in 1934 with respect to Philippine independence was another step in making good the same philosophy which animated the Good Neighbor policy. [We know how the Filipino people have fought for their freedom in this war, and are proud that we have helped this great people to achieve nationhood.]

The Philippines have progressed from the status of territorial possessions to that of a self-governing Commonwealth. When the Japanese have been driven from those Islands, they will become an independent Republic.

As I have said on a previous occasion, the example of the Philippines provides a pattern for handling the problems of other peoples throughout the world, who seek to develop themselves for the responsibility of self-government.

[I cite another early action of this Administration in the field of Foreign Policy which I do not regret. That was the recognition in 1933 of Soviet Russia.]

For sixteen years before then the American people and the Russian people had no practical means of communicating with each other. We re-established those means. And today we are fighting with the Russians against common foes -- and we know that the Russian contribution to victory has been, and will continue to be, gigantic.

As I said two years ago, "I like to think
that the history of the Philippine Islands
in the last forty-four years ^(P)
provides — in a very real
sense a pattern for the
future of other small nations
and peoples of the world. It is a pattern
of what men of good-will look
forward to in the future."

However, certain politicians now very prominent in the Republican Party, have condemned our recognition; and one of them went so far as to state in ^{my this past recognition} 1940:

"In so far as the present Administration has adhered to the policies of its predecessors it has met with the general approval of the American people. But it has occasionally strayed from the path. A conspicuous and most unfortunate departure was the recognition by the New Deal of Soviet Russia.

Interjected He went on to say:
"At last, I think our Administration will stop trying to make deals with Russia. We need no such partnerships. With the world as it is today, we can afford no more fussy-minded departures from the established course of our foreign policy."

I must confess that this Administration made more than one departure from the policies of the three preceding administrations.

It was they who [nominated Warren G. Harding in 1920 and] sur-
dered the hopes of Woodrow Wilson for a world organization for peace.
But then, as now, the isolationist Old Guard professed to be enthusiastic ^{during election time}
about international cooperation.

They then assured the American people that they favored an Association of Nations -- which would be stronger and more workable than the League. While campaigning for votes in 1920 Harding said that ^{he} *formed with all his heart and* this Association of Nations ^{should be} "so organized and so participated in as to make the actual attainment of peace a reasonable possibility."

And, he added, "Such an Association I favor with all my heart."

However, after Harding's election, the Association of Nations was never heard of again. The isolationists scuttled the whole concept of world organization which had seemed so dear to Harding's heart before Election Day.

One of the leading ^{isolationists} Republicans who killed international co-operation in 1920 was Senator Hiram Johnson. In the event of Republican victory this year -- 1944 -- that same Senator Johnson would be Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

During the twelve years which followed 1921 the foreign policy of the Republican Administrations was dominated by the heavy hand of isolationism.

Much of the strength of our Navy was scuttled; and some of the Navy's resources were handed over to friends in private industry like Teapot Dome.

Tariff walls went higher and higher, blocking international trade.

There was snarling at our former Allies -- and at the same time encouragement was given to American finance to invest 2½ billion dollars in Germany, our former enemy.

All petitions that this nation join in the World Court were

rejected or ignored.

There were various conferences, to be sure - with expression of good intentions and pious hopes. But there was never a suggestion that this nation would contribute anything more tangible than noncommittal words to the maintenance of world peace.

This Administration came to power in 1933;

Instead of high tariffs, in 1934 we instituted a series of reciprocal trade agreements under a statute of Congress. The Republicans opposed these agreements and tried to stop the extension of the law every three years.

In 1935 I asked the Congress to join the World Court - but Republican opposition in the Senate prevented us from obtaining the necessary two-thirds majority.

In 1937 I asked that aggressor nations be quarantined -- and for this I was branded by isolationist Republicans in and out of public office as an alarmist and war-monger.

From that time on, I made clear by repeated messages to the American Congress and by repeated statements to the American people the danger threatening from abroad and the need of reacting to meet it.

In July 1939 I tried to obtain a repeal of the Arms Embargo in the Neutrality Law which so tied our hands against helping the Allies, that Hitler was relying upon it in starting his war upon Europe. ^P But it was made plain to Mr. Hull and me that, because of the isolationists, we could not possibly hope to attain the desired revision of the Neutrality Law.

This fact was also made plain to Adolf Hitler. Six weeks later he brutally attacked Poland -- and the second world war had begun.

During those some twelve years, Hitler was rising to power, Mussolini was fortifying his Fascist state and the Japanese were establishing in Asia and on many islands the bases from which to attack China and the Philippines and America itself.

These days -- and I am now speaking of October, 1944 -- I hear many voices on the air shouting accusations against me for my "failure" to prepare this nation for this war -- for my "failure" to warn the American people of the approaching tragedy.

But I cannot forget -- and I do not think that the American people can forget, either -- that these same voices were not audible five years ago -- or even four years ago -- giving warning of the grave peril which we then faced.

In fact, many of those same voices were then joining in the isolationist chorus, condemning me as "alarmist" and "war monger," and attributing hysteria to those of us who entertained the idea that any totalitarian state, separately or collectively, would attempt to attack the United States.

There have been and there are in the Republican Party distinguished men and women of vision and courage both in and out of public office, who have consistently opposed isolationism. They vigorously supported our aid to our Allies and all the measures that we took to build up our national defense. And many of these Republicans have rendered distinguished services to our country in this war as members of the Congress and of this Administration. I am happy that one of these distinguished Americans is sitting here at this table tonight - our great Secretary of War - Henry Stimson.

But - it is the plain fact that the leadership of such people has been repudiated by the isolationist Old Guard which is now in control of the Republican Party - just as solidly as it was in control in the days of Harding.

Politicians who embraced the policy of isolationism -- or who never raised their voices against it in days of peril -- are not reliable custodians of America's future.

While this Administration was trying to point out the dangers

from abroad and trying to arm the United States, what were the present Republican leaders doing?

It seems incredible when we listen to them now -- but the record will show that with rare exceptions they fought us -- they fought us on the floors of the Congress. They fought us in the columns of the newspapers which they owned or controlled, [and they fought us in sponsored programs over the air] -- they fought us in every effort which we made for peace and for [adequate] national defense, and for a sound international economic policy.]

The majority of the Republican members of the Congress voted against the Selective Service Law in 1940; *they voted against repeal of the arms embargo in 1940;* they voted against the Lend-Lease Law in 1941; they voted in August, 1941, against extension of Selective Service -- which meant, against keeping our army together -- four months before Pearl Harbor; and they voted against *Arming of our merchant ships* [repeal of crippling provisions of the Neutrality Act] in November, 1941, [when the Japanese were already assembling for their attack on Pearl Harbor.]

I am quoting history to you. I am going by the record. And I am giving you the whole story and not merely a *phrase* [snip] here and a *phrase* [snip] there picked out of context in such a way that they distort the facts. I am giving you history as it has already been written.

[No policy, foreign or domestic, is stronger than the man who put that policy to practice.]² The question of the man who will bring the foreign policy of this country to practice is in issue in this election - very much in issue. It is in issue not in terms of partisan application, but in terms of sober, solemn facts - the facts that are on the record.

If the Republicans were to win control of the Congress in this election, inveterate isolationists would occupy positions of ^{dominating} great influence and power.

I have already spoken of the ranking Republican member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Hiram Johnson.

Next to Senator Johnson, the most influential member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee would be Gerald P. Nye of North Dakota. He would ^{ad}also in all probability ^{the}become chairman of the all powerful Senate Committee on Appropriations. - *would be Gerald P. Nye.*

In the House of Representatives the man who is the present leader of the Republicans there, and who would be Speaker -- Joseph Martin of Massachusetts -- voted against the Repeal of the Arms Embargo in 1939, against the Lend-Lease Bill in 1941, against the extension of the Selective Service law in 1941, against the arming of merchant ships in 1941.

The Chairman of the all powerful Committee on Rules would be
Hamilton Fish ^[of New York.]

These are fair examples of the voting records of important
Republicans like Senators Taft of Ohio, Shipstead of Minnesota, ^[Copper]
of Kansas, Vandenberg of Michigan, Danaher of Connecticut, Tobey of New
Hampshire, Davis of Pennsylvania, Brooks of Illinois, Wiley of Wisconsin,
Representatives Knutson and Mann of Minnesota, Short of Missouri, Hoffman
of Michigan, Dirksen of Illinois, Taber and Reed of New York, Hope of
Kansas, Walcott of Michigan, Halleck of Indiana and several others of
their kind.

~~Here is a list of the names of the men who are now supporting slavery~~
~~for the Republican ticket in this historic year of 1944.~~ (A)

There have been Democrats in the isolationist camp but they
have been ^{few and far between} distinctly in the minority and they have not attained posi-
tions of leadership. } ^{fortunately}

Let us not beat around the bush. Isolationist minority in
the Democratic Party is symbolized by Senator Burton K. Wheeler, of
Montana, and Senator Robert E. La Follette, of North Carolina, and I do
not want either of these gentlemen to vote for me in this election.

to support me

① p 14

There are ~~several~~ ^{many} others like them in the Congress of the United States every one of whom is now actively campaigning for the National Republican ticket this year.

Can any one really suppose that these isolationists have changed their minds about world affairs?

And I am proud of the fact that this Administration does not have the support of the Old Guard isolationist press -- and I mean specifically the McCormick-Patterson-Hearst-Gannett, Scripps-Howard press -- who have fought and continue to fight against any form of international cooperation for peace.

The American people have gone through great national debates in the recent critical years. They were soul-searching debates. They reached from every city to every village and to every home.

In the year before the attack on Pearl Harbor we debated our principles and the challenge to aid those fighting for freedom, and to gird ourselves to defend our own freedom.

Obviously it was open to us not to aid those overwhelmed by the Hitler attack. We could have come to terms with Hitler and accepted a minor role in his totalitarian world. He would have welcomed us.

We could have compromised with Japan, and bargained for a place in a Japanese-dominated Asia by selling out the heart's blood of the Chinese people.

The decision not to bargain with the tyrants was not mine alone. It was a decision that rose from the hearts and souls and sinews of the American people. They faced reality, they appraised reality, and they knew what freedom meant, what it was worth and what, if need be, they were prepared to pay to preserve it.

[Our nation is today the most powerful in the world. It is powerful not only because of its material strength, but because of its moral influences. It is powerful because other nations, large and small, on all continents see, and do, trust us as a good neighbor.]

^{being - the}
The moral, the political, the economic and the military power — which this nation has attained has brought to us the responsibility and with it the opportunity for leadership in the community of nations. In our own best interest and in the name of peace and humanity, this nation cannot and must not shirk that responsibility.

There are some who hope to see a structure of peace, completely set up immediately, with all the apartments assigned to everyone's satisfaction, with the telephones in, the plumbing complete, the heating system and the electric ice boxes functioning perfectly, all furnished with linen and silver — and with the rent pre-paid.

The United Nations have not ^{yet} produced such a comfortable dwelling place. [— and should not attempt to do so, overnight.] But we have achieved expression of a common resolve, on the part of four great powers who are not united to wage this war, that they will embark together after the war on the greater and more difficult

enterprise of waging peace, ^{the} that they will embark on it in continuous consultation with the ^{all} smaller states of the United Nations. It is a declaration of intention before the world: the intention of the great states which must, of necessity, be the pillars of the eternal House of Many Mansions, to make themselves its foundation stones.

Peace, like war, can only succeed through power. The peace of the world can only be preserved with the active and united energies of the great powers -- for the simple reason that world peace can only be drastically broken by the acts of one or another of the great powers.

The Council of the United Nations will be no more than a well-intentioned mockery unless it is given real power -- and that means power to act quickly and decisively to keep the peace by force if necessary. A policeman would not be a very effective policeman, if when he saw a felon break into a house, he had to go to the Town Hall and call a town meeting to issue a warrant before the felon could be arrested.

[If the United States is represented on the United Nations council merely by a puppet, then the United Nations organization will fail.]

ten days ago
Our objective, as I stated ~~on October 12 of this year~~, is to complete the organization of the United Nations without delay and before the hostilities actually cease.

We shall enter a peace organization as a sovereign power, and therefore our representative in that organization cannot legislate for us. Nevertheless, it is clear that, if such an organization is to have any reality at all, he must be endowed with power to act -- and that power must be granted by the people themselves, by constitutional means, through their representatives in the Congress.

Under no circumstances will we be obligated to furnish forces if our representative votes against the application of force. But so far as the charter itself is concerned, a vote of the Council to use force, in which the American delegate concurs, would and should commit our government to fulfill ^{its} obligations *which the Congress has placed upon it* with respect to the supplying of forces.

[Military cooperation, by itself, will not be enough to put down aggression. There must be continuing cooperation between all nations, large and small to create conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations. There must also be continuing cooperation to promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.]

Insert (A)

[This has been a people's war -- and it must be followed by a people's peace. That profound belief has been the basis of my own thinking, and of Cordell Hull's thinking, in every conference that we have held -- in my first conference with Mr. Churchill on the Atlantic Ocean in the summer of 1941 -- and in every subsequent conference in which the representatives of this nation have taken part.

The conception of a people's peace -- a peace that is really "of the people, by the people, for the people" -- that has been the cornerstone of the whole structure that we have been planning and that we have actually started to build.]

The Dumbarton Oaks Conference did not spring up overnight. (B)

It was ^{rather} a chapter in the long process of discussion and cooperation with other peace-loving nations *beginning with the Atlantic*

It is my profound conviction that the American people as a whole have a complete understanding of these things. The American people know that Cordell Hull and I are thoroughly conversant with the Constitution of the United States and that we could not commit this nation to any secret treaties or any secret guarantees or ~~even~~

Charter Conference, the scope and continuing through the Conferences at Casablanca, Moscow, Cairo, Tishan and Quebec and Washington.

Ap. 19

When the armies are drawn back, and bombers no longer go out, and the cannon are silent, and the ships come home, there will still be peoples, and nations, trying to live together.

We cannot attain our great objectives by ourselves. Never again can this country, at its own pleasure, move in and out of the community of nations. Never again, after cooperating with other nations in a world war to save our way of life, can we wash our hands of maintaining the peace for which we fought.

~~#~~ (B) p. 19

It was called by Secretary Hull and me after
years of thought, discussion, ~~and~~ preparation and
consultation with our Allies.

any secret suggestions which were in violation of that Constitution.

[And -- speaking of our Constitution -- I believe that the whole, historic process of its adoption provides us with a very striking and legitimate precedent.

Our Constitution, in its original form, was admittedly not perfect. It was a compact -- a charter -- between thirteen colonies -- and we must not forget that in those days, in 1789, New York was farther away in terms of travel days from Richmond, Virginia, than Chicago now is from Moscow.

When the Constitution was submitted to the various States -- the original thirteen States -- there was agreement upon fundamental principles, but considerable argument about

details. *It was however ratified with full faith that by amendment*

The American people have perpetually displayed a supreme capacity for faith. And over and over again -- in the incredible years of our American history -- that faith has been justified.

I believe -- I have always believed -- that unity can be brought to this world by the same essential processes which produced this highly experimental nation.

I know -- we all know -- that the profound ideas expressed in the Constitution of the United States -- ideas first expressed by visionaries -- are not mere idealistic dreams. They are now proved to be among the most important realities of human history. They are the law. The law by which 130 million men, women and children, of many diverse creeds and racial origins, have organized themselves into the greatest and most powerful nation that the world has ever known.

Now let me say something that should be self-evident about the peace structure. It must depend on foundations that go deep into the soil of man's faith and man's hearts, otherwise it is worthless.

There is no organization which because it is well-designed can of itself preserve peace. Only the unflagging will of man can preserve it.

No President of the United States can make the American

contribution to preserve the peace without the constant, alert and conscious collaboration of the American people. Only the determination of the people to use the machinery gives worth to the machinery. [And it is only because ^{we believe that} the American people ^{and} already have made up their minds on this great issue; ~~that~~ this Administration has been able to press forward confidently with its plans.

Let me say something else that should be self-evident. Unless the great powers who have worked together for victory continue to work together for the peace, there will be no peace. For if one of them, or more than one, proceeds on a road of expansion and conquest that already spells another world war. And in that event no peace organization can curb such a war. The very fact that we are at work on the organization of the peace proves that the great powers are committed to trust in each other. Put this proposition any way you will, it is bound to come out the same way: we either work with the other great powers, or we must be prepared some day to fight them.

It is an entirely new thing in human history that Allies could work together so closely, so harmoniously and effectively, in the fighting of a war and, at the same time, in the building of the peace.

[When we think of a world organization for the preservation of peace and justice, we must think of that organization in terms of human interests, human organization, human rights.]

[If this organization is cold-blooded and impersonal, it will fail, no matter how efficient its machinery may appear to be in the blueprints.

The Nazi state, the Fascist state, the Japanese militarist state were all super-efficient. But they were all inhuman and that is why the "new World Order," as they envisaged it, could not possibly succeed, in France, or Norway, or the Philippines, or wherever else they tried to enforce it at the point of a gun.]

The kind of world order which we the peace-loving nations must achieve, must depend essentially on friendly human relations, on tolerance, on unassailable sincerity and good will and good faith. We have achieved that relationship to a remarkable degree in our dealings with our allies in this war, as the events of the war have proved. If we fail to maintain that relationship in the peace -- and expand it and strengthen it -- then there will be no lasting peace.

[Men cannot work together effectively in an atmosphere of mutual suspicion, mistrust and fear. Such an atmosphere breeds quarrels between individuals and wars between nations.]

For a century and a quarter, ever since the Monroe Doctrine, we have lived at peace with Great Britain and her Commonwealth and Empire. [At least twice that peace has been threatened by disputes — during the administrations of Abraham Lincoln and Grover Cleveland — which could have developed into wars if representatives of both nations had not dealt with one another as decent, reasonable, reliable human beings who had a common desire to keep the peace.]

We have tried time and again to make the same friendly approach to Germany and Japan. We have failed — because those greedy nations did not want peace — they wanted war. And war is just what they got. They have sown the wind and reaped the whirlwind.

In our future relationship with the Soviet Union, we shall be dealing with a nation which, I am firmly convinced, wants peace and needs peace. Russia has millions of untilled acres and vast undeveloped resources. She has suffered terrible loss of life and untold destruction to her cities and industrial centers. Russia has had enough of fighting; she needs to build — to develop — to raise the standard of living for 150 million people. She needs our friendship and our help.

The Chinese people — 450 millions of them — also have a tremendous job of reconstruction and development ahead of them. They also have emerged within living memory from the darkness of ancient tyranny. They also have seen great areas of their homeland overrun and despoiled

by the invaders. They also need our friendship and our help.

If, by deeds as well as by words, we prove our good will and our desire to cooperate, the British, the Russians and the Chinese will continue to be our friends and our allies twenty years from now -- *yes -- generations from now. ^P And they all can help us too!*

[The alternative is to help Germany to re-arm as a protection against Russia in Europe and to help Japan to re-arm as a protection against China in Asia. Such an alternative, of course, would represent a policy of suicidal insanity -- and that policy cannot even be considered by the American people or by their government.]

[Those who would stir up trouble, and promote mistrust and fear, as between ourselves and our allies, are prolonging this war and are sowing the seeds of another and even more disastrous war.]

[We salute the reborn French Republic -- our oldest friend and our first ally.] We have played our part in driving the Germans out of France. *We* shall play our parts in driving the Quislings out of all the other gallant countries which have been occupied and dominated by the Nazis. ^{To} All of these nations we pledge our friendship and goodwill.

As for Germany -- that tragic nation which has brought to mankind

and the Fascists out of Italy

SECOND DRAFT

- 26 -

and to itself so much suffering and so much death -- we had our Allies are entirely agreed that we shall not bargain with the Nazi conspirators, or give them a shred of any concession which leaves them in control, openly or covertly, of the instruments of government.

We shall not leave to them any elements of military power-- or of potential power.

[We shall not leave to them the technical equipment and installations which constitute military power in a technical age.

Nor shall we permit them to rebuild the war plants which the Allied air forces have so largely destroyed.]

(26)

But I should be false to the very foundations of my religious and political convictions, if I should ever relinquish the hope and even the faith that in all peoples, without exception, there live some instinct for truth, some attraction toward justice, and some passion for peace, buried as they may be in the German case under a brutal [and also not unpopulal] regime. *P* We bring no charge against the German race, as such, for we cannot believe that God has eternally condemned any race of humanity. For we know in our own land how many men and women of German ancestry have proved loyal, freedom-loving, peace-loving citizens.

There is going to be stern punishment for those in Germany directly responsible for this agony of mankind. The German people are

not going to be enslaved -- because the United Nations do not traffic in human slavery. But they will [certainly] have to work their way back into the fellowship of peace-loving and law-abiding nations. And in their climb up that steep road, we shall certainly see to it that they are not encumbered by having to carry guns. They will be ^{relieved} ~~burdened~~ of that burden: -- we hope forever.

[If to Dr. Goebbels these words threaten the German people with slavery, then for Dr. Goebbels there is no freedom which is not tyranny over others, and the only freedom he knows is the freedom to wage aggressive war. All the men and women of the world, who have not been touched by the concepts of a master race and made mad by the lusts of domination, are determined to ^{that} ~~deny~~ freedom for aggression to the German people, the Japanese people, or any other clique or conspiracy in the family of nations.]

The task ahead of us will not be easy. Indeed it will be as difficult and complex as any task which has ever faced an American administration.

I will not say to you now or ever that we of my party know all the answers. I am certain, for myself, that I do not know how all the ^{un}foreseeable difficulties can be met. All I can say to you is this -- that I have unlimited faith that the job can be done -- and that faith is based on knowledge gained in the arduous, practical and continuing

experience of these past eventful years.

I speak to the present generation of Americans with reverent participation in its sorrows and in its hopes. No generation has undergone a greater test, nor has met the test with greater heroism and greater wisdom, and no generation has had a more exalted mission. For this generation must act not only for itself, but as a trustee for all those who fell in the last war, their mission tragically unfulfilled. It must act also for all who have paid the supreme price in this war, lest their mission be betrayed. And finally it must act for the generations to come, which must be granted a heritage of peace.

I do not exaggerate that mission. We are not fighting for, and we shall not achieve, Utopia. Indeed, in our own land, the work to be done is never finished -- that is one of the glories of our country -- and we have yet to realize the full and equal enjoyment of our freedoms. So in embarking on the building of a world fellowship we have set ourselves to a long and arduous task, which will challenge our patience, our intelligence, our imagination, as well as our faith.

That task requires the judgment of a seasoned and a mature people. And this the American people have become. [Insert F - copy not attached] We shall not again be thwarted in our will to live as a

nature nation, confronting limitless horizons. We shall bear our full responsibility, exercise our full influence, and bring our full help and encouragement to all who aspire to peace and freedom.

We now are and we shall continue to be strong brothers in the family of mankind -- the family of the children of God.

- - - - -

Tonight I am speaking as a guest of the Foreign Policy Association -- a distinguished organization composed of Americans of all shades of political opinion.

I know that your membership is made up of men and women who take an interest in the whole world -- who believe the fundamental principle of the interdependence of all nations -- that what pulls one nation down, may pull all the other nations down; and that what brings one nation to better things, may bring those better things to all other nations.

[What I am about to say to you comes from a long experience, and an intimate acquaintance with the leaders and with the problems of many lands.]

I am going to talk ~~quite frankly~~ about the Foreign Policy of the United States. *from the Monroe doctrine to the Chicago Tribune.*

I am going to talk about the record of the past -- the record of both parties -- and I am going to talk about our American plans for the future.

When the first World War was ended, I believed -- I believe now -- that enduring peace in the world has not a chance unless this nation is willing to cooperate in winning it and maintaining it. I thought then -- I know now -- that we have to back our words

Answer
TA

Mount
of A

I am talking without rancor or
snap judgement.

I am speaking without losing my
temper or losing my head

with deeds.

Insert A
We are now fighting again to save our freedom and to help
organize a world in which future generations may live in freedom.

This year the United Nations have won tremendous
victories all over the world.

As I speak to you tonight, our forces have effected
a landing in the Philippine Islands. When General MacArthur
left the Philippines in a speed boat, he announced that he would
be back. Our army -- our navy -- indeed our whole nation are
in the process of fulfilling that pledge.

Cont
We all know the tremendous increase in the number of
our merchant and fighting ships, but we may not appreciate the
tremendous build-up of our ground and air forces which has
been going on constantly in the Pacific -- almost from the
very beginning. We have an invincible armada of carrier and
land based planes operating all the way from Hawaii to the
Philippines. And I can tell you tonight that our ground and
air forces in the Pacific, now run over two million men --
they are trained to the hilt -- they know how to fight the
treacherous Japs -- and MacArthur and Nimitz will take them to
Tokyo.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

INSERT A - PAGE #2

A quarter of a century ago we helped to save our freedom but we failed to organize a world in which future generations could live in freedom. Opportunity knocks again. There is no guarantee that it will knock a third time.

Our *all over the world*
~~These are~~ fighting men - ~~and these now in France and Italy -~~
that many
 know ~~how~~ hard and bitter battles are still to be fought before our
 enemies are brought to total defeat.

Hitler and the Nazis continue the fight -- desperately, inch
 by inch, and may continue to do so all the way to Berlin.

Insist → And we have another important engagement to keep -- in Tokyo.
 We shall keep it no matter how long or hard the road we must travel.

Insist → But -- even in the midst of fighting this war, and of
 winning it -- we have to conduct our foreign policy and chart our
 course to an enduring peace.

The leaders of this nation have always held that concern for
 our national security does not end at our borders. President Monroe
 proclaimed it more than a century ago; and he and every American
 President following him were prepared to use force, if necessary,
 to assure the independence of other American nations *threatened by*
aggressors from across the seas.

The principle has not changed, though the world has. Wars
 are no longer fought from horseback, or from the decks of sailing
 ships.

It was with recognition of that fact that in 1933 we took as
 the basis for our foreign relations, the Good Neighbor policy -- the
 principle of the neighbor who because he resolutely respects himself,
 equally respects the rights of others; the neighbor who respects his

(Insert
B)
engagement in Tokyo
no 76 And we have another important
the matter how long or hard
the road we ~~too~~ must travel, our
forces will fight their way there under
the leadership of MacArthur and Nimitz.

Insert
C

All of our thinking about foreign policy ~~and~~ in this war must be conditioned by the fact that ^{millions of} our American boys are today fighting, many thousands of miles from home, for the defense and the perpetuation of our American ideals.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

obligations and the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors.

We and the other American republics have made the Good Neighbor policy real in this hemisphere. It is our conviction that this policy can be, and should be, made universal. That is the basis on which Secretary Hull and I have conducted our affairs with Russia, Britain, China, and other peace-loving nations.

At inter-American conferences beginning at Montevideo in 1933, and continuing down to date we have made it clear to this hemisphere, that we practice what we preach.

Through the policy of joint action in matters of common concern, the safety and security of this hemisphere were preserved in the hour of its greatest danger, and -- God willing -- will be preserved for generations to come.

Our action in 1934 with respect to Philippine independence was another step in making good the same philosophy which animated the Good Neighbor policy.

The Philippines have progressed from the status of territorial possessions to that of a self-governing Commonwealth. When the Japanese have been driven from those Islands, they will become an independent Republic.

~~As I have said on a previous occasion, the~~

THIRD DRAFT

-5-

Philippines provides a pattern for handling the problems of other peoples throughout the world, who seek to develop themselves for the responsibility of self-government.

As I said two years ago: "I like to think that the history of the Philippine Islands in the last forty-four years provides in a very real sense a pattern for the future of other small nations and peoples of the world. It is a pattern of what men of goodwill look forward to in the future".

For sixteen years before then the American people and the Russian people had no practical means of communicating with each other. We re-established those means. And today we are fighting with the Russians against common foes -- and we know that the Russian contribution to victory has been, and will continue to be, gigantic.

However, certain politicians now very prominent in the Republican Party have condemned our recognition; and one of them went so far as to say this [about recognition] in 1940:

"In so far as the present Administration has adhered to the policies of its predecessors it has met with the general approval of the American people. But it has occasionally strayed from the path. A conspicuous and most unfortunate departure was the recognition by the New Deal of Soviet Russia

He went on to say:

"At last, I think our Administration will stop trying to make deals with Russia. We need no such partnerships. With the world as it is today, we can afford no more fuzzy-minded departures from the established course of our foreign policy."

Invent Page 3
24

I cite another early action
in the field of foreign policy of
which I am proud. That was
the recognition in 1933 of Soviet
Russia

~~I must confess that this Administration made more than one departure from the policies of the three preceding administrations.~~

~~It was they who murdered the hopes of Woodrow Wilson for a world organization for peace.~~ *after the last war in the campaign of 1920* But then, as now, the isolationist

Old Guard professed [during election time] to be enthusiastic about international cooperation.

While campaigning for votes in 1920 ^{President} Harding said that he favored with all his heart an Association of Nations "so organized and so participated in as to make the actual attainment of peace a reasonable possibility."

^{President} However, after Harding's election, the Association of Nations was never heard of again.

One of the leading isolationists who killed international cooperation in 1920 was Senator Hiram Johnson. In the event of Republican victory this year -- 1944 -- that same Senator Johnson would be Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

During the twelve years which followed 1921 the foreign policy of the Republican Administrations was dominated by the heavy hand of isolationism.

Much of the strength of our Navy was scuttled; - and some of the Navy's resources were handed over to friends in private industry *as in the unforgettable case of - the Teapot Dome.*

Tariff walls went higher and higher - blocking international trade.

There was smugling at our former Allies and at the same time encouragement was given to American finance to invest 2½ billion dollars in Germany, our former enemy.

All petitions that this nation join in the World Court were rejected or ignored.

This Administration ^{took office} [came to power] in 1933.

Instead of high tariffs, we instituted in 1934 a series of reciprocal trade agreements under a statute of the Congress. The Republicans opposed these agreements and tried to stop the extension of the law every three years.

In 1935 I asked the Congress to join the World Court ^(A) ~~E~~ -- but Republican opposition in the Senate prevented us from [obtaining the necessary two-thirds majority.

In 1937 I asked that aggressor nations be quarantined -- and for this I was branded by isolationist [Republicans] in and out of public office as an "alarmist" and "war-monger."

^{as you well know,}
From that time on, I made clear by repeated messages to the American Congress and by repeated statements to the American people the danger threatening from abroad -- and the need of rearming to meet it.

In July 1939 I tried to obtain a repeal of the Arms Embargo in the Neutrality Law which so tied our hands against helping the Allies, that Hitler was relying upon it in starting his war upon Europe.

2/3

(A) p. 7

For

~~More than two-thirds~~
~~of the Dem~~

The Democrats voted
back it 43 to 20. The
Republicans voted against
it 14 to 9. Thus we
were prevented from

(B) ~~It~~ ^{was} made plain to Mr. Hull and me that, because of the isolationists, ^{etc.} we could not possibly hope to attain the desired revision of the Neutrality Law.

This fact was also made plain to Adolf Hitler. Six weeks later he brutally attacked Poland -- and the second world war had begun.

During those same twelve years, Hitler was rising to power, Mussolini was fortifying his fascist state ~~and the Japanese were establishing in Asia and on many islands the bases from which to attack China and the Philippines and America itself.~~

These days -- and I am now speaking of October, 1944 -- I hear ~~the~~ voices on the air ^{attacking} [shouting accusations against] me for my "failure" ^{to prepare this nation for this war -- see my "critique"} to warn the American people of the approaching tragedy ^{and}

[But I cannot forget -- and I do not think that the American people can forget, either --] ^{is so} that these same voices were not audible five years ago -- or even four years ago -- giving warning of the grave peril which we then faced.

In fact, ^{one} ~~many~~ of those same voices [were then joining in the isolationist chorus, condemning me as "alarmist" and "war-monger," and attributing hysteria to those of us who entertained the idea ^{attributed} that ~~any totalitarian state, separately or collectively, would attempt to attack the United States.~~ ^{Germany, Italy, or Japan contemplated war upon us.} (C.)

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

INSERT B - PAGE 5 - TOP OF PAGE

The late Senator Borah told
a group ^{who I called together} ~~gathered~~ in the White House,
that his ^{own private} information was better
than that of the State Department --
and that there would be no war in
Europe. (~~CONFIDENTIAL~~)

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

INSERT C - BOTTOM OF PAGE #8

expounded this idea
And I am told that the ^{very man who} ~~author of these~~
~~sentences~~ would, if the Republicans
were victorious, become the new
American Secretary of State.

~~(Break up previous sentence)~~

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

INSERT D - PAGE #9

P Let us remember that this very war might have been averted in time if Europe had listened to, and if the Republican Administration of President Hoover had backed up the great effort of Secretary of State Stimson in 1931, to clamp down on the Japanese rape of Manchuria at the moment it was started.]

if Mr. ~~Stimson~~ Stimson's
views had prevailed when,
~~in~~ in 1931, ~~the~~ the
Japanese attacked Manchuria.

There have been and there are in the Republican Party distinguished men and women of vision and courage both in and out of public office, who have consistently opposed isolationism. They vigorously supported our aid to our Allies and all the measures that we took to build up our national defense. And many of these Republicans have rendered ^{magnificent} ~~distinguished~~ services to our country in this war as members of the Congress and of this Administration. I am happy that one of these distinguished Americans is sitting here at this table tonight -- our great Secretary of War -- Henry Stimson.

But -- it is the plain fact that the leadership of such people has been repudiated by the isolationist Old Guard which is now in control of the Republican Party -- just as solidly as it was in control in the days of Harding.

Politicians who embraced the policy of isolationism -- or who never raised their voices against it in days of peril -- are not reliable custodians of America's future.

[While this Administration was trying to point out the dangers from abroad and trying to arm the United States, what were the present Republican leaders doing?

It seems incredible when we listen to them now -- but the record will show that with rare exceptions they fought us -- they

[fought us on the floors of the Congress -- they fought us in the columns of the newspapers which they owned or controlled, -- they fought us in every effort which we made for peace and for national defense.]

The majority of the Republican members of the Congress voted against the Selective Service Law in 1940; they voted against repeal of the Arms Embargo in ¹⁹³⁹1940; they voted against the Lend-Lease Law in 1941; ^{and} they voted in August, 1941, against extension of Selective Service -- which meant, against keeping our army together -- four months before Pearl Harbor; ~~and they~~
~~voted against arming of our merchant ships in November, 1941~~

I am quoting history to you. I am going by the record.

And I am giving you the whole story and not merely a phrase here ^{half} and a phrase there picked out of context in such a way that they distort the facts. [I am giving you history as it has already been written.]

The question of the men who will bring the foreign policy of this country to practice is in issue in this election -- very much in issue. It is in issue not in terms of partisan application, but in terms of sober, solemn facts -- the facts that are on the record.

~~If~~ If the Republicans were to win control of the Congress in this election, inveterate isolationists would occupy positions of commanding influence and power.

I have already spoken of the ranking Republican member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Hiram Johnson.

~~Next to Senator Johnson~~, ^{the most} influential member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee ~~and also, in all probability,~~ ^{and also, in all probability,} the chairman of the ~~the~~ powerful Senate Committee on Appropriations -- ^{is Senator} ~~would be~~ Gerald P. Nye.

In the House of Representatives the man who is the present leader of the Republicans there, and who would be Speaker -- Joseph W. Martin of Massachusetts -- voted against the Repeal of the Arms Embargo in 1939, against the Lend-Lease Bill in 1941, against the extension of the Selective Service law in 1941, against the arming of merchant ships in 1941, and against the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act ^{of 1938} and their extension in 1937 and 1940.

THIRD DRAFT

- 12 -

The Chairman of the ~~and~~ powerful Committee on Rules would be Hamilton Fish.

~~These are fair examples of the voting records of important Republicans like Senators Taft of Ohio, Shipstead of Minnesota, Vandenberg of Michigan, Danaher of Connecticut, Tobey of New Hampshire, Davis of Pennsylvania, Brooks of Illinois, Wiley of Wisconsin, Representatives Knutson and Mads of Minnesota, Short of Missouri, Hoffman of Michigan, Dirksen of Illinois, Taber and Reed of New York, Hope of Kansas, Wolcott of Michigan, Halleck of Indiana and several others of their kind.~~

There are many others like them in the Congress of the United States every one of whom is now actively campaigning for the national Republican ticket this year.

Can anyone really suppose that these isolationists have changed their minds about world affairs?

There have been Democrats in the isolationist camp but they have been few and far between, and, ~~consequently~~, they have not attained positions of leadership. [I do not want any of them to vote for me or to support me in this election.]

THIRD DRAFT

- 13 -

And I am proud of the fact that this Administration does not have the support of the isolationist press — and I mean specifically the McCormick-Patterson-Hearst-Gannett, ~~Washington-Herald~~ press [who have fought and continue to fight against any form of international cooperation for peace.]

The American people have gone through great national debates in the recent critical years. They were soul-searching debates. They reached from every city to every village and to every home.

[In the year before the attack on Pearl Harbor] We debated our principles and ^{our determination} ~~the challenge~~ to aid those fighting for freedom, [and to gird ourselves to defend our own freedom.]

Obviously it was open to us not to aid those ^{threatened} ~~overwhelmed~~ by the Hitler attack. We could have come to terms with Hitler, and accepted a minor role in his totalitarian world. He would have welcomed us.

We could have compromised with Japan, and bargained for a place in a Japanese-dominated Asia by selling out the heart's blood of the Chinese people.

The decision not to bargain with the tyrants [was not mine alone. It was a decision that] rose from the hearts and souls and sinews of the American people. They faced reality; they appraised reality; and they knew what freedom meant, [what it was worth and what, if need be, they were prepared to pay to preserve it.]

The power -- the moral, the political, the economic and the military power -- which this nation has attained has brought to us the responsibility and with it the opportunity for leadership in the community of nations. In our own best interest, and in the name of peace and humanity, this nation cannot ^{and will not} ~~and~~ must not shirk that responsibility.

There are some who hope to see a structure of peace, completely set up immediately, with all the apartments assigned to everyone's satisfaction, with the telephones in, the plumbing complete, the heating system and the electric ice boxes functioning perfectly, all furnished with linen and silver -- and with the rent pre-paid.

The United Nations have not yet produced such a comfortable dwelling place. But we have achieved expression of a common resolve, on the part of four great ^{nations} powers who are ~~not~~ ^{now} united to wage this war, that they will embark together after the war on the greater and more difficult enterprise of waging peace. We will embark on it with all the ~~member~~ ^{- large number of} states of the United Nations, [It is a declaration of intention before the world; the intention of the great states which must, of necessity, be the pillars of the eternal House of Many Mansions, to make themselves its foundation stones.]

Our objective, as I stated ten days ago, is to complete the organization of the United Nations without delay and before the hostilities actually cease.

Peace, like war, can only succeed ^(A) through power. [The peace of the world can only be preserved with the active and united energies of the great ^{nations} powers — for the simple reason that world peace can only be drastically broken by the acts of one or another of the great ^{nations} powers.]

The Council of the United Nations [will be no more than a well-intentioned mockery unless it is given real power -- and that ^{must have the} power to act quickly and decisively to keep the peace by force,

JK

A

where there is a
will to enforce it, ~~and~~
where ^{there} is available ~~power~~
power to enforce it

if necessary. A policeman would not be a very effective policeman, if when he saw a felon break into a house, he had to go to the Town Hall and call a town meeting to issue a warrant before the felon could be arrested.

We shall enter a peace organization as a sovereign power; and therefore our representative in that organization cannot legislate for us. Nevertheless, it is clear that, if such an organization is to have any reality at all, ^{representative in advance} ~~it~~ must be endowed with power to act -- and that power must be granted by the people themselves, by constitutional means / through their representatives in the Congress ^{with authority to act.}

Under no circumstances will we be obligated to furnish forces if our representative votes against the application of force. But ^{So} far as the charter itself is concerned, ^{decision} a vote of the Council to use force, in which the American delegate concurs, would and should commit our government to fulfill the obligations which the Congress has placed upon it with respect to the supplying of forces.

When the armies are drawn back, and bombers no longer go out, and the cannon are silent, and the ships come home, there will still be peoples, and nations, trying to live together.

We cannot attain our great objectives by ourselves. Never again can this country, at its own pleasure, move in and out of the community of nations. Never again, after cooperating with other nations in a world war to save our way of life, can we wash our hands of maintaining the peace for which we fought.

The Dumbarton Oaks Conference did not spring up overnight. It was called by Secretary Hull and me after years of thought, discussion, preparation and consultation with our Allies. It was another chapter in the long process of discussion and cooperation with other peace-loving nations — beginning with the Atlantic Charter Conference, and continuing through the Conferences at Casablanca, Moscow, Cairo, Teheran, Quebec and Washington.

It is my profound conviction that the American people as a whole have a complete understanding of these things. The American people know that Cordell Hull and I are thoroughly conversant with the Constitution of the United States and that we could not commit this nation to any secret treaties or any secret guarantees ~~on any~~ ~~secret suggestions~~ which were in violation of that Constitution.

E

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

INSERT E - PAGE #17

After my return from Teheran,
I stated officially that no secret
commitments had been made. The issue
then is between my veracity and the
continuing assertions of those who
have no responsibility in the
foreign field -- or perhaps I should
say -- a field foreign to them.

The peace structure must depend on foundations that go deep into the soil of men's faith and men's hearts, otherwise it is worthless.

There is no organization which because it is well-designed can of itself preserve peace. Only the unflagging will of man can preserve it.

No President of the United States can make the American

contribution to preserve the peace without the constant, alert and conscious collaboration of the American people. Only the determination of the people to use the machinery gives worth to the machinery. We believe that the American people have already made up their minds on this great issue; and this Administration has been able to press forward confidently with its plans.

Let me say something else that should be self-evident. [Unless the great powers who have worked together for victory continue to work together for the peace, there will be no peace. For if one of them, or more than one, proceeds on a road of expansion and conquest that already spells another world war. And in that event no peace organization can curb such a war.] The very fact that we are at work on the organization of the peace proves that the great powers are committed to trust in each other. Put this proposition any way you will, it is bound to come out the same way: we either work with the other great powers, or we must be prepared some day to fight them.

It is an entirely new thing in human history that Allies could work together so closely, so harmoniously and effectively, in the fighting of a war and, at the same time, in the building of the peace.

The kind of world order which we the peace-loving nations

must achieve, must depend essentially on friendly human relations,
on acquaintance.
on tolerance, on unassailable sincerity and good will and good faith.

We have achieved that relationship to a remarkable degree in our dealings with our allies in this war, as the events of the war have proved. If we fail to maintain that relationship in the peace -- and expand it and strengthen it -- then there will be no lasting peace.

For a century and a quarter, ever since the Monroe Doctrine, we have lived at peace with Great Britain and her Commonwealth and Empire.

[We have tried time and again to make the same friendly approach to Germany and Japan. We have failed -- because those greedy nations did not want peace -- they wanted war. And war is just what they got. They have sown the wind and reaped the whirlwind.]

[In our future relationship with the Soviet Union, we shall be dealing with a nation which, I am firmly convinced, wants peace and needs peace. Russia has millions of untilled acres and vast undeveloped resources. She has suffered terrible loss of life and untold destruction to her cities and industrial centers. Russia has had enough of fighting: she needs to build -- to develop -- to raise the standard of living for 180 million people. She needs our friendship and our help.]

The Chinese people -- 450 millions of them -- also have a tremendous job of reconstruction and development ahead of them. They also have emerged within living memory from the darkness of ancient tyranny. They also have seen great areas of their homeland overrun and despoiled by the invaders. They also need our friendship and our help.

If, by deeds as well as by words, we prove our good will and our desire to cooperate, the British, the Russians and the Chinese will continue to be our friends and our allies twenty years from now -- yes -- generations from now.

~~And they all can help us too!~~

We have played our part in driving the Germans out of France and the Fascists out of Italy. We shall play our parts in driving the Quislings out of all the other gallant countries which have been occupied and dominated by the Nazis. To all of these nations we pledge our friendship and goodwill.

As for Germany -- that tragic nation which has brought to mankind and to itself so much suffering and so much death -- *down the wind* *and is now reaping the whirlwind* -- we and our Allies are entirely agreed that we shall not bargain with the Nazi conspirators, or give them a shred of any concession which leaves them in control, openly or covertly, of the instruments of government.

We shall not leave to them any elements of military power -- or of potential power.

But I should be false to the very foundations of my religious and political convictions if I should ever relinquish the hope and even the faith that in all peoples, without exception, there live some instinct for truth, some attraction toward justice, and some passion for peace, buried as they may be in the German case under a brutal regime.

We bring no charge against the German race, as such, for we cannot believe that God has eternally condemned any race of humanity. For we know in our own land how many men and women of German ancestry have proved loyal, freedom-loving, peace-loving citizens.

There is going to be stern punishment for those in Germany directly responsible for this agony of mankind. The German people are not going to be enslaved -- because the United Nations do not traffic in human slavery. But they will have to work their way back into the fellowship of peace-loving and law-abiding nations. And in their climb up that steep road, we shall certainly see to it that they are not encumbered by having to carry guns. They will be relieved of that burden: -- we hope forever.

The task ahead of us will not be easy. Indeed it will be as difficult and complex as any task which has ever faced an American administration.

I will not say to you now or ever that we of my party know all the answers. I am certain, for myself, that I do not know how all the unforeseeable difficulties can be met. All I can say to you is this -- that I have unlimited faith that the job can be done -- and that faith is based on knowledge gained in the arduous, practical and continuing experience of these past eventful years.

I speak to the present generation of Americans with reverent participation in its sorrows and in its hopes. No generation has undergone a greater test, nor has met the test with greater heroism and greater wisdom, and no generation has had a more exalted mission. For this generation must act not only for itself, but as a trustee for all those who fell in the last war, ^{to finish} their mission ~~unsuccessfully~~ unfulfilled. It must act also for all who have paid the supreme price in this war, lest their mission be betrayed. And finally it must act for the generations to come, which must be granted a heritage of peace.

I do not exaggerate that mission. We are not fighting for, and we shall not achieve, Utopia. Indeed, in our own land, the work to be done is never finished — that is one of the glories of our country — and we have yet to realize the full and equal enjoyment of our freedoms. So in embarking on the building of a world fellowship we have set ourselves to a long and arduous task, which will challenge our patience, our intelligence, our imagination, as well as our faith.

That task requires the judgment of a seasoned and a mature people. And this the American people have become. We shall not again be thwarted in our will to live as a mature nation, confronting limitless horizons. We shall bear our full responsibility, exercise our full influence, and bring our full help and encouragement to all who aspire to peace and freedom.

We now are and we shall continue to be strong brothers in the family of mankind — the family of the children of God.

177

Tonight I am speaking as a guest of the Foreign Policy Association -- a distinguished organization composed of Americans of all shades of political opinion.

[I know that your membership is made up of men and women who take an interest in the whole world -- who believe the fundamental principle of the interdependence of all nations -- that what pulls one nation down, may pull all the other nations down; and that what brings one nation to better things, may bring those better things to all other nations.]

I am going to talk about the Foreign Policy of the United States from the Monroe doctrine to the Chicago Tribune.

I am going to talk about the record of ^{our foreign policy in} the past -- the record of both parties -- and I am going to talk about our American plans for the future.

I am talking without rancor or snap judgment.

I am speaking without losing my temper or losing my head.

When the first World War was ended, I believed -- I believe now -- that enduring peace in the world has not a chance unless this nation is willing to cooperate in winning it and maintaining it. I thought then -- I know now -- that

we have to back our words with deeds.

A quarter of a century ago we helped to save our freedom but we failed to organize a world in which future generations could live in freedom. Opportunity knocks again. There is no guarantee that it will knock a third time.

[Our fighting men -- all over the world -- know that many hard and bitter battles are still to be fought before our enemies are brought to total defeat.]

Hitler and the Nazis continue the fight -- desperately, inch by inch, and may continue to do so all the way to Berlin.

And we have another important engagement in Tokyo. No matter how long or hard the road we must travel, our forces will fight their way there under the leadership of MacArthur and Nimitz.

All of our thinking about foreign policy in this war must be conditioned ^{by} ~~as~~ the fact that millions of our American boys are today fighting, many thousands of miles from home, for the defense and the ^{of our country} perpetuation of our American ideals.

And here are still many hard and bitter battles to be fought.

FOURTH DRAFT

- 3 -

The leaders of this nation have always held that concern for our national security does not end at our borders. President Monroe proclaimed it more than a century ago; and he and every American President following him were prepared to use force, if necessary, to assure the independence of other American nations threatened by aggressors from across the seas.

The principle has not changed, though the world has. Wars are no longer fought from horseback, or from the decks of sailing ships.

It was with recognition of that fact that in 1933 we took as the basis for our foreign relations, the Good Neighbor policy -- the principle of the neighbor who because he resolutely respects himself, equally respects the rights of others. [the neighbor who respects his obligations and the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors.]

We and the other American republics have made the Good Neighbor policy real in this hemisphere. It ^{is} our conviction that this policy can be, and should be, made universal. [That is the basis on which Secretary Hull and I have conducted our affairs with Russia, Britain, China, and other peace-loving nations.]

151

At inter-American conferences beginning at Montevideo in 1933, and continuing down to date, we have made it clear ^{throughout the world} to this hemisphere, that we practice what we preach.

Through the policy of joint action in matters of common concern, the safety and security of this hemisphere were preserved in the hour of its greatest danger, and -- God willing -- will be preserved for generations to come.]

Our action in 1934 with respect to Philippine independence was another step in making good the same philosophy which animated the Good Neighbor policy.

The Philippines have progressed from the status of territorial possessions to that of a self-governing Commonwealth. When the Japanese have been driven from those islands, they will become an independent Republic.

As I said two years ago: "I like to think that the history of the Philippine Islands in the last forty-four years provides in a very real sense a pattern for the future of other small nations and peoples of the world. It is a pattern of what men of good will look forward to in the future".

I cite another early action in the field of foreign policy of which I am proud. That was the recognition in 1933 of Soviet Russia

For sixteen years before then the American people and the Russian people had no practical means of communicating with each other. We re-established those means. And today we are fighting with the Russians against common foes -- and we know that the Russian contribution to victory has been, and will continue to be, gigantic.

However, certain politicians, now very prominent in the Republican Party, have condemned our recognition, ~~and one of them went so far as to say this in 1949:~~

A

~~In so far as the present Administration has adhered to the policies of its predecessors it has met with the general approval of the American people. But it has occasionally strayed from the path. A conspicuous and most unfortunate departure was the recognition by the New Deal of Soviet Russia~~

~~He went on to say:~~

~~"At last, I think our Administration will stop trying to make deals with Russia. We need no such partnerships with the world as it is today, we can afford no more fuzzy-minded departures from the established course of our foreign policy."~~

Letter (A) p. 5.

I am impelled to wonder how Russia would have survived against German attacks without American aid during these past years. if these same people had had their way.

We are now fighting this war as allies of the Russians. We intend to remain their allies in peace.

After the last war ^{in the} ^{political} campaign of 1920, the isolationist Old Guard professed to be enthusiastic about international cooperation.

While campaigning for votes in 1920, ^{Senator} ~~President~~ Harding said that he favored with all his heart an Association of Nations "so organized and so participated in as to make the actual attainment of peace a reasonable possibility."

However, after President Harding's election, the Association of Nations was never heard of again.

One of the leading isolationists who killed international cooperation in 1920 was Senator Hiram Johnson. In the event of Republican victory ^{in the Senate} this year -- 1944 -- that same Senator Johnson would be Chairman of the Senate Foreign

Relations Committee. *I know the American voters will bear that in mind.*

During ~~the~~ ^{the} years which followed 1920, the foreign policy of the Republican Administrations was dominated by the heavy hand of isolationism.

Much of the strength of our Navy was gutted; -- and some of the Navy's resources were handed over to friends in private industry -- as in the unforgettable case of the Teapot Dome.

Tariff walls went higher and higher -- blocking international trade.

There was snarling at our former Allies and at the same time encouragement was given to American finance to invest 2½ billion dollars in Germany, our former enemy.

All petitions that this nation join in the World Court were rejected or ignored.

This Administration took office in 1933.

Instead of high tariffs, ^{the State Department, under the leadership of Henry Kissinger} ~~was~~ instituted in 1934 a series of reciprocal trade agreements under a statute of the Congress. The Republicans opposed these agreements and tried to stop the extension of the law every three years.

In 1935 I asked the Congress to join the World Court. The Democrats voted for it 43 to 20. The Republicans voted against it 14 to 9. Thus we were prevented from obtaining the necessary two-thirds majority.

In 1937 I asked that aggressor nations be quarantined -- and for this I was branded by isolationists in and out of public office as an "alarmist" and "war-monger."

From that time on, as you well know, I made clear by repeated messages to the American Congress and by repeated statements to the American people the danger threatening from abroad -- and the need of rearming to meet it.

In July 1939 I tried to obtain a repeal of the Arms Embargo in the Neutrality Law which so tied our hands against helping the Allies, that Hitler was relying upon it in starting his war upon Europe.

The late Senator Borah told a group which I called together in the White House, that his own private information was better than that of the State Department -- and that there would be no war in Europe.

And it was made plain to Mr. Hull and me that, because of the isolationist vote, we could not possibly hope to attain the desired revision of the Neutrality Law.

This fact was also made plain to Adolf Hitler. Six weeks later he brutally attacked Poland -- and the second World War had begun.

These days -- and I am now speaking of October, 1944 -- I hear voices on the air attacking me for my "failure" to prepare this nation for this war and to warn the American people of the approaching tragedy.

(A)

~~We are now fighting this war as allies of the Russians. We intend to remain their allies in peace.~~

In 1941, this Administration proposed and the Congress passed, ~~in~~ in spite of isolationist opposition, ~~the~~ the Lend-Lease Law — a practical and dramatic notice to the world that we intended to help those nations resisting aggression.

194

These same voices were not so very audible five years ago -- or even four years ago -- giving warning of the grave peril which we then faced.

In fact, one of those same voices attributed hysteria to those of us who entertained the idea that Germany, Italy or Japan contemplated war upon us. And I am told that the very man who expounded this idea would, if the Republicans were victorious, become the new American Secretary of State.

There have been ^{still} and there are, in the Republican Party distinguished men and women of vision and courage both in and out of public office, who have consistently opposed isolationism. They vigorously supported our aid to our Allies and all the measures that we took to build up our national defense. And many of these Republicans have rendered magnificent services to our country in this war as members ~~of the Congress and of~~ of this Administration. I am happy that one of these distinguished Americans is sitting here at this table tonight -- our great Secretary of War -- Henry Stimson.

Let us remember that this very war might have been averted, if Mr. Stimson's views had prevailed when, in 1931, the Japanese attacked Manchuria.

103

STET

The majority of the Republican members of the Congress voted against the Selective Service Law in 1940; they voted against repeal of the Arms Embargo in 1939; they voted against the Lend-Lease Law in 1941 and they voted in August, 1941, against extension of Selective Service -- which meant, against keeping our army together -- four months before Pearl Harbor.

I am quoting history to you. I am going by the record. And I am giving you the whole story and not merely a phrase here and half a phrase there picked out of context in such a way that they distort the facts.



Sheet A p. ~~100~~ 10.

I happen to believe that, even in a political campaign,
we should all obey that ancient injunction -- Thou shalt not
bear false witness against thy neighbor.

198

The question of the men who will bring the foreign policy of this country to practice is in issue in this election -- very much in issue. It is in issue not in terms of partisan application, but in terms of sober, solemn facts -- the facts that are on the record.

~~_____~~ ~~_____~~

If the Republicans were to win control of the Congress in this election, inveterate isolationists would occupy positions of commanding influence and power.

I have already spoken of the ranking Republican member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Hiram Johnson.

One of the most influential members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, a man who would also be the chairman of the powerful Senate Committee on Appropriations -- is Senator Gerald P. Nye.

In the House of Representatives the man, who is the present leader of the Republicans there, and who would be Speaker -- ^{is} Joseph W. Martin ^{a leader of the isolationists. He} voted against the Repeal of the Arms Embargo, ~~in 1939~~, against the Lend-Lease Bill, ~~in 1941~~, against the extension of the Selective Service law, ~~in 1941~~, against the arming of merchant ships, ~~in 1941~~, and against the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act ~~of 1934~~ and their extensions, ~~in 1937 and 1940~~.

-12-

none other than
 The Chairman of the powerful Committee on Rules would
 be Hamilton Fish.

There are many others like them in the Congress of the
 United States ~~every~~ ^{and} ~~one~~ ^{them} is now actively campaigning
 for the national Republican ticket this year.

Can anyone really suppose that these isolationists
 have changed their minds about world affairs?

There have been Democrats in the isolationist camp
 but they have been few and far between, and they have not
 attained positions of leadership.

*The
 Polibians who embraced the
 policy of isolationism - or who
 never raised their voices against
 it in our days of peril - are not
 reliable custodians of the future
 of America.*

168

And I am proud of the fact that this Administration does not have the support of the isolationist press -- and I mean specifically the McCormick-Patterson-Hearst-Gannett press.

The American people have gone through great national debates in the recent critical years. They were soul-searching debates. They reached from every city to every village and to every home.

We debated our principles and our determination to aid those fighting for freedom.

Obviously it was open to us not to aid those threatened by the Hitler attack. We could have come to terms with Hitler, and accepted a minor role in his totalitarian world. [He would have welcomed us.] *We rejected that!*

We could have compromised with Japan, and bargained for a place in a Japanese-dominated Asia by selling out the heart's blood of the Chinese people. *And we rejected that!*

The decision not to bargain with the tyrants rose from the hearts and souls and sinews of the American people. They faced reality; they appraised reality; and they knew what freedom meant.

182

The power -- the moral, the political, the economic and the military power -- which this nation has attained has brought to us the responsibility, and with it the opportunity for leadership in the community of nations. In our own best interest, and in the name of peace and humanity, this nation cannot, must not, and will not shirk that responsibility.

There are some who hope to see a structure of peace, completely set up immediately, with all the apartments assigned to everyone's satisfaction, with the telephones in, the plumbing complete, the heating system and the electric ice boxes functioning perfectly, all furnished with linen and silver -- and with the rent pre-paid.

The United Nations have not yet produced such a comfortable dwelling place. But we have achieved ^{a very practical} expression of a common ^{purpose} ~~purpose~~, on the part of four great nations who are now united to wage this war, that they will embark together after the war on ^a ~~the~~ greater and more difficult enterprise ^{— That} of waging peace. We will embark on it with all the states ~~of the United Nations~~ -- large and small.

peace-loving nations of the world - large and small.

FOURTH DRAFT

- 15 -

Our objective, as I stated ten days ago, is to complete the organization of the United Nations without delay and before ~~the~~ hostilities actually cease.

Peace, like war, can only succeed where there is a will to enforce it, and where there is available power to enforce it. The peace of the world can only be preserved with the active and united energies of the great nations -- for the simple reason that world peace can only be drastically broken by the acts of one or another of the great nations.

The Council of the United Nations must have the power to act quickly and decisively to keep the peace by force, if necessary. A policeman would not be a very effective policeman, if when he saw a felon break into a house, he had to go to the Town Hall and call a town meeting to issue a warrant before the felon could be arrested.

~~We shall enter a peace organization as a sovereign power, and therefore our representatives in that organization cannot legislate for us. Unquestionably, it is clear that, if~~

~~such an organization is to have any reality at all, our representative must be endowed in advance by the people themselves, by constitutional means through their representatives~~

stat

stat

Not ~~in the Congress, with authority to act.~~

So far as the charter itself is concerned, a decision of the Council to use force, in which the American delegate concurs, would and should commit our government to fulfill the obligations which the Congress has placed upon it, with respect to the supplying of forces.

~~When the armies are drawn back, and bombers no longer go out, and the cannon are silent, and the ships come home, there will still be peoples, and nations, trying to live together.~~

If we do not catch the idea when we
have our hands on him, if we let the
house down down because the House Council
has not ~~passed an ordinance~~ ^{passed an ordinance} ~~relaying the~~ ^{relaying the}
~~not~~ ^{not} ~~passed an ordinance~~ ^{passed an ordinance} ~~relaying the~~ ^{relaying the}
use of the fire department, then we are not
doing our share to prevent another world war
and the people of the nation want the their
government ~~to act, and not merely to talk,~~ ^{to act, and not merely to talk,}
~~in such an event~~

FOURTH DRAFT

-17-

We cannot attain our great objectives by ourselves. ~~Never~~
~~again see this country, at its own pleasure, move in and out of~~
~~the community of nations.~~ Never again, after cooperating with
other nations in a world war to save our way of life, can we wash
our hands of maintaining the peace for which we fought.

The Dumbarton Oaks Conference did not spring up overnight.
It was called by Secretary Hull and me after years of thought,
discussion, preparation and consultation with our Allies. It was
another chapter in the long process of ~~discussion and~~ cooperation
with other peace-loving nations -- beginning with the Atlantic
Charter Conference, and continuing through the Conferences at
Casablanca, Moscow, Cairo, Teheran, Quebec and Washington.

It is my profound conviction that the American people as a
whole have a ^{very real} ~~complete~~ understanding of these things. The American
people know that Cordell Hull and I are thoroughly conversant with
the Constitution of the United States and that we ^{know} ~~could~~ not commit
this nation to any secret treaties or any secret guarantees which
^{are} ~~were~~ in violation of that Constitution.

After my return from Teheran, I stated officially that no
secret commitments had been made. The issue then is between my
veracity and the continuing assertions of those who have no

(The State Department ~~lost~~ of the Minutes States did a
magnum, but got in preparing for any for the Conference and leading it to
a successful termination.)

responsibility in the foreign field -- or perhaps I should say -- a field foreign to them.

The peace structure ^{which we are building} must depend on foundations that go deep into the soil of men's faith and men's hearts [^] otherwise it is worthless.

[There is no organization which because it is well-designed can of itself preserve peace] Only the unflagging will of men can preserve it.

No President of the United States can make the American contribution to preserve the peace without the constant, alert and conscious collaboration of the American people. ^P Only the determination of the people to use the machinery gives worth to the machinery. ^P We believe that the American people have already made up their minds on this great issue; and ^{The Department of State} ~~this Administration~~ has been able to press forward confidently with its plans.

[Let me say something else that should be self-evident] The very fact that we are ^{now} at work on the organization of the peace proves that the great ^{nations} ~~powers~~ are committed to trust in each other. Put this proposition any way you will, it is bound to come out the same way: we either work with the other great ^{nations} ~~powers~~, or we must be prepared some day [^] fight them.

It is ~~an entirely~~^a new thing in human history ~~that~~^{for} Allies ^{to} ~~could~~ work together so closely, so harmoniously and effectively, in the fighting of a war, and ^{at} the same time, ⁱⁿ the building of the peace.

The kind of world order which we the peace-loving nations must achieve, must depend essentially on friendly human relations, on acquaintance, on tolerance, on unassailable sincerity and good will and good faith. We have achieved that relationship to a remarkable degree in our dealings with our allies in this war, — as the events of the war have proved. ^P If we fail to maintain that relationship in the peace -- and expand it and strengthen it -- then there will be no lasting peace.

FOURTH DRAFT

-20-

As for Germany -- that tragic nation which has sown the wind and is now reaping the whirlwind -- we and our Allies are entirely agreed that we shall not bargain with the Nazi conspirators, or ^{leave} ~~give~~ them a shred of [any concession which leaves them in] control ^{open or secret} ~~openly or secretly~~ of the instruments of government. We shall not leave ~~any~~ ^{single} element of military power -- or of potential ^{military} power.

But I should be false to the very foundations of my religious and political convictions, if I should ever relinquish the hope ^{and} even the faith ^{that} in all peoples, without exception, there live some instinct for truth, some attraction toward justice, and some passion for peace ^{buried} as they may be in the German case under a brutal regime.

We bring no charge against the German race, as such, for we cannot believe that God has eternally condemned any race of humanity. For we know in our own land how many men and women of German ancestry have proved loyal, freedom-loving, peace-loving citizens.

There is going to be stern punishment for ^{all} those in Germany directly responsible for this agony of mankind. ⁷ The German people are not going to be enslaved -- because the United Nations do not traffic in human slavery. But ^{it will be necessary for them to learn} ~~they will have to work~~ ^{how} their way back into the fellowship of peace-loving and law-abiding nations.

And in their climb up that steep road, we shall certainly see to it that they are not encumbered by having to carry guns. They will be relieved of that burden: -- we hope forever.

The task ahead of us will not be easy. Indeed it will be as difficult and complex as any task which has ever faced an American administration.

I will not say to you now or ever, that we of my party know all the answers. I am certain, for myself, that I do not know how all the unforeseeable difficulties can be met. ^{What} ~~and~~ I can say to you is this -- that I have unlimited faith that the job can be done, ^{and} that faith is based on knowledge gained in the arduous, practical and continuing experience of these past eventful years.

I speak to the present generation of Americans with reverent participation in its sorrows and in its hopes. No generation has undergone a greater test, ~~we~~ ^{that} has met ~~the~~ test with greater heroism and greater wisdom, and no generation has had a more exalted mission.

^P For this generation must act not only for itself, but as a trustee for all those who fell in the last war, ^a a part of their mission unfulfilled. ^P It must act also for all who have paid the supreme price in this war, ^a lest their mission ^{to} be betrayed. ^P And finally it must act for the generations to come, ^a which must be granted a heritage of peace.

FOURTH DRAFT

- 22 -

I do not exaggerate that mission. We are not fighting for, and we shall not achieve, Utopia. Indeed, in our own land, the work to be done is never finished. ~~That~~ That is one of the glories of our country -- ~~and~~ We have yet to realize the full and equal enjoyment of our freedom. So in embarking on the building of a world fellowship we have set ourselves to a long and arduous task, which will challenge our patience, our intelligence, our imagination, as well as our faith.

That task requires the judgment of a seasoned and a mature people. And this the American people have become. We shall not again be thwarted in our will to live as a mature nation, confronting limitless horizons. We shall bear our full responsibility, exercise our full influence, and bring our full help and encouragement to all who aspire to peace and freedom.

We now are, and we shall continue to be, strong brothers in the family of mankind -- the family of the children of God.

Tonight I am speaking as a guest of the Foreign Policy Association — a distinguished organization composed of Americans of all shades of political opinion.

I am going to talk about ^{American} ~~the record of~~ our foreign policy [^] ~~in the past — the record of both parties — and I am going to talk~~ about ~~our American plans~~ [^] for the future.

I am talking without rancor or snap judgment.

I am speaking without losing my temper or losing my head.

When the first World War was ended, I believed — I believe now — that enduring peace in the world has not a chance unless this nation is willing to cooperate in winning it and maintaining it. I thought then — I know now — that we have to back our words with deeds.

A quarter of a century ago we helped to save our freedom but we failed to organize ^{The kind of} ~~a~~ world in which future generations could live in freedom. Opportunity knocks again. There is no guarantee that it will knock a third time.

^{Today,} [^] Hitler and the Nazis continue the fight — desperately, inch by inch, and may continue to do so all the way to Berlin.

And we have another important engagement in Tokyo. No matter how long or hard the road we must travel, our forces will fight their

way there under the leadership of MacArthur and Nimitz.

All of our thinking about foreign policy in this war must be conditioned by the fact that millions of our American boys are today fighting, many thousands of miles from home, for the defense of our country and the perpetuation of our American ideals. And there are still many hard and bitter battles to be fought.

The leaders of this nation have always held that concern for our national security does not end at our borders. President Monroe ~~proclaimed it more than a century ago, and we~~ and every American President following him were prepared to use force, if necessary, to assure the independence of other American nations threatened by aggressors from across the seas.

The principle has not changed, though the world has. Wars are no longer fought from horseback, or from the decks of sailing ships.

It was with recognition of that fact that in 1933 we took, as the basis for our foreign relations, the Good Neighbor policy — the principle of the neighbor who, ~~however~~ resolutely respecting himself, equally respects the rights of others.

We and the other American republics have made the Good Neighbor policy real in this hemisphere. It is ~~our~~^{my} conviction that this policy can be, and should be, made universal.

At inter-American conferences, beginning at Montevideo in 1933, and continuing down to date, we have made it clear to this hemisphere that we practice what we preach.

Our action in 1934 with respect to Philippine independence was another step in making good the same philosophy which animated the Good Neighbor policy.

The Philippines have progressed from the status of territorial possessions to that of a self-governing Commonwealth. When the Japanese have been driven from those islands, they will become an independent Republic.

As I said two years ago: "I like to think that the history of the Philippine Islands in the last forty-four years provides in a very real sense a pattern for the future of other small nations and peoples of the world. It is a pattern of what men of good will look forward to in the future".

FIFTH DRAFT

- 4 -

I cite another early action in the field of foreign policy of which I am proud. That was the recognition in 1933 of Soviet Russia.

For sixteen years before then the American people and the Russian people had no practical means of communicating with each other. We re-established those means. And today we are fighting with the Russians against common foes -- and we know that the Russian contribution to victory has been, and will continue to be, gigantic.

However, certain politicians, now very prominent in the Republican Party, have condemned our recognition.

I am impelled to wonder how Russia would have survived against German attack if these same people had had their way.

~~We are now fighting this war as allies of the Russian people~~
~~We intend to remain their allies in peace.~~

After the last war -- in the political campaign of 1920 -- the isolationist Old Guard professed to be enthusiastic about international cooperation.

While campaigning for votes in 1920, Senator Harding said that he favored with all his heart an Association of Nations "so organized and so participated in as to make the actual attainment of peace a reasonable possibility."

However, after President Harding's election, the Association of Nations was never heard of again.

One of the leading isolationists who killed international cooperation in 1920 was Senator Hiram Johnson. In the event of Republican victory in the Senate this year -- 1934 -- that same Senator Johnson would be Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I know the American voters will bear that in mind.

During the years which followed 1920, the foreign policy of the Republican Administrations was dominated by the heavy hand of isolationism.

Much of the strength of our Navy was scuttled; -- and some of the Navy's resources were handed over to friends in private industry -- as in the unforgettable case of ~~the~~ Teapot Dome.

Tariff walls went higher and higher -- blocking international trade.

There was snarling at our former Allies and at the same time encouragement was given to American finance to invest 2½ billion dollars in Germany, our former enemy.

All petitions that this nation join in the World Court were rejected or ignored.

FIFTH DRAFT

- 6 -

after
This Administration took office, ~~we~~
~~Instead of high tariffs, the State Department, under the~~
and I replaced high tariffs with
~~leadership of Secretary Hull, instituted in 1934 a series of reciprocal~~
trade agreements under a statute of the Congress. The Republicans
opposed these agreements -- and tried to stop the extension of the
law every three years.

In 1935 I asked the Congress to join the World Court.
in the Senate
The Democrats voted for it 43 to 20. The Republicans voted against
A
it 14 to 9. Thus we were prevented from obtaining the necessary two-
thirds majority.

In 1937 I asked that aggressor nations be quarantined --
and for this I was branded by isolationists in and out of public
office as an "alarmist" and "war-monger."

From that time on, as you well know, I made clear by
repeated messages to the American Congress and by repeated statements
to the American people the danger threatening from abroad -- and the
need of rearming to meet it.

In July, 1939, I tried to obtain a repeal of the Arms
provisions
Embargo in the Neutrality Law which so tied our hands against
selling arms to the European democracies for defense against
A ~~helping the Allies, that Hitler was relying upon it in starting~~
~~his war upon Europe.~~

FIFTH DRAFT

- 7 -

The late Senator Borah told a group, which I called together in the White House, that his own private information ^{from abroad} was better than that of the State Department -- and that there would be no war in Europe.

And it was made plain to Mr. Hull and me that, because of the isolationist vote, we could not possibly hope to attain the desired revision of the Neutrality Law.

This fact was also made plain to Adolf Hitler. ^{a few} ~~days~~ weeks later he brutally attacked Poland -- and the second World War had begun.

In 1941, this Administration proposed and the Congress passed, in spite of isolationist opposition, the Lend-Lease Law -- a practical and dramatic notice to the world that we intended to help those nations resisting aggression.

These days -- and I am now speaking of October, 1944 -- I hear voices on the air attacking me for my "failure" to prepare this nation for this war and to warn the American people of the approaching tragedy.

179

These same voices were not so very audible five years ago -- or even four years ago -- giving warning of the grave peril which we then faced.

In fact, one of those same voices attributed hysteria to those of us who entertained the idea that Germany, Italy or Japan contemplated war upon us. And I am told that the very man who expounded this idea would, if the Republicans were victorious, become the new American Secretary of State.

There have been, and there still are, in the Republican Party distinguished men and women of vision and courage, both in and out of public office, who have vigorously supported our aid to our Allies and all the measures that we took to build up our national defense. And many of these Republicans have rendered magnificent services to our country in this war as members of this Administration. I am happy that one of these distinguished Americans is sitting here at this table tonight -- our great Secretary of War -- Henry Stimson.

Let us remember that this very war might have been averted/

FIFTH DRAFT

- 9 -

if Mr. Stimson's views had prevailed when, in 1931, the Japanese
in this case
 attacked Manchuria.

The majority of the Republican members of the Congress
 voted against the Selective Service Law in 1940; they voted
 against repeal of the Arms Embargo in 1939; they voted against the
 Lend-Lease Law in 1941 and they voted in August, 1941, against
 extension of Selective Service -- which meant, *voting*
 against keeping our
 army together -- four months before Pearl Harbor.

I am quoting history to you. I am going by the record.
 And I am giving you the whole story and not merely a phrase here
 and half a phrase there picked out of context in such a way that
 they distort the facts.

I happen to believe that, even in a political campaign,
 we should all obey that ancient injunction -- Thou shalt not bear
 false witness against thy neighbor.

The question of the men who will *formulate and carry out*
~~be~~ ^{the} foreign policy
 of this country ~~is~~ is in issue in this election -- very
 much in issue. It is in issue not in terms of partisan application,
 but in terms of sober, solemn facts -- the facts that are on the
 record.

155

If the Republicans were to win control of the Congress in this election, inveterate isolationists would occupy positions of commanding influence and power.

I have already spoken of the ranking Republican member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Hiram Johnson.

One of the most influential members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee [—] a man who would also be the chairman of the powerful Senate Committee on Appropriations -- is Senator Gerald P. Nye.

In the House of Representatives, the man ^{undoubtedly} who is the present leader of the Republicans there, and who would be Speaker, ~~is~~ is Joseph W. Martin, ~~a leader of the isolationists~~. He voted against the Repeal of the Arms Embargo, against the Lend-Lease Bill, against the extension of the Selective Service law, against the arming of merchant ships, and against the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and their extensions.

The Chairman of the powerful Committee on Rules would be none other than Hamilton Fish.

There are many others like them in the Congress of the United States -- and every one of them is now actively campaigning for the national Republican ticket this year.

Can anyone really suppose that these isolationists have changed their minds about world affairs? Politicians who embraced the policy of isolationism -- or who never raised their voices against it in our days of peril -- are not reliable custodians of the future of America.

There have been Democrats in the isolationist camp but they have been few and far between, and they have not attained positions of leadership.

And I am proud of the fact that this Administration does not have the support of the isolationist press -- and I mean specifically the McCormick-Patterson-Hearst-Gannett press.

The American people have gone through great national debates in the recent critical years. They were soul-searching debates. They reached from every city to every village and to every home.

FIFTH DRAFT

- 12 -

We debated our principles and our determination to aid those fighting for freedom.

~~Obviously it was open to us not to aid those threatened by the Hitler attack.~~ ^{Obviously,} We could have come to terms with Hitler, and accepted a minor role in his totalitarian world. We rejected that!

We could have compromised with Japan, and bargained for a place in a Japanese-dominated Asia by selling out the heart's blood of the Chinese people. And we rejected that!

The decision not to bargain with the tyrants rose from the hearts and souls and sinews of the American people. They faced reality; they appraised reality; and they knew what freedom meant.

The power which this nation has attained — the moral, the political, the economic and the military power — has brought to us the responsibility, and with it the opportunity, for leadership in the community of nations. In our own best interest, and in the name of peace and humanity, this nation cannot, must not, and will not shirk that responsibility.

There are some who hope to see a structure of peace, completely set up immediately, with all the apartments assigned to everyone's satisfaction, with the telephones in, the plumbing complete, the heating system and the electric ice boxes functioning perfectly, all furnished with linen and silver -- and with the rent pre-paid.

The United Nations have not yet produced such a comfortable dwelling place. But we have achieved a very practical expression of a common purpose on the part of four great nations, who are now united to wage this war, that they will embark together after the war on a greater and more difficult enterprise -- that of waging peace. We will embark on it with all the peace-loving nations of the world -- large and small.

Our objective, as I stated ten days ago, is to complete the organization of the United Nations without delay and before hostilities actually cease.

Peace, like war, can only succeed where there is a will to enforce it, and where there is available power to enforce it. ~~The peace of the world can only be preserved with the active and united energies of the great nations -- for the~~

~~simple reason that world peace can only be practically broken by~~
~~the acts of one or another of the great nations.~~

The Council of the United Nations must have the power to act quickly and decisively to keep the peace by force, if necessary. A policeman would not be a very effective policeman if, when he saw a felon break into a house, he had to go to the Town Hall and call a town meeting to issue a warrant before the felon could be arrested.

It is clear that, if ^{the world} ~~any~~ organisation is to have any reality at all, our representative must be endowed in advance by the people themselves, by constitutional means through their representatives in the Congress, with authority to act.

So far as the charter itself is concerned, a decision of the Council to use force, in which the American delegate concurs, would and should commit our government to fulfill the obligations which the Congress has placed upon it, with respect to, the supplying of forces.

If we do not catch the ^{international} felon when we have our hands on him, ^{him get away with his loot} if we let ~~the international~~ because the Sen-Council has not ^{authorizing his arrest} passed an ordinance ~~authorizing the use of the fire department~~, then we

FIFTH DRAFT

- 15 -

are not doing our share to prevent another World War. The people of the Nation want their Government to act, and not merely to talk, wherever and whenever there is a threat to world peace.

We cannot attain our great objectives by ourselves.

Never again, after cooperating with other nations in a world war to save our way of life, can we wash our hands of maintaining the peace for which we fought.

The Dumbarton Oaks Conference did not spring up overnight.

It was called by Secretary Hull and me after years of thought, discussion, preparation and consultation with our Allies. ^{Our} ~~The~~ State Department ^{splendid} ~~did a splendid~~ job in preparing for the Conference and leading it to a successful termination. It was another chapter in the long process of cooperation with other peace-loving nations -- beginning with the Atlantic Charter Conference, and continuing through ~~the~~ Conferences at Casablanca, Moscow, Cairo, Teheran, Quebec and Washington.

It is my profound conviction that the American people as a whole have a very real understanding of these things.

The American people know that Cordell Hull and I are thoroughly conversant with the Constitution of the United States and

know that we cannot commit this Nation to any secret treaties or any secret guarantees which are in violation of that Constitution.

After my return from Teheran, I stated officially that no secret commitments had been made. The issue then is between my veracity and the continuing assertions of those who have no responsibility in the foreign field — or, perhaps I should say, ~~the~~ a field foreign to them.

The peace structure which we are building must depend on foundations that go deep into the soil of man's faith and man's hearts — otherwise it is worthless. Only the unflagging will of men can preserve it.

No President of the United States can make the American contribution to preserve the peace without the constant, alert and conscious collaboration of the American people.

Only the determination of the people to use the machinery gives worth to the machinery.

We believe that the American people have already made up their minds on this great issue; and ^{the administration} ~~the Department of State~~ has been able to press forward confidently with its plans.

FIFTH DRAFT

- 17 -

The very fact that we are now at work on the organization of the peace proves that the great nations are committed to trust in each other. Put this proposition any way you will, it is bound to come out the same way: we either work with the other great nations, or we ^{right} ~~must~~ ^{have to} some day fight them.

It is a new thing in human history for Allies to work together ^{as we have done} so closely, so harmoniously and effectively in the fighting of a war, and -- at the same time -- in the building of the peace.

The kind of world order which we the peace-loving nations must achieve, must depend essentially on friendly human relations, on acquaintance, on tolerance, on unassailable sincerity and good will and good faith. We have achieved that relationship to a remarkable degree in our dealings with our Allies in this war -- as the events of the war have proved.

→ If we fail to maintain that relationship in the peace -- ^{if we fail to} ~~and~~ expand it and strengthen it -- then there will be no lasting peace.

189

As for Germany — that tragic nation which has sown the wind and is now reaping the whirlwind — we and our Allies are entirely agreed that we shall not bargain with the Nazi conspirators, or leave them a shred of control — open or secret — of the instruments of government.

We shall not leave them a single element of military power — or of potential military power.

But I should be false to the very foundations of my religious and political convictions, if I should ever relinquish the hope — and even the faith — that in all peoples, without exception, there live some instinct for truth, some attraction toward justice, and some passion for peace — buried as they may be in the German case under a brutal regime.

We bring no charge against the German race, as such, for we cannot believe that God has eternally condemned any race of humanity. For we know in our own land how ^{good} many men and women of German ancestry have proved loyal, freedom-loving, peace-loving citizens.

There is going to be stern punishment for all those in Germany directly responsible for this agony of mankind.

FIFTH DRAFT

- 19 -

The German people are not going to be enslaved -- because the United Nations do not traffic in human slavery. But it will be necessary for them to earn their way back into the fellowship of peace-loving and law-abiding nations. And, in their climb up that steep road, we shall certainly see to it that they are not encumbered by having to carry guns. They will be relieved of that burden -- we hope, forever.

The task ahead of us will not be easy. Indeed it will be as difficult and complex as any task which has ever faced an American administration.

I will not say to you now, or ever, that we of my party know all the answers. I am certain, for myself, that I do not know how all the unforeseeable difficulties can be met. What I can say to you is this -- that I have unlimited faith that the job can be done. And that faith is based on knowledge gained in the arduous, practical and continuing experience of these past eventful years.

I speak to the present generation of Americans with reverent participation in its sorrows and in its hopes. No generation has undergone a greater test, or has met that test with greater heroism and greater wisdom, and no generation has had a more exalted mission.

FIFTH DRAFT

- 20 -

For this generation must act not only for itself, but as a trustee for all those who fell in the last war -- a part of their mission unfulfilled.

It must act also for all who have paid the supreme price in this war -- lest their mission, too, be betrayed.

And finally it must act for the generations to come -- which must be granted a heritage of peace.

I do not exaggerate that mission. We are not fighting for, and we shall not achieve, Utopia. Indeed, in our own land, the work to be done is never finished. We have yet to realize the full and equal enjoyment of our freedom. So, in embarking on the building of a world fellowship, we have set ourselves to a long and arduous task, which will challenge our patience, our intelligence, our imagination, as well as our faith.

That task requires the judgment of a seasoned and a mature people. And this the American people have become. We shall not again be thwarted in our will to live as a mature nation, confronting limitless horizons. We shall bear our full responsibility, exercise our full influence, and bring our full help and encouragement to all who aspire to peace and freedom.

FIFTH DRAFT

- 21 -

We now are, and we shall continue to be, strong brothers
in the family of mankind -- the family of the children of God.

DRAFT

Speech of the President
Oct 21, 1944

Nearly a quarter of a century ago I shared in a presidential campaign dedicated to a single issue: the maintenance of an enduring peace. Twenty-four years have not changed my convictions on the major point then at issue.

I believed then--I believe now--that enduring peace in the world has not a chance unless this nation is willing to cooperate in winning it and maintaining it. I thought then--I know now--that this means more than saying good words. It means that we have to back our words with deeds.

What is more, we as a nation have to make clear, in advance, that we will back up our words. If the Kaiser had known in 1914--if Hitler had known in 1939--that the free nations would join together to block their plans for world conquest, neither would have plunged the world into war.

The campaign of 1920 was lost. And it is modern history that ^{in 1920 after the war was won} the chance for enduring peace was lost. We are now fighting again for a world in which ^{future generations} we and our children and our children's children may live free from fear. I am clear that every American, and especially the men and women fighting this war, want us to do everything

we humanly can to prevent war from happening again.]

That, indeed, is the first and greatest aim of our foreign policy, ^{is} peace and security, through the development of peaceful institutions.] *the establishment of an international organization for the maintenance of the world.*

The leaders of this nation have always held that concern for our national security does not end at our borders. President Monroe proclaimed it more than a century ago; and he and every American President following him were prepared to use force, if necessary, to assure the independence of other American nations. Only in that way could the United States be secure to enjoy peace in this hemisphere.

The principle has not changed, though the world has. Wars are no longer fought from horseback, or from the decks of sailing ships. Just as growing trade and industry have united the isolated sections of our own country into one interdependent nation, so science and air have made a world of isolated countries into a community of close neighbors.

It was with recognition of that fact that in 1933 we took as the basis for our foreign relations, the Good Neighbor policy--the principle of being a good neighbor, the neighbor who resolutely respects

himself,

himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others; the neighbor who respects his obligations and the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors.

~~The world knows what the Good Neighbor policy is.~~
We and the other American republics have made ~~it~~ real in this hemisphere. We should like to make it universal. It is universal for us; and so far as we can do so, ~~we~~ ^{our purpose} ~~and it is~~ propose to promote its adoption everywhere.

We have given practical illustration of the meaning of the Good Neighbor policy; and the record is worth repeating. We withdrew control in Haiti. We gave up our right to intervene in Cuban affairs. We made commercial agreements with most of the nations of the Western Hemisphere. We cleared out the dregs of dollar diplomacy, and yet provided for the reasonable capital development of our American neighbors. At inter-American conferences beginning at Montevideo in 1933, Buenos Aires in 1936 and Lima in 1938, as well as later through consultations of Foreign Ministers at Panama in 1939, Habana in 1940, and Rio de Janeiro in 1942, we made it clear to this hemisphere that we practice what we preach.

Through this policy and its continued application year after year, both we and our neighbors in this hemisphere

have

have reaped vast rewards. Through the policy of joint action in matters of common concern, the safety and security of this hemisphere were preserved in the hour of its greatest danger, and God willing, will be preserved for generations to come.

Our action in 1934 with respect to Philippine independence was another step in making good the philosophy of the Good Neighbor policy. We are now sure--if there ever was anyone who doubted it before--that this Government chose the right course. Bataan--Corregidor--these are the flaming words that confirmed our faith in the policy that we followed.

Outside these areas our task was made more difficult by the rising suspicion and growing distrust among nations. [For the Good Neighbor policy is by its very nature a reciprocal one. It could not be made universally effective unless nations could be freed from the fears for their peace and security.

We followed throughout the world the policy of endeavoring to assist in the preservation of peace and security. We did this by maintaining that treaties and agreements among nations are made to be kept--not broken; and by advocating the principle that disputes between nations should be settled only through peaceful means. By treaty our nation renounced war as an instrument of
national

[national policy as did other nations. We reaffirmed at Montevideo in 1933, and thereafter, our intention to adhere to that promise, and took every occasion possible to impress upon Germany, Italy and Japan that they were under like obligation.

We took part in attempts to reduce the burden of armaments. We saw in Germany, Italy and Japan preparations for war being carried to a point which created the danger of war. To the very end in disarmament negotiations we offered to enter into international agreements designed to reduce armaments provided others would do likewise.]

By 1937 it was apparent that an epidemic of world lawlessness was spreading. I pointed out then that every community usually takes action to quarantine an epidemic, and that it was time we began to quarantine aggressors.

[The public did not wholly agree with me at that time; but I will say frankly to you now that I wish we had been able] to muster enough support in 1937 [so that we could have] ^{under take} tackled an effective quarantine program.

[The record will show that this Government asserted every ounce of influence it had to persuade the aggressor nations which started the present war to settle their issues by peaceful negotiation. We failed; and the guilt]

for

As a result of that speech, it was denounced in the Congress and in feature pictures of the press as an alarmist and was ignored. And this Administration was smothered in 1937.

for that failure rests squarely on Hitler and on Mussolini and on the war lords in Tokyo.

There are some kinds of people who do not want to settle things peacefully. And there are some kinds of people who want things which nobody ought to let them have peacefully. The Nazis, in their hunt for world domination, the Japanese in their lust for conquest, are cases in point.

I think it is fair to say that, in 1939, we had carried the policy of the Good Neighbor as far as we could carry it. In that year, when Hitler's armies smashed into Poland, it was clear that the necessities of American security had to be met--and that at once. Oceans were no barrier to ships that sailed through the air. Actually, small German parties attempted to land on the coast of Greenland in 1940. We had, therefore, to redouble our efforts for general defense; and in doing so, to make arrangements with other peace-loving nations to assist that defense.

Late in September 1939 we consulted with our neighboring American republics with a view to keeping war out of the western hemisphere. The striking demonstration of inter-American solidarity given at this conference proclaimed to the world that nations as well as individuals can cooperate for common liberty and welfare.

This

This inter-American pledge of solidarity was renewed even more forcefully in July 1940 at Habana; and that, you will remember, was when Hitler's legions were everywhere victorious, and stood on the shores of the Atlantic; and when Hitler's Fifth Columns impudently proclaimed that they could take South America by telephone. We then pledged common action with the other American nations to repel aggression against any one of us. In this we forged a new weapon for hemisphere defense which later was further developed at the meeting at Rio de Janeiro in January 1942 after this country had been attacked.

In September 1940, as a further step in assuring our security, we arranged with Great Britain to acquire leases of naval and air bases in Newfoundland, on the Island of Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, St. Lucia, Trinidad, and Antigua, and in British Guiana. The rights to the bases in Bermuda and Newfoundland were gifts. The others were acquired for fifty of our over-age destroyers. I said at the time: "The value to the Western Hemisphere of these outposts of security is beyond calculation." We found this out when we fought and won the Battle of the Atlantic.

In that

In that fateful year of 1940, we gave our foreign policy added tools by strengthening the national defense. I asked the Congress, and it immediately responded, for authority to provide our air forces with 50,000 military and naval planes; for authority to call the National Guard and the necessary Reserve personnel into active military service; and for other needed appropriations to expand our military and naval program. And for the first time in its history, this Nation adopted compulsory military training when we were not at war. The National Selective Service Act is the instrument with which were created our victorious army, navy, and air force of today.

But in all of this, I emphasized that our ideal, our objective still was peace--peace at home and peace abroad. Nevertheless, we stood ready, as I said, "not only to spend millions for defense but to give our service and even our lives for the maintenance of our American liberties".

In January of 1941 there was no longer doubt that the resolute peoples everywhere who were resisting aggression were contributing directly to the security of America. They merited our support; and we expressed that support in the Lend-Lease Act of March 1941. This was taken as--and was--an affirmation that this country was determined that the democratic cause should prevail. We strengthened our neighbors--and thereby strengthened ourselves.

Finally

Finally, in October 1941, I asked the Congress for the repeal of those crippling provisions of the Neutrality Act which prevented arming our own merchant ships against attack, and delivering vitally needed goods to nations resisting aggression.

Meanwhile, we had continued our active search for peace in the Far East. The record will show that every effort was made to bring about a just peace between Japan and China, a peace for the Pacific under which peoples of many different nationalities could live side by side without fear of invasion. The madmen of Tokyo would have none of this. We worked for peace in the Pacific; they wanted conquest of the Pacific. Their final answer to our patient efforts was given at Pearl Harbor.

Our attention during these years was not centered alone upon the political problems in the world. Economic strife among nations was as great a threat to peace as were political differences. Unnecessary and disastrous obstacles to trade were arising everywhere. In the years immediately prior to 1933, this country too had, by its tariff policy, contributed immensely to the causes of the economic distress then abroad in the world.

We set about to rectify those past mistakes. If

world

world trade was to flow again, if the economic interdependence of nations was to be recognized, then it was our responsibility to make our contribution to this by seeing that this country got rid of its ostrich-like tariff policy. It was time we realized that to sell goods abroad we had to make it possible for other nations to sell their goods here. The course we took was that of mutual reduction of tariffs and removal of other obstacles to trade through reciprocal trade agreements.

The Trade Agreements Act became law in 1934. It stands today, thrice renewed by Congress, as a clear indication to the community of nations that this country has abandoned the policy of economic isolation which reached its climax in the notorious Hawley-Smoot Act of 1930.

The results of that action in 1934 were highly favorable. Under that Act we concluded trade agreements with 28 nations, including the two largest customers for our goods, Great Britain and Canada. About two-thirds of our pre-war trade was carried on with the countries with which we have concluded these agreements. The effect of these agreements on international trade was fully apparent before that trade was disrupted by the war.

Our faith

Our faith in the policy still stands. We have affirmed it during the war, both in the Atlantic Charter and in the mutual-aid agreements made under the Lend-Lease Act. A special responsibility for leadership in world economic affairs falls upon us because of our great economic strength. I know of no better way for us to exercise that leadership than by moving forward vigorously to strengthen and expand a policy which has proved its great benefits to the community of nations as well as to our own.

Looking back, today, at the record of those eight and one-half years, it seems incredible that any American leader could have opposed the course we followed in our efforts for peace, our steps toward effective national defense, our striving for a sound economic policy. Yet that course was generally opposed by the Republican organization as such, though not by all members of the party. The most kindly comment we can make now is that the Republican Party showed itself by its actions either unwilling or unable to understand the international facts of life. Let us look at the record.

The Trade Agreements Act became a basic part of this country's foreign policy when it was passed in 1934. Curiously enough, in the present campaign the Republican leaders claim that the trade agreements policy is a Republican invention. Yet in 1936, when the Act was scarcely two
years

two years old, the Republican Party platform stated--and I quote--

"We will repeal the present Reciprocal Trade Agreement law. It is futile and dangerous. Its effect on agriculture and industry has been destructive. Its continuation would work to the detriment of the wage-earner and the farmer."

When the Act came up for extension in 1937, the Republicans in the House voted 81 to 3 against extension and in the Senate all of their 14 votes were against extending it.

In 1940, when the extension of the Act was again before the Congress, only 5 Republicans in the House voted for the extension, while 146 voted against it. The 20 Republican votes cast in the Senate were all against extension.

It was not until 1943, that the Republican Party finally got the point, and both in the Senate and in the House, the majority of their votes favored extension. And in 1944 they are claiming parentage of a policy which only 8 years before they had described as "futile and dangerous".

Let us turn to that part of the Republican record concerned with maintaining American security. Let us see what they said before the election of 1940 and then what they did between the election and Pearl Harbor.

The

The Republican Party Platform of 1940 said--and I quote:

"The zero hour is here. America must prepare at once to defend our shores, our homes, our lives, and our most cherished ideals. **** We favor the extension to all peoples fighting for liberty, or whose liberty is threatened, of such aid as shall not be in violation of international law or inconsistent with the requirements of our own national defense."

That was what they said. Here is what they did. Three months after the election, when the roll was called in the House in February 1941 on the question of the passage of the Lend-Lease Act, the Republicans voted 135 to 24 against that bill. In the Senate a month later, they voted 17 to 10 against.

Five months later, in August 1941, the question of extending the one-year period of training under the Selective Service Act was before the Congress. Unless action was taken, about two-thirds of the Army would begin a demobilization in the following autumn. This was a critical moment. In my request to the Congress for the extension of the training period, I said:

"I do not believe that the danger to our national safety is only about the same as it was a year ago. I do believe--I know--that the danger today is infinitely greater. I do believe--I know--that in all truth we are in the midst of a national emergency."

We thought that the Republican Party was also aware of the danger to our nation. In their Party Platform of 1940, they had said--and I quote:

"We declare

"We declare for the prompt, orderly, and realistic building of our national defense to the point at which we shall be able not only to defend the United States, its possessions, and essential outposts from foreign attack, but also efficiently to uphold in war the Monroe Doctrine."

But the Republicans in the House voted 133 to 21 against extending the Selective Service Act; in the Senate Republicans voted 13 to 7 against extension.

Nor was this all. One month before Pearl Harbor, when Japanese plans for that cowardly attack must have been completed, perhaps even while last minute arrangements were being made, the question before Congress was the repeal of the crippling provisions of the Neutrality Act. In the House, the Republicans voted 113 to 39 against that repeal; in the Senate the vote was 21 to 6 against repeal.

No--it does not seem to me that the Republican Party is willing to recognize the international facts of life. And when it does, infrequently enough, it seems to recognize them only to the extent necessary to get the votes of the people.

Well, if all responsibility in foreign policy ended with merely getting the votes, then this nation would indeed face a dreary prospect. Once before at the end of a war we saw such a spectacle. I am not too young to

remember

remember back twenty-four years when we returned to "normalcy"-- to political and economic isolationism. For twelve long years the forces which then came to power ruled our foreign policy with an iron hand. The result was all too apparent--international cooperation calculated to preserve peace came to an end. And I need not say what political party became the subversive tool of these forces. Yes--they got the votes; the nation got the worst crash in its history; and the world lost a chance to build an enduring peace.

Again this nation is marching toward victory. This time it proposes to win the peace as well. Ours is the task and responsibility to do all that is humanly possible to see that the peace once attained is kept. The nation accepts that responsibility, and we have been preparing for that task.

We have started with the clear recognition of two indisputable international facts of our time.

The first of these is that our nation--the United States of the twentieth century--is one of the most powerful in the world of today. We cannot escape the responsibilities of this fact, no matter how many individual Americans might wish to do so.

The moral, the political, the economic, and the military power which this nation has attained has brought
to us,

to us, and without our choice, the responsibility for leadership in the community of nations. In the name of peace and of humanity, in our own best interest, this Nation cannot--and this Nation will not shirk that role.

We have made known our acceptance of the trust of leadership. The declaration of principles, known as the Atlantic Charter, is the foundation upon which we base our hopes for a better future for the world. It was later adopted by all the United Nations in the Declaration of January 1, 1942. It states the principles upon which nations can live together as neighbors in peace and ever increasing well being for all.

We know--as I have said earlier tonight--that we cannot achieve this end merely by saying good words. We know that we must back our words by deeds.

But we have not proceeded alone, nor could we even if we wished. Ours is not and cannot be the sole responsibility for achieving an enduring peace. We are only one of many nations in the world, large and small. The task of assuring peace and security is a joint responsibility of all peace-loving nations. But first and foremost that responsibility rests upon those large nations, which, because of their size and strength, must bear a special responsibility in this respect. Unless these nations can harmonize their aims and reconcile their policies, there will be no peace. This is the other great fact of our time that we recognize.

It is

It is in full light of these two great facts--our responsibility for leadership in the world community, and our need to cooperate with all peace-loving nations--that we are forming our policy for peace.

At bottom, we trust more in the continuing relationships of peoples and nations, than in any pat answers or short-range "dictates". It was Hitler who always produced "solutions", and trusted to them. They lie, now, in ruins around him.

Many people hope--it is human for them to do so--that a magic blueprint will miraculously appear, settling all questions. Literally thousands of plans have been sent to me, from people in all walks of life, reflecting this hope. Heartily I wish that the world problem--for it is that--could be solved by any one plan. It cannot--nor can it be settled at any one time. Rather, we must determine our principles, get them generally accepted, build the necessary institutions, and go forward, through the present into the emerging future.

The peace we seek cannot become a reality unless there is a community of nations. Order must again prevail and outlaws and gangsters must suffer their just punishment. The nations who were the victims of ruthless aggression must be restored. These are among the immediate tasks of the peace.

It is

It is clear that the not-very-distant future will look vastly different from the scene of today. At present, the world-scene is dominated by huge armies, passing through great areas, and affecting the political and economic life of these areas. But that condition will pass. Even the largest powers in the world cannot perpetually keep millions of men under arms outside their borders.

Within two or three years at most after victory, a greater part of these will have been withdrawn. Then the old structure of races and nations will reappear. Indeed, it is there now, though half hidden by battle smoke and moving troops. The permanent forces with which we have to work are the ideas and the desires of the peoples. All government finally rests on the just consent of the governed.

That is why our first concern has been the reconstitution of the liberated nations under governments of their own choosing--a huge task in itself, but a task foreseen in the Atlantic Charter. We have steadily worked at that, even within sound of the moving battle lines.

Italians, first to shake off their Axis government and Axis yoke, are slowly but steadily rebuilding their nation. They have their own accounts to settle among
themselves

themselves, and long years of Fascist misgovernment to undo. Even before their richest regions are redeemed from the German hordes, they have reestablished their government, undertaken the purification of their administration services, and set about the work of reconstruction.

France, now almost clear of invaders, has swiftly moved toward resuming her historic position. Every report which reaches me pays tribute to the energy and organizing power with which she is meeting her grave problems. I believe history will repeat itself; that France will again demonstrate an amazing power of quick recovery, and that Paris will shine again as a great world-light.

Belgium, valiant and intact, has recreated her government in Brussels, and even now is bringing together the representatives of her people, and reestablishing her social fabric. The liberation of the Netherlands and Luxembourg and their valiant peoples is going forward as our armies proceed; and arrangements are already complete for reestablishing their government in their own territory.

Greece, most terribly tried by oppression and starvation, is at length beginning to see the black cloud break. Again the work of setting up a government of Greek choosing is going forward.

We work

We work and fight for the liberation of those countries still in the grip of the dying Nazi monster--Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Denmark. Finland has made her peace with Britain and Soviet Union, though active fighting against the Germans is still in progress there.

Two Axis satellite countries, Bulgaria and Rumania, have been substantially cleared of German troops by the Soviet Armies. History makes it clear that puppet governments do not last.

As you know, the war in Europe is more advanced than that in the Pacific, although there, too, we have made mighty progress. The policy of reconstruction in that area does not differ from that guiding our work in the West.

Beyond this lies the task of building for continuing international relationships--political, economic, and social--as the foundation for the maintenance of peace and security and the promotion of human welfare. The means of accomplishing this was forecast in the Atlantic Charter.

The work of building the institutions of international organization for these purposes was brilliantly begun by Secretary Hull at Moscow a year ago. Certain main outlines were agreed on and set out in the Four Nation Declaration, which is a part of history. That work has been carried forward in the Dumbarton Oaks conversations, and the far-reaching results of that meeting have been made known throughout the entire world.

in spite of the efforts to suggest the contrary, there has been no "secret" about the recommendations agreed upon at Dumbarton Oaks. It was clearly understood at the beginning that the conclusions reached there would be made available to the people of this country and of all countries for public study and debate.

This has now been done. We have made good our word.

The Dumbarton proposals are a sound foundation. They are an excellent first step. Plans are already made to follow through. Again I emphasize the basic theory: the fundamental consideration must be continuing relations of good neighborship between peoples, expressed in institutions which will give effective results to international cooperation. If we can achieve this, we can win the peace, and even correct our past mistakes. And we intend to succeed.

Long-term international arrangements and cooperation for the peace do not end with a general international organization. What happens within nations is as important to the world community as what happens among nations. We have learned that political unrest in the world is usually a symptom of economic unrest in the individual nations. There can be no freedom from fear without freedom from want.

Clearly

Clearly there will be no good neighborhood between nations starving and snarling in distress. Surely we are bound to try to create conditions which will lessen the tyranny of want throughout the world. This is an essential of lasting peace.

There are imperative needs of the immediate future. To meet them, we have joined in the creation of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. It is hard at work on its immense task with the aid of the great material support which the Congress has authorized as the contribution of this nation, and of the increasing contributions of other nations.

For longer-range purposes, the principal keys to international economic relations are four: trade, finance, transport, and communications. These are the means by which peoples work together in the production and distribution of the goods and services which support life and make it more comfortable. International institutions in these fields are new and few.

We have to start almost from scratch. And yet we must start.

All people in their daily life depend on economic processes for their food, their homes, their children's education, for most worth-while things. In many countries they depend directly on international economic relations;

in all

in all countries, including our own, they are powerfully affected by these relations.

We have been active in all these four fields of world economic relations.

Trade discussions with Britain and with other nations have been going on for some time. They are not yet finished. We know already that cooperation to our mutual advantage can be worked out. We have good reason to believe that other nations will join. We believe that appropriate institutions can be set up to assist and further this trading relationship.

Finance has been studied, and the outline of a system has been formulated at the Bretton Woods conference. The proposals there made are a matter of general knowledge. For the first time in history a plan to stabilize currency exchanges by united international effort has been presented. With it, a plan for a world bank has also been developed for assisting capital movements between nations where private banking is unable or unwilling to meet the needs of reconstruction and development.

In transportation, our plans are less advanced. Throughout the world ships, railroads, and airplanes are still largely preempted by war needs, and will continue to be for some time to come. We are, however, going forward. An international conference of fifty-five

nations

nations will meet in Chicago on November 1 of this year which will discuss civil air transport and, I hope, will make possible the prompt opening of commercial airways covering most of the world. We have still before us the main work of shipping settlements--a big and complicated matter. But agreements for continuing cooperation up to the defeat of Japan have been worked out, and are being made effective.

The field of telegraph, telephone and radio communications has been explored, and preliminary but essential talks have been arranged. The field is technical and not without difficulty. We have some foundation on which to build, especially in radio work, though it is going to be hard to keep up with the scientists and inventors.

Side by side with economic development--indeed, as an essential part of it--must go the task of solving social problems. We took the initiative in convening a United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture. An Interim Commission established by this Conference has just proposed a constitution for a Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. We have pledged our help in the world-wide effort to improve labor standards and social security measures. Our continuing participation

participation in the International Labor Organization stands in evidence of our good faith.

All of these policies and programs--our attitude toward the nations we are liberating, our proposals for a general international organization, and the arrangements we are proposing for international commerce and trade--all of these are bringing us, steadily and surely, to our goal of an enduring peace. In the work of shaping and carrying forward these policies and programs, the Department of State, the agency of our government specially charged with the conduct of foreign relations, has performed its difficult functions fully and effectively.

The end of the war will bring no millenium. It will bring a new and glorious opportunity to work still harder for worth-while things.

The immensity of the problems before us is not a cause for discouragement. It is a challenge--a challenge not to withdraw into a world of dreams but to plunge with new joy into work before us, to keep our eyes upon the stars but our hands upon the plow.

In the timeless phrase of the late Wendell Willkie, this is one world. A sound policy for the United States now must be a policy of world-wide cooperation; anything less will lead to a new world war.

When

When the armies are drawn back, and bombers no longer go out, and the cannon are silent, and the ships come home, there will still be peoples, and nations, trying to live together. If we are able to make the policy of the Good Neighbor universal, as we hope to do, the future will become a time of promise.

We cannot attain our great objectives by ourselves. Never again can this country, at its own pleasure, move in and out of the community of nations. Never again, after cooperating with other nations in a world war to save our way of life, can we wash our hands of maintaining the peace for which we fought.

No--no matter how pleasant it may seem in retrospect, we can never go back to the world of the nineteenth or eighteenth century. We are fighting a twentieth century war. We must make a twentieth century peace.

453 Irving Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.
October 13, 1944

Mr. Charles W. Taussig
Chairman, Anglo-American Caribbean Commission
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Taussig:

It has come to my attention that in the near future the President will deliver a major address on foreign policy and related matters. If you, as Chairman of the President's Caribbean Advisory Committee, are in position to make any suggestions concerning the subject matter to be included in that address, I believe certain items merit the most serious consideration.

1. The present National Administration has a record of building and encouraging free and democratic political institutions, as well as extending economic benefits, in our territories which the President might properly stress. This would serve to show our good faith when we take a similar position about world colonial problems and to show that the policies we advocate on a world scale are actually working in our own territories. Moreover, in New York State alone the number of voters of West Indian origin or ancestry - including Puerto Ricans - is very substantial. They will be influenced by words showing that the President is vitally interested in a forward-looking program for the Caribbean area.

2. I find that there is now in circulation a considerable amount of gossip and rumor - whether politically inspired I do not know - that the National Administration is not concerning itself with improvements in the status of colonies, particularly those colonial areas inhabited by the darker peoples of the earth. More baldly, it is often suggested that the President will let Mr. Churchill have his way on such matters. This notion has considerable influence in the Negro community where interest in and a sense of kinship with dependent peoples abroad is much keener than ever before. It would, therefore, be politically helpful if the President should outline in his foreign policy address the objectives for which his administration pledges itself to work in relation to the political status of economic advancement of dependent areas, with some express reference to our belief that the skin color of dependent peoples should not effect the dealings of the great powers with them.

Sincerely yours,

William H. Hastie
William H. Hastie

Member, President's Caribbean Advisory Committee

October 18, 1944

MEMORANDUM

To: Judge S. I. Roserman
From: Oscar Cox
Subject: Reconstruction and Foreign Trade

Here are several pages on this subject which
you might consider for use in the October 21st talk.

cc: Mr. Harry L. Hopkins ✓

COC:mp 10/18 '44



GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
National Archives and Records Service
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT LIBRARY
1011 19th St., N. W.

From the Papers of
Harry L. Hopkins

RECONSTRUCTION AND FOREIGN TRADE

Our foreign policy, particularly with reference to reconstruction and foreign trade, is materially affected by our domestic policy—and our domestic policy may in turn be materially affected by our foreign policy.

A strong and prosperous America with as full production and full employment as possible is the one of the surest foundation stones for a healthy international trade. The more we produce in the United States, the more goods we buy from other countries. And to sell our goods abroad we must buy goods abroad.

A high level of international trade will make for more jobs and fuller production in the United States after the war.

In 1944 exports from the United States will total nearly fifteen billion dollars—more than four times our peacetime trade. Millions of our workers, farmers and miners and a multitude of our industries have been engaged in the production of these exports. Every nation of the world has become familiar with American products it has never known before—and we have seen to it that the goods shipped during the war bear the United States label.

Our allies have needed the products of our factories, farms and our mines to fight effectively with us in the winning of the war. They will need our products also in the peace for the tremendous task of



GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

National Archives and Records Service
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT LIBRARY
and
PRES. L. I.

From the Papers of
Henry L. Hopkins

repairing the devastation and destruction of the war and to develop their resources. Russia, China, France, our good neighbors in South America, and the other countries of the world will have a pressing need for American goods.

Our postwar foreign trade can bring vitally needed supplies to the other countries of the world. At the same time, it can provide jobs and opportunities for business expansion on a scale that can only be matched by our wartime experience.

We can have faith that this market exists and that it can result in millions of jobs. Now, I have heard a great deal recently about the necessity of "having faith" in America and in the future. But the old Bible saying still applies: "Faith without works is dead." A little constructive thought and action won't hurt our faith a bit. As wise old Benjamin Franklin said, "God helps them that help themselves." I propose that we do just that, and combine faith with works. We have a vast number of willing customers for our products who over a period of time can pay for our goods. Some of them will need financial assistance to tide them over the difficult reconstruction period and in some cases our own bankers and exporters may not be able to give them the help they need. I believe that this government should assist in the financing of exports to



GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
National Archives and Records Service
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT LIBRARY
4001 PENTAGON, N. W.

From the papers of
Harry L. Hopkins

the extent necessary, and I think we should be realistic enough to be aware of the fact that financial help will be necessary on a relatively large scale. But we should not indulge ourselves in childlike faith and repeat again the shortsighted Republican policy of the 20's. Their policy encouraged indiscriminate lending for purposes that have little relationship to the enhancing of a country's ability to repay its debts. You may remember that some American money found its way into the pockets of playboy sons of foreign dictators and that a great deal of it went to Germany for the rebuilding of their industrial plants. That must not happen again.

The loans we make should be for productive useful purposes of the kind which this administration has always sponsored such as our FHA loans which enable millions of home owners to borrow money on terms that they can repay--low interest over a long enough period of time so that they would not default on their debts. And despite a doubting Thomas I know that the American people favor this type of loan both at home and abroad to the unsound fiscal policy of the Republican kind in the 20's.



GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
National Archives and Records Service
PRESIDENT R. ROOSEVELT LIBRARY
COLL. 100, 11.

From the Papers of
Harry L. Hopkins