

Tully Archives: FDR Papers

Speech Drafts: Address Before the Woodrow Wilson Foundation,
December 28, 1933.

Franklin D. Roosevelt Library & Museum

Collection: Grace Tully Archive

Series: Franklin D. Roosevelt Papers

Box 13; Folder = Speech Drafts:

Address before the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, December 28, 1933

①

MEMORANDUM FOR WOODROW WILSON DINNER SPEECH
THIS FOLLOWS AFTER SOUTH AMERICA

In the wider world field a chain of events has led, of late, away from rather than towards the ultimate objectives of Woodrow Wilson.

The superficial observer calls the cause of this, Nationalism; the use of that term connotes nationalism in its narrower, restrictive sense and above all an nationalism which in that sense is based on, and supported by, the over-whelming masses of the people themselves in each nation.

I challenge that description of the world populations today.

The blame for the danger to world peace lies not in the world population but in the political leaders of that population.

The imagination of the masses of world population was stirred, as never before, by President Wilson's gallant appeal to them--to those masses--to banish future war. His appeal meant little to the imagination or the hearts of a large number of the so-called statesmen who gathered in Paris to assemble a treaty of so-called peace in 1919. I saw that with my own eyes and heard that with my own ears. Political profit, personal prestige, national aggrandizement launched the League of Nations, an overburdened ship, with a crew, the members of which sought their own safety and their own profit first.

Nevertheless, through the League, directly or through its guiding motives indirectly, the states of the world have groped forward to find something better than the old way of composing their differences.

The League has provided a common meeting place; it has provided machinery which serves for international discussion; and in very many practical instances it has helped Labor and Health and Commerce and Education and last but not least the actual settlement of many disputes great and small among nations great and small.

Today the United States is cooperating openly in the fuller utilization of the League of Nations machinery than ever before.

I believe, ^{that} I express the views of ~~many~~ my countrymen when I state that the old policies, alliances, combinations and balances of power have proved themselves inadequate for the preservation of world peace. The League of Nations, encouraging as it does the extension of non-aggression pacts, of reduction of armament agreements, is a prop in the world peace structure.

We are not members and we do not intend to apply for membership, but we are giving cooperation to the League in every matter which is not primarily political and in every matter which obviously represents the views and the good of the peoples of the world as distinguished from the views and the good of political leaders, of privileged classes or of imperialistic aims.

If you figure the world's population at approximately one billion and a half people, you will find it is a safe guess to make that at least one billion, three hundred million of them are today content with the territorial limits of their respective nations and are willing further to reduce their armed forces tomorrow if every other nation in the world will agree to do

December 28, 1933

(3)

the same thing. Back of the threat to world peace lies the fear and perhaps even the possibility that the other two hundred million people may go along with ^a the leadership which seeks territorial expansion at the expense of neighbors and which under various pleas [?] ~~in avoidance~~ and unwilling to reduce armament or stop rearmament even if everybody else agrees to non-aggression and to arms reduction.

Our own country has reduced the means to the peace objective to practical terms.

I have said to every nation in the world something to this effect:

1. Let every nation agree to eliminate over a short period of years, and by progressive steps, every weapon of offense in its possession and to create no additional weapons of offense. This does not guarantee a nation against invasion unless you implement it first with the right to fortify its own border with permanent and non-mobile defenses.

2. And to assure itself through international continuing inspection that its neighbors are not creating or maintaining offensive weapons of war.

3. A simple declaration that no nation will permit any of its armed forces to cross its own borders into the territory of another nation. Such an act would be regarded by humanity as an act of aggression and, as an act, therefore, it would call for punishment by humanity, for it is clear, of course, that no such general agreement for the elimination ^{of} the weapons of offense ^{ive} warfare and of non-aggression would be of any value to the world unless every nation, without exception, entered into the agreement. ^{by solemn obligation}
If then such ^{an} agreement were signed by a great majority of the

nations on the definite condition that it would go into effect only when signed by all the nations, it would be a comparatively easy matter to determine which nations in this enlightened time are willing to go on record as belonging to the small minority of mankind which still believes in the use of the sword for invasion of, and attack upon their neighbors.

It is not a pipe dream of mine--it is assurance based on a hard-headed practical survey of what I believe ^{to} ~~would~~ be the temper of the overwhelming majority of all men and women who make up the world's population--when I say that the people of nearly all nations subscribe today to the fundamental objective, I have set forth ~~and~~ ^{and} the practical road to that objective. The political leaders are many of these peoples, ^{who} interpose and will interpose argument, excuse, befogging amendment--yes, and even ridicule. But I tell them that the men and women they serve are so far in advance of that type of leadership that we could get a world accord on world peace within a generation if the people of the world spoke for themselves.

Through all the centuries and down to the world conflict of 1914 to 1918, wars were made by governments. Woodrow Wilson challenged that necessity. That challenge made the people who create and who change governments think. They wondered with Woodrow Wilson whether the people themselves could not some day prevent governments from making war.

It is but an extension of the challenge of Woodrow Wilson for us to propose in this newer generation that from now on war by governments shall be changed to peace by peoples.

Collection: Grace Tully Archive; Series: Franklin D. Roosevelt Papers Box 13; Folder: Speech Drafts: Address before the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, December 28, 1933

December 28, 1933

SOUTH AMERICA

(Mobile Speech)

I do not hesitate to say that if I had been engaged in a political campaign as a citizen of one of the other American Republics I ~~shall~~^{should} have been strongly tempered to play upon the fears of my compatriots by charging the United States of North America with imperialistic desires for territorial or other selfish aggrandisement. and as a citizen of some other Republic I might have found it ~~difficult~~^{diff} to believe in the altruism of the largest American Republic which from time to time occupied territory of other Republics even as a temporary measure. It has, therefore, seemed clear to me as President that the time had to come to supplement and implement the Mobile declaration of President Wilson by establishing the definite policy of the United States as one opposed to armed intervention.

The maintenance of constitutional government in other nations is ~~not~~^{ne} and never should have been any sacred obligation devolving on United States alone. The maintenance of law and the orderly processes of government in this hemisphere are first of all the concern of each individual nation within its own borders and it is only if the failure of orderly processes affects the other nations of the continent that it becomes their concern; and the point to stress that in such an event it becomes their joint concern governing a continent in which we are all neighbors.

I do not hesitate to say that the Conference now concluding its labors in Montevideo has resulted in a better state of feeling among the American Republics than has existed at any time within a generation. For participation in coming to that result we can give due and hearty credit to the Secretary of State of the United States, Cordell Hull.