

ADDRESSES

UPON

THE AMERICAN ROAD

BY

Herbert Hoover

1940-1941

NEW YORK  
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

1941

COPYRIGHT, 1941, BY  
EDGAR RICKARD

Printed in the United States of America

# Contents

## *PART I: PEACE AND WAR: FOREIGN POLICIES AND PREPAREDNESS*

BELGIAN PAVILION AT WORLD'S FAIR [ <i>Dedication on May 18, 1940</i> ]	3
NATIONAL DEFENSE <sup>4</sup> [ <i>New York City, May 27, 1940</i> ]	
OUR FUTURE ECONOMIC DEFENSE [ <i>University of Pennsylvania Bicentennial Celebration,     Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, September 18, 1940</i> ]	14
THE SURRENDER OF THE BELGIAN ARMY [ <i>New York City, October 22, 1940</i> ]	37
OUR FOREIGN RELATIONS [ <i>Lincoln, Nebraska, October 31, 1940</i> ]	34
ON AMERICAN LIBERTY [ <i>Broadcast from the Metropolitan Opera, New York City,     December 7, 1940</i> ]	52
SOME NATIONAL PROBLEMS [ <i>The Pennsylvania Society of New York,     December 21, 1940</i> ]	55
THE LEASE-LEND BILL [ <i>Press Statement, New York, January 10, 1941</i> ]	63

THE QUESTION OF PEACE [ <i>New Haven, Connecticut, March 28, 1941</i> ]	66
THE IMMEDIATE RELATION OF THE UNITED STATES TO THIS WAR [ <i>A Statement to the American People, New York City, May 11, 1941</i> ]	77
A CALL TO AMERICAN REASON [ <i>Chicago, Illinois, June 29, 1941</i> ]	87
THE CRISIS [ <i>Chicago, Illinois, September 16, 1941</i> ]	103
 <i>PART II: RELIEF TO THE OCCUPIED DEMOCRACIES</i>	
STARVATION IN THE OCCUPIED DEMOCRACIES [ <i>Press Statement, August 11, 1940</i> ]	117
REPLY TO A STATEMENT OF SUPPORT OF THE BRITISH REFUSAL TO ALLOW RELIEF OF THE INVADDED DEMOCRACIES [ <i>New York City, October 6, 1940</i> ]	119
AMERICA AND THE FAMINE IN THE FIVE LITTLE DEMOCRACIES [ <i>Poughkeepsie, New York, November 15, 1940</i> ]	121
WHEN WINTER COMES TO EUROPE [ <i>Collier's Magazine, November 23, 1940</i> ]	132
THE MARCH OF HUNGER IN EUROPE [ <i>Chicago, Illinois, February 16, 1941</i> ]	147
A REPLY TO BRITISH REFUSAL TO PERMIT RELIEF [ <i>New York City, March 10, 1941</i> ]	156

*PART III: SOCIAL, EDUCATIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC  
QUESTIONS*

IT NEEDN'T HAPPEN HERE [ <i>American Mercury, July, 1940</i> ]	165
ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA [ <i>New York City, June 5, 1941</i> ]	174
COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF HAVERFORD COLLEGE [ <i>Haverford, Pennsylvania, June 7, 1941</i> ]	178
ADDRESS AT THE SYMPOSIUM OF THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF STANFORD UNIVERSITY [ <i>Stanford University, June 19, 1941</i> ]	188
DEDICATION OF THE HOOVER LIBRARY ON WAR, REVOLUTION AND PEACE [ <i>Stanford University, June 20, 1941</i> ]	196
 <i>PART IV: POLITICAL ISSUES</i>  	
COALITION GOVERNMENT [ <i>Letter to Senator Charles W. Tobey, May 21, 1940</i> ]	201
REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION [ <i>Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, June 25, 1940</i> ]	205
THE THIRD TERM [ <i>Columbus, Ohio, October 24, 1940</i> ]	224
THE MAJOR ISSUES [ <i>Salt Lake City, Utah, November 1, 1940</i> ]	240
INDEX	257

***PART I***

PEACE AND WAR: FOREIGN POLICIES AND  
PREPAREDNESS

# Belgian Pavilion at World's Fair

*Dedication on May 18, 1940*

WE ARE not gathered here to a celebration. We come with heavy hearts. This exhibition is dedicated today as a mute appeal of the worthiness of the Belgian people, their contribution to advancement of industry, to human culture; their service to human progress, and their right to live as a free people. Again they are drawn into the vortex of war through no fault of their own.

There is no eloquence in our language that can express our indignation and our pity. Rather must we turn ourselves now to seek measures by which we can alleviate their hideous sufferings, by which we can again preserve the lives of a heroic people against the day when this agony of civilization shall have passed. It is to that task that we must dedicate ourselves. But our hearts are too full for words. We have come to express our sympathy and our confidence.

# National Defense

NEW YORK CITY

[*May 27, 1940*]

I WISH to talk to my countrymen tonight upon national defense.

The increasing dangers in the world make it imperative that we be better prepared. But equally the time has come when the American people must insist that adequate organization be set up within the government which will produce this defense. It must be an organization directed by men of outstanding experience in production, management and labor unhampered by partisan politics.

Today we are onlookers at the most tremendous human tragedy of centuries. We are horrified at each gigantic scene. Scene after scene is so great and so terrible that even across three thousand miles of ocean our people are filled with sympathy, with indignation, with hopes and with fear. Our people are justly alarmed for our own safety. And some of them are more panicky than the people in Paris and London.

Whatever our feelings of outrage are now is the time to keep cool. We need cool judgment if we are to make secure our own defense. The President has stated that a flight of hostile planes over Omaha, Des Moines, or New York could take place from enemy air bases in the Western Hemisphere. But before operating from a base in the Western Hemisphere an enemy must first capture that territory. Such an enemy must fortify that base. He must transport thousands of airplanes, hundreds of thousands of troops, thousands of machinists, with shops and vast stores of weapons and materials. And he must



get all of that past the American fleet which is twice as strong as the combined fleets of Europe, omitting the British. This is a job that will take time even if it were possible. There is no occasion for panic. There is need for speed.

It can be argued that war makers from overseas have no reason or intention to attack the Western Hemisphere. Reasons can be advanced that this war cannot reach American shores. Whatever the outcome in Europe may be, or whatever the intentions of European war makers may be, that is not the problem I wish to discuss. What America must have is such defenses that no European nation will even think about crossing this three thousand miles of ocean at all. We must make sure that no such dangerous thoughts will be generated in their minds. We want a sign of "Keep off the Grass" with a fierce dog plainly in sight.

I was born and raised in that religious atmosphere which for three hundred years has never varied in its extreme devotion to peace. Yet I know that peace comes in the modern world only to those nations which are adequately prepared to defend themselves. The European Allies are now paying in blood and disaster for their failure to heed plain warnings. With adequate preparedness they might have escaped attack.

#### THE CAUSE FOR AMERICAN CONCERN

The anxiety and alarm which in recent days have gripped our people have not been all due to the rise of a new system of government in Europe which does not hesitate to overrun innocent neutrals. It is not all due to the new character of mechanized armies. It is not all due to the barbaric use of these weapons against peaceful people and against women and children. It is also due to alarm and shock over the disclosure of the inadequacy of our preparedness plans and our defense.

The Congress has hugely increased appropriations for national defense, steadily for the past five years. The expenditures upon the Army and Navy have more than doubled from about 550 million in 1934 to over one billion three hundred

thousand this year. Now the Chief of Staff tells the Congress that we are not organized to wage modern war—that our arsenals are not equipped to produce the guns we should have; that it will take until June, 1942, to obtain the necessary new rifles for our present force, that we are woefully behind in antitank guns, in antiaircraft guns; in coast defense; and in tanks.

Congress was told that we could only put 75,000 men into the field as a mobile force at the present time, and that these would not be fully equipped. Further, that it would take 18 months at least to equip our present army and reserves of 450,000 men. We are told we do not even have sufficient clothing for this army.

And the Chief of the Air Corps comes before the Congress and says that none of the Army's airplanes can be regarded as modern. Asked how many of our 2700 military airplanes "can be modernized," the Air Corps Chief replied: "Offhand, I should say a half dozen." And perhaps most disheartening of all was his statement that the whole production of military airplanes even under the impulse of Allied orders is only about 340 per month. And this contrasts with a sudden statement that we need 4000 per month.

President Roosevelt in his address last evening implied that previous administrations had been derelict in providing national defense. These statements have a partisan flavor. I could challenge the implications of Mr. Roosevelt's figures. For instance, despite the number of ships commissioned or not commissioned, the Statistical Abstract, published by Mr. Roosevelt's Administration, shows we had available fighting ships to a total of about 1,100,000 tons when he took office, against about 1,350,000 tons today.

Of far more importance, however, national defense is a relative thing. It is relative to the military menace in the rest of the world. No government has the right to impose unnecessary burdens on all those who toil.

For fourteen years after the Great War, and up to the end of the last Administration, the face of the civilized world was kept turned toward peace. All major nations were in agreement

limiting their navies and these agreements were being observed. Germany was limited by the Treaty of Versailles to 100,000 men and not much navy. Agreement to limit land armament among other nations was making progress. Methods for settlement of disputes by peaceful means were becoming stronger. During this time we in the United States spent about \$700 million a year on our Army and Navy. President Roosevelt considered the outlook throughout the world for peace and disarmament was so promising that he in 1934 himself reduced this rate of expenditure by about \$100,000,000.

The peaceful democratic government of Germany collapsed into dictatorship under Hitler two months after Mr. Roosevelt was elected. It was in Mr. Roosevelt's Administration that Europe began to rumble with aggression and armament. The German Army grew to 2,500,000 men. Their navy expanded. Great Britain, France, Russia and Japan and all others at once expanded their expenditures 400 per cent. The total of sixty nations increased expenditures from 4 billion in 1932 to 17 billion in 1938. The suggestion that we should have armed against menaces that had not been born seems overdone.

During this last five years we have had warning time and again, publicly and privately. The Congress has increased appropriations year by year since 1934. It even permitted relief funds to be used for defense. We obviously have not gotten preparedness.

Did we wish to engage in criticism we could point out that for years as officers responsible for national defense we had a Secretary of the Navy too ill to attend to his duties. Then he was replaced by a temporary appointment. For three years the differences between the Assistant Secretary of War and his superior have been public knowledge. The recommendations of wise men for organization and coordination of industry have been rejected. It all proves the stark need of revolutionary change in method of organization for the future.

What we are interested in now is not recrimination. What we want is to be prepared.

The first step in adequate preparedness must be made right

in Washington. Our governmental machinery must be made capable of producing preparedness.

#### THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

In the ten years prior to 1934, when the face of the world was turned toward peace, our expenditure for munitions and constructions was under 150 million a year. Such organization as was necessary to make these purchases and bring about their manufacture could be carried out under the War and Navy Departments. We are confronted with a much larger and more complicated problem. The Congress is just passing an appropriation of 3 and a third billion, a large part of it to be used to manufacture planes, tanks, guns and ships. That is a problem of gigantic industrial production. That requires another form of organization if we are not to fail again.

#### WHAT SORT OF PREPAREDNESS DO WE WANT?

Before that organization is created we must answer the question as to what kind of preparedness we want. My own view is that we need first a strong navy. We need a skeletonized but more flexible army. We need large additions of skilled personnel in our reserves, air pilots, tank drivers, and gunners. And we need equally the organization of our industrial capacity to produce our weapons and supplies. It is in that organization where we are weakest. We do not want 50,000 planes put away in hangars. These planes would be obsolete in a year. I do not suppose that this is the President's proposal. In the face of constantly advancing science and invention it would be folly to have 50,000 airplanes in peacetime. It would require half a million men to look after them and to fly them. It would require more billions of dollars a year to support them.

What we need is organization in Washington capable of bringing about coordination in American industry that can produce 50,000 airplanes in a year if they were called to do it.

If we could demonstrate that we could supply the Army and Navy with 4000 planes during a single month that would be ample notice to the world to keep off our grass. Likewise we need an organized capacity to produce tanks and other arms.

We need much larger research to constantly improve these machines.

The test of preparedness is not to be found in words or blueprints. The test is the capacity and the ability of our factories to turn out quickly and effectively—guns, airplanes, tanks and whatever we require. And the proof to these things lies in an adequate organization in the Government that will permit these things to be produced by industry.

The magnitude of this problem of producing 4000 airplanes a month contrasts vividly with the present capacity of 340 military planes a month.

#### WHAT SORT OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION MUST WE HAVE?

In the last twenty-five years the governments of the world have been confronted, as never before in history, with the problem of creating governmental organizations capable of making their national preparedness function. During that time it has been my duty to observe and to deal with these organizations on the economic side in a score of governments. I have seen their successes and their failures. During the last war I was constantly in contact with the governmental organizations behind the lines in France and Germany and Great Britain. I saw these organizations emerge from national muddling by politicians. I saw them develop into extremely efficient agencies under the leadership of competent men. At one time I examined these organizations at the request of President Wilson. Later on I sat in our American War Council and participated in organizing this country's industrial resources when we entered the Great War. While in the White House I had part in preparing plans for organization against a time of emergency for defense of our country.

This experience of the whole world leads to certain definite

and specific conclusions as to organization of preparedness in industry when governments are under strain.

First and foremost: This is a business requiring expert knowledge of manufacturing, industry, labor and transportation and agriculture. The lesson of the whole of the last World War and every step in the present war is that the procurement of munitions in any large volume must be separated from the Army and Navy establishment. It must be done by an organization separate and independent of either department. It is an industrial job—a manufacturing job, a mass production job—for management and labor. It requires that thousands of factories be coordinated to do their part.

The profession of our soldiers and sailors is to make war. They are not trained as production and financial executives. And neither are the politicians nor bureaucrats. This is a job for business men and labor.

Nor is it a job that can be done any better by political coalitions. This is no question of political unity. It is a question of hardheaded practical business organization in which for the security of the nation there is no politics at all.

The second lesson learned over and over again out of all these recent years is that such operations cannot be controlled by boards or councils or conferences.

They must be controlled by a single handed trusted and experienced man. Every nation in Europe in the last war started in to organize industrial production of war materials through boards. And after muddling for months and the sacrifice of the lives of hundreds of thousands of men and the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars every government fighting in that war finally created a Munitions Department, headed by a single man. When we entered the Great War we failed to profit by that experience. We set up the War Industries Board in an advisory capacity to the Army and Navy. It was supposed to coordinate the activities of those departments with industry. It occupied itself largely with futile debates. We lost precious months by the fuddling of this board. After these months of muddling we came to a tardy realization that the experience of

the nations might be worth while, and we made one man, Mr. Bernard Baruch, responsible. And then the industrial machine began to hum and munitions to arrive.

The efficient production of goods involves the same problems and techniques, whether they are produced for private or public consumption, whether they are for war or for peace.

The whole genius of the American people has demonstrated over one hundred and fifty years that when we come to executive action, including the office of the President of the United States, we must have single headed responsibility. It is just as foolish to set up a board to conduct munitions business as it would be to set up a board to conduct the presidency of the United States,

Centralization of executive responsibility for the production of munitions does not require clothing any man with autocratic powers. This form of organization can and should be based upon organized cooperation. The American people have the highest sense of cooperation of any nation in the world. We proved that in the last war. We shall prove it again if the government organizes in such a way as to instill confidence in the people.

The third lesson taught by experience is that we must get these vast expenditures of money out of politics—get them out of sectional pressures and out of group pressures. We must get them focused into one place where the whole nation can look at it and watch the spending. That is the only way we can prevent profiteering. It is the only way we can eliminate waste and assure efficiency. We must not blind ourselves to the sectional pulling and log rolling that goes on in our country. We know too well the use that can be made politically of favors to localities and to individuals in the expenditure of such large sums of money.

It is a sorry thing that the American people have to learn these lessons over and over again every time necessity knocks at our doors.

Therefore what are the essentials of this organization if we want real preparedness? It requires:

1. That a Munitions Administration be created in Washington.
2. That it should have a single headed Administrator with assistant heads for labor, agriculture, and industry.
3. That Administrator should be an industrialist and not a politician.
4. That he should have authority to appoint a non-partisan advisory board representing the Army, Navy, labor, transportation, manufacturing and agriculture.
5. That the whole of the purchasing and manufacturing for the Army and Navy from private industry should be done by this Administrator. The business of the Army and Navy is to state what they want. It is for the Munitions Administrator to deliver it.
6. That a research organization should be created to constantly improve these products.
7. That all appropriations for such work should be made to this organization.

This is a form of organization that will get speed and economy. Urgency, speed and economy are not bureaucratic virtues.

#### REGENERATION OF OUR NATIONAL STRENGTH

Creation of such organization would be only the first step in meeting the task before us.

Preparedness in a nation is not alone the ability to manufacture arms, or even the number of soldiers or warships or airplanes. It lies in the moral strength and the resolute will of the people. It also lies in economic strength and prosperity of a people. I do not wish to dwell upon the fact that today we have 10 million unemployed; that we have 18 million destitute people on relief, that one-third of our population is living at subnormal standards that agriculture is kept afloat only by government subsidy. That our national strength for defense has been weakened by the huge increase of our national debt and taxes in time of peace.

Business and industry have been palsied with fear, hesitation



and lack of confidence. In consequence our industrial efficiency has even decreased in the last eight years. That can be proven. A recent census of the machine tools in the United States showed that while only 52 per cent were over ten years old in 1932, there are 70 per cent of them over ten years old today. That means our industrial plant has slipped backward in its vital equipment.

Today our call is for industrial production to defend the nation. To get that we must have more than efficient government organization. We must change the attitude of government toward industry. If we are to be prepared for the supreme test of national defense there must be regeneration of the springs of economic life in our people. We must restore confidence and thus employment. We truly need national unity for this most fundamental part of life and national defense.

France is today paying in blood the penalty for a government of similar economic attitudes under the government of Premier Blum.

We have no good reason to be discouraged or fearful. We have the largest resources in the world. We have the greatest mechanical genius. Our men are courageous and our women inspired in fortitude. The whole world knows the capacity of the United States in initiative, in execution, in creation and performance. Once we convince the world that our capacities are organized no nation will have any desire to establish bases on the Western Hemisphere or make any attacks upon us now or any other time.

It may be necessary for Human liberty to take refuge upon this continent. We must efficiently be prepared to defend it as the last hope of the world.

# Our Future Economic Defense

*University of Pennsylvania  
Bicentennial Celebration*

PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA  
[September 18, 1940]

I HAVE agreed to discuss this evening some of our problems in economic preparedness for the world to come. No doubt after this war there will be profound changes over the whole gamut of social and political life as well. But I shall confine myself to a reach into the future economic forces with which we shall likely be confronted when peace or suspended fighting appears again in the world. And I shall make some suggestions as to defense measures. Some of them should be applied at once.

In half an hour I can present only a bare outline. I hope to expand these suggestions on some future occasion.

And I give advance notice that it is not a partisan discussion, despite the intellectual climate of a national campaign. There are disabled minds, of course, which would imagine an attack upon the New Deal if I were to read the Ten Commandments during this period. But I will not even do that.

There is little humor or wit that fits into economic discussion. It does not have the drama of airplanes, guns, soldiers, bugles. But the time is here when we have simply got to think in these new economic frontiers even if they are not exciting.

National preparedness in any direction must be based upon some anticipation of forces and events. I am fully aware of the tentative nature of any anticipation. But in the situation today we must have preparedness in economic ideas as well as in arms

if we are to defend America. It is not too early to begin to think.

There are today two schools engaged in after war thinking. They are the realists who wish to prepare for the worst and the hopefuls who still believe in fairies and benevolences. There is much more joy in the latter school. I should like to engage in that sort of thought. I should prefer to discuss what I would like the world to do—what it ought to do for the progress of mankind. It is a far more soothing form of public discussion.

I have, however, the depressing conviction that for many years after any so-called peace that is likely to come from this war we shall be confronted with grave economic dangers. We need to defer hope that forces of spiritual regeneration and progress will regain ascendancy for a long time.

In order to have some basis of discussion and suggestion I shall at this moment assume:

Those certain large areas will continue under totalitarian dictatorship for some time to come.

That the whole character of the totalitarian ideologies promises economic aggression for some time to come.

That there will be other large areas in the world which will wish to maintain a free economy.

#### THE DIVISION OF THE WORLD

It would seem likely that the totalitarian domination of Germany and Italy will cover most of the continent of Europe from Russia to the Atlantic and will also include the dependencies of these former European states in Africa and the East Indies. I am not going to try to read Messrs. Hitler and Mussolini's minds upon the political setup which they may create on the continent. But I feel that we may safely assume that they will try to set up a totalitarian economic hegemony of this entire area. In the East, the Japanese will at least for a long time strive for a similar hegemony over China. Russia will form a third totalitarian group in between.

In the remaining world there can be some hope of retaining the major characteristics of free economy.

On the basis I have stated, the totalitarian areas will likely embrace about 60 per cent of the world's population and about 40 per cent of the world's trade. About 40 per cent of the exports of the United States in 1938 went to these totalitarian areas. Whether the totalitarian area is less or greater, the problems we shall have to meet are much the same.

Of course a major shift in today's war outlook would require revision of thought.

I do not believe the British Empire will fail in its heroic defense. Certainly if the United States joins in this war we would inevitably become a totalitarian dictatorship ourselves and any hope of maintained free economy in the world would be gone for a generation. But we cannot sit still and simply say we will wait until the end of this war before we start to think. And our universities are the places from which we should have systematic thinking.

The destructive economic horsemen whom we shall face after this fighting is over do not, however, wholly come from the present war. But we must look their steeds in the teeth if we are to prepare economic defense against them. They will not be gift horses. There are likely to be Trojan horses among them. Putting them all together they make an uncomfortable group.

#### THE ECONOMIC SITUATION

First: The initial form of peace will probably be merely a suspension of mass killing. The most unlikely of all outcomes is disarmament. The whole totalitarian idea has a military base, and whether it continues aggressive after this war ends or not, the free nations will be sufficiently afraid of it to remain armed. That means we are now compelled to direct a large segment of our productive capacity for daily living over to production for military defense. And that is no real remedy for our ills in unemployment and agriculture, which are already sapping the standard of living of all the people.

Second: The totalitarian economic systems will have certain major impacts upon other nations. Their exports and imports will likely be conducted either directly by the government or under such controls as will amount to the same thing. They will emphasize barter trade with foreign countries set in a framework of clearing agreements and blocked currencies. They will hold to their theory or be compelled from impoverishment to increasing self-sufficiency within their own borders.

Third: Most of the totalitarian nations and most of the Free states will be so burdened with debt that a period of devaluation, inflation, or repudiation in some form will ensue with all the instabilities to currencies and exchange that come from this quarter.

Fourth: Long-term international credit in the world has already greatly broken down. Intergovernmental debts from the First World War, except Finland's, were repudiated long before the present outbreak. Moreover, taking the world over, loans made by private investors to foreign governments have been so largely defaulted or repudiated as to have greatly impaired all confidence in such investments. Further, an increasing number of countries even outside the totalitarian states have impaired the rights of private property of foreigners either by taxation or confiscation. Thus, the whole moral foundations of international credit, both governmental and private, have been so undermined that there is likely to be little of it for some time. There may be the artificialities of semi-political loans made by governments.

Among the consequences of this breakdown of International credit is that the development of backward areas—and thus the economic growth of the world—will be greatly slackened for lack of capital.

Another consequence is the inability to use long-term credit to equate trade balances over terms of years.

Fifth: For a long time to come, the function of gold in settlement of international balances will be greatly limited. The United States has today cornered most of the world's gold.

There is no present method that would restore it to general international use and but few nations will want to give up commodities for the metal gold.

Sixth: All these pressures make for increased barter trade or at least trade upon a direct two country basis. Thus triangular trade, through country A exporting to country B, then country B to country C and thence to country A, will be greatly diminished.

The instabilities and unemployment resulting from these restrictions of world trade create a constant pressure for building up home industries—or its artificial form in so-called self-containment.

The net effect of all these impacts is to shrink the export market for everybody.

Seventh: The hours of labor in the totalitarian areas will be at least 20 per cent and possibly 30 per cent longer than at present in the United States. And in many free states it is inevitable that wages and the standard of living will be lowered and hours of labor longer. Thus they will produce many goods at prices with which, with our present costs, we cannot compete.

Eighth: The world is going to resume trade the moment peace comes. The idea of the Free states combining against the totalitarian nations in trade is nonsense. The world has to live. Moreover, the interests of the Free states are too divergent to consummate such combinations. For instance, our South American cousins cannot live unless they sell their agriculture surpluses into the totalitarian areas. They cannot sell their surpluses to us. We produce a surplus of many of the same things. They will buy totalitarian manufactured goods in return. Any other expectation is sheer illusion.

Ninth: There is likely to be a temporary demand for farm products. When this war ends, all Europe will be short of food supplies. The extent of that shortage will depend on how long the war lasts. If the war goes on for one year there will be famine in large areas.

I hope this long list of economic ills does not all come upon

humanity. But we had better predicate our thinking on the worst possible blows just as we must in thinking of military defense. I believe, however, we have defenses without adopting totalitarian methods ourselves.

#### THE EFFECT OF THESE ECONOMIC FORCES UPON US

If we interpret these blows upon the United States we shall find they materialize in three major directions. That is from the huge armament which is imposed upon us; from the effect upon our export trade; and from the effect upon our import trade. And mixed in it all are our already difficult domestic problems of unemployment and the unsatisfactory state of our agriculture.

#### THE ECONOMIC EFFECT OF OUR ARMAMENT

From everything we can see now, we are faced with years of stupendous expenditure upon military preparedness. That is, if we wish to keep evil eyes turned away from the Western Hemisphere. Obviously, if part of our manpower is to be diverted to armies and navies and unemployed, we lose that much productive power for articles and services which might have been a part of our standard of living.

#### EXPORT

The whole of the external pressures that I have enumerated drive inevitably to our diminished export market.

Our total peacetime productive economy is dependent as to about 5 or 6 per cent upon export trade. However, this 5 or 6 per cent has a larger effect than this bare proportion. In some commodities, such as cotton, 30 or 40 per cent is dependent upon a foreign market. Failure to sell our surplus cotton not only demoralizes all our cotton growers but our demoralized cotton growers affect other groups.

#### IMPORTS

At present costs of production we shall be flooded with foreign goods that we could produce ourselves.

Wherever the totalitarian and the impoverished world generally can do it, they will combine to force up prices upon those commodities which we do not ourselves produce.

#### WHAT TO DO

It would be of no purpose for me to present all this economic complexity unless I had some suggestions for defense measures.

At once let me say that we are more fortunately situated than most nations. And if we have the will power to set up adequate defense on one hand and constructive measures on the other, despite *all* these obstacles I am convinced we could carry the United States on to a greater period of prosperity than ever before in its history.

#### MOBILIZED NATIONAL EFFICIENCY IS OUR PRIMARY DEFENSE

Our primary defense is to increase our industrial efficiency. And by that I mean to produce more goods and services per capita of the kind we can use at the prices we can sell them at. And that is vital right now as well as after war.

Increased economic efficiency expresses itself in reduction of the prices or the relative prices of goods and services. Thereby more people can buy them. Thereby we hold the standard of living against increased taxes. Thereby we can sell goods and services at home and abroad in competition with foreigners. Thereby we can even lift the standard of living at home as against the adverse forces of diverted manpower. And thereby we can make more jobs in producing goods and services in relief of our unemployment.

But to reduce prices of goods and services we must reduce the cost of producing them. And both to lift the standard of



Living and to take up the slack of technological unemployment from the older industries and our present unemployed, we must discover new articles and services. Thereby we create new industry.

There was a time when we got cost reducing inventions and new articles and services from the genius in the garret. But that day has gone by. These gifts now come from long years of patient experiment in great laboratories. Like the growth of plants cell by cell some day there comes forth the blossom of great discovery, of illuminating hypothesis, of great generalization or a new instrument of research. From this raw material of abstract science then applied science research gains greater command of power, new articles of use, new methods, and new laborsaving devices.

And at once I come to the first step in increase of industrial efficiency. That is more support to research in pure science. In all of our universities and our scientific institutions I doubt if we are spending \$20,000,000 a year. That is only about 7 per cent of our allowance for cosmetics. And the amount is decreasing for lessening returns on endowments are forcing our universities to divert their funds to their primary job of teaching. There is not a professor of physics in the country who cannot state a hundred lines of research that are urgent but lagging for lack of resources.

Nor do we have to await new discoveries in pure science. A thousand openings already beckon to action by applied science to use what we already know.

Therefore the second step is more support to applied science research. We probably spend \$200,000,000 on that, mostly through government and industry. But that is only 15 per cent of our cigarette bill, and with the depression that has slackened, whereas it should be increased.

Nor we do not have to await the turning out of new inventions and new methods by applied science research. Again we need to put into action what we already know. We must bring our plant and equipment out of its present slump of obsolescence. We must eliminate more industrial waste motion and

more waste of materials and men. We must apply every laborsaving device. We must remove every sort of restriction by both capital and labor which impedes or penalizes the use of better methods and better machines. We must maintain free competition so that lower costs will be passed on to the consumer at lower prices. And we must have constructive tax systems and removal of unnecessary governmental restrictions which lessen or destroy the initiative of men.

This does not mean more pressure upon individual workers. It means that we work our machines and heads harder. It does not mean that we should abandon any protections to the health of workers. That would make for inefficiency in itself.

The common expression in our country today is that these competitive conditions from abroad will compel us to reduce wages, lengthen our hours of labor, and reduce our standard of living as the totalitarian nations have done. There is an alternative. That is to increase our industrial efficiency.

The proof of our national ability to do this is shown in our own economic history. During the decade from 1920 to 1930 we increased our productive efficiency by the astonishing amount of about 40 per cent. In other words, with a growth of 15 per cent in population we were able to produce 40 per cent more goods and services. In the decade from 1930 to 1940, however, we made little progress. In many ways we slipped backward. We have not kept our plant and equipment up to date. Our machine tools became an average of three years less up-to-date than in 1930. This step back expresses itself in many other ways such as slackening of research and decrease in our national income.

As an example of methods of applying what we know I may recall that at my request in 1920 the various engineering societies made an exhaustive and detailed study of industrial wastes and upon methods of increasing industrial efficiency. The Department of Commerce joined with the engineering societies in organizing a great voluntary national campaign over ten years. It was participated in by employers, labor and engineers. Over 1000 committees of research and co-operation were organized.

They developed and carried through over 1000 positive projects. Our scientific societies put on a great organized campaign for more research. Our pure science research was greatly expanded. Our industrial research laboratories increased by over 1000 during the decade.

There were no laws enacted; there were no restrictions on the volume of production or prices. There was no dictation. It was simply a co-ordination of sound technology and sound public interest with co-operative volunteer action. I am making no claim that these were the only forces at work for increased efficiency during that time. Anyway, those ten years as I have said represented the greatest advance in national efficiency of any since our beginnings. It could be done again.

But there are two things required—more money for research and organized co-operation to apply what we already know.

It is by all these means that we can hope to avoid reduction in wages, to contribute to meet competition at home from foreign goods and to be able to sell more goods abroad. It is by these means that we can build up more home industries to employ our people displaced from foreign trade or now unemployed.

These proposals are not new. But now our very life as a democracy will hang upon our doing it. We have to meet the dictators and their ideologies of forced efficiency and forced labor. Free men can compete with any forced system if they will organize their intelligence. We can turn the gifts of science to up building of mankind and not to its destruction. And in them are a thousand new frontiers and new opportunities for youth.

#### SELF-CONTAINMENT AS A WEAPON OF DEFENSE

There are other important defenses which look more particularly to after war consequences. This question of building up home industries goes further than the natural processes of scientific discovery, invention and application of what we already know. The idea of self-sufficiency has been injected into

this troubled world. That assumes creating home industries despite lower prices and better quality from imports. But I regret to say we may be forced either by economics or military necessity to free ourselves from dependence on overseas supplies.

I realize that a world frantic on self-containment where costs and quality are sacrificed is contrary to true hope of world progress. Likewise, a world frantic to make military airplanes is contrary to hopes of world good. But we are not for the present in the kind of world devoted entirely to good. However, we could produce about three-fourths of our present imports if we had to.

Certainly it is time we exhaustively examine our own possibilities in this direction.

#### QUOTAS ON IMPORTS AS A DEFENSE MEASURE

Foreign trade defenses must likely be built up in another quarter. Totalitarian economics places foreign trade in the hands of governments in competition with the individual trader of free systems. Unprotected the individual trader cannot withstand totalitarian economic blitzkriegs. If the totalitarians want the button market of Peru they can afford to give away buttons until all competitors are dead. Moreover, they can afford to sell goods in the United States on a basis that will drive our own manufacturers into bankruptcy. We have hitherto relied upon anti-dumping laws for the protection against imports of less than cost of production. Who is to say that they have been dumping goods when no one can find nor calculate their costs of production? Years ago we realized that truth when we tried on such a basis to stop the shipment of Russian lumber that was stained by the blood of enslaved kulaks.

Moreover, with restriction of our exports and unemployment at home, we cannot sit by and watch a flood of cheap goods over our borders or holdups in prices of the things we do not produce.

One avenue of defense should be much further explored. That is the use of quotas. All nations, including ourselves, have dallied with it during the last five years. The quota is the limitation of the volume of goods shipped to us by any one nation to an amount determined by ourselves. Reciprocal quotas might be used to both protect our own people and to secure outlets for exports. Within such quotas our private traders could carry on for themselves and avoid barter, price control and other totalitarian methods.

For us to defend ourselves by placing our exports and imports in the hands of our government would only mean placing the production of them under more government control. Then we drift to totalitarianism ourselves.

The quota is far more ironclad than tariffs, and the reciprocal quotas more potent than reciprocal tariffs against the economic dive bombers of the new era. None of these methods make for the ideal. But we cannot refuse to consider economic defense weapons any more than we can refuse to consider building airplanes. We had better begin to think about it.

#### IN CONCLUSION

Unfortunately Foreign Trade defense measures are mostly negative. We may hope they are a temporary world phase. But building up the nation upon scientific research and its applications is positive and it rests upon a foundation for all time. From them we may have the sure faith that we can carry this country to higher standards of living and prosperity than we have hitherto known, despite all the ills which beset us.

And there is long view hope that the world may some day improve its general conduct. I am one who believes that given time, these false systems will break down of their own evil. I have no proof of this. I believe it because I believe that the peoples who have one time lived in liberty will always hunger for its blessings. There is implanted within them a spark which can never be extinguished no matter what the repression may be.

The product of scientific research is not alone the building of industry. It is not alone the eradication of disease or the multiplication of harvests. It is not alone the extension of opportunity and adventure for our youth.

Research into the fundamental laws of nature contributes to the moral and spiritual life of mankind. Here lies the unfolding of beauty, the ever widening of the boundaries of knowledge. Here is the "inculcation of veracity of thought" in a world sodden with intellectual dishonesty. Here is the lifting of men's minds beyond the depressing incidents of the day. Here is the confirmation of a Supreme Guidance in the universe far above man himself.

And today we need more of it to help save a great nation.

Our great service for all humanity is to make the industrial revolution serve free men. We must prove here in America that free men are the only basis of prosperity and progress. We must prove that the purpose of science is to save mankind not to destroy it. And we must prove that we can defend ourselves.

# The Surrender of the Belgian Army

NEW YORK CITY

[*October 22, 1940*]

ON MAY 28, 1940, Premier Paul Reynaud of France made the following statement over the radio: "I must announce to the French people a grave event. This event occurred last night. France can no longer count on the Belgian Army . . . King Leopold III without a word to the French and British soldiers . . . laid down his arms. It is a fact without precedent in history." That statement is absolutely untrue, both in fact and in its implications.

The majority of the Belgian leaders at that moment in France, unable to obtain other information and under extreme pressure from the French Prime Minister supported this denunciation.

Prime Minister Churchill in the House of Commons, however, on May 28, stated: "I have no intention of suggesting to the House that we should attempt at this moment to pass judgment upon the action of the King of the Belgians in his capacity as Commander-in-Chief of the Belgian Army. That army has fought very bravely and has both suffered and inflicted heavy losses."

Mr. Churchill had been constantly advised of the progress of events by the British liaison officer with the King of the Belgians, Admiral Sir Roger Keyes, who had remained with King Leopold to the last evening prior to the capitulation. His reports to Mr. Churchill from May 25, when the Belgian Ministers left the King for London and Paris, up to the very end were in absolute contradiction to the statement of Premier

Reynaud. The British Prime Minister obviously could not add to the already accumulating difficulties by public discussion with the Premier of France.

I do not accuse Premier Reynaud of willful misrepresentation. The enormous strain he was under, and the misinformation which had been placed in his hands by officers of the French Army endeavoring to cover their own failures, are a matter of record.

Nevertheless, human justice and the interest in a brave people who have always occupied so warm a place in the American heart, require that this statement be not allowed to stand. It is contrary to all of the facts. Having had a quarter of a century of acquaintance and friendship not only with the Belgian people but with the constitutional leaders of Belgium, including the present King and his father, I feel it my duty to place the truth before the American people.

It is the more important that the truth be known as in the coming winter starvation and famine will stalk through Belgium. Many otherwise sympathetic people, who would be interested in seeing that this brave nation again has a chance to live, tend to dismiss its cries in the belief that it betrayed the cause of freedom at a critical time. Never has a more wrongful charge been laid at the feet of a nation or its leaders.

When Premier Reynaud made his statement I felt from all my knowledge of the character of both the leadership in Belgium and the people themselves that it could not be true. And since that time I have made it my business to secure from Belgium an assembly of the facts, not from one person, but from a score of eminent men, Belgians and Americans, who lived through the various phases of this tragic incident. The material they have placed in my hands includes the most positive of documentation.

That documentation which is attached unfolds the following story:

The neutrality of Belgium had been guaranteed by Germany, France and Britain. This assurance was solemnly repeated as late as August 26, 1939. Belgium, in fidelity to her



treaties and her national policies, maintained neutrality in the most circumspect manner up to the moment of the attack. In the early stages of the war constant assurances were given by the Germans that they would under no circumstances transgress the sovereignty of Belgium. But in her dangerous surroundings and with her knowledge of the Germans and the ever present possibility that an attack would again be made upon France through Belgium as in 1914, the Belgian Government in the early days of the war had mobilized its army of about 700,000 men.

For a clear understanding of the surrender of this army it is necessary to state in broad lines the military situation which led up to that event. To aid in clarity I have, with the aid of Belgian staff officers, who were present in Belgium during these operations, prepared four maps showing the position of the Allied armies at four critical dates.

The defense plan of the Belgians in case of German attack was to engage in delaying action on an outpost line along her northern boundary from Antwerp to Liege by way of the Albert Canal, and thence up the Meuse River to the French boundary. The total length of this line was approximately 150 miles.

A second and principal line of defense had been prepared (Line No. 2 known as the K.W. Line). This line ran from Antwerp via Lierre, Malines and Louvain to Wavre and Namur. From the fortress of Namur to the French boundary the Meuse River itself constituted the line of defense. The K.W. line was about 60 miles in length or 90 miles shorter than the Antwerp—Liege—Ardennes line. It was not expected by the Belgians that they could hold No. 1 line for long.

The Belgians in case of attack by the Germans expected to receive support from the British and French armies as guarantors of their neutrality. These armies at the outbreak of hostilities were concentrated in northern France. The Belgian Army planned to hold the Albert Canal line long enough to allow the British and French armies to join them on the K.W. (No. 2) line and the Meuse.

Without any warning whatever the Germans attacked the Belgian outpost line at four o'clock in the morning of May 10. At this hour swarms of German planes descended upon the Belgian airdromes. Most of the Belgian air force taken without warning was unable to get off the ground, and was practically wiped out. Coincidentally numerous cities and towns, with railway stations and bridges, in Belgium were bombed and machine-gunned by German planes, and the citizens went into action under the personal command of the King.

The strongly fortified position of Eben Emael, near Liege, a pivot of the Belgian outpost defense line, was taken on May 10 by the surprise use of German gliders and parachutists who landed during the night without sound or warning on that fort, in addition to use of anti-aircraft artillery at short range. The other Belgian forts at Liege continued their resistance.

The Belgians resisted on the outpost line until May 12 and then gradually fell back to the main defense line (No. 2), where they took up position with the Allied forces. The line was stabilized at that point about May 14. At that moment the extreme left wing resting upon the coast was held by the French Seventh Army. This army had on May 11 pushed ahead into southern Holland, but had been forced to retreat. Next on the line the Belgians held thirty-five miles from Antwerp to Louvain. On their right came about three British divisions, who held about twelve miles of line as far as Wavre. On their right again the French army held the line to Namur and thence up the Meuse to the French border, whence it continued south to join the Maginot Line. Along this line the Belgians were also holding the forts at Namur, and were still firing from the completely isolated forts at Liege.

On May 13 and 14 the Germans broke through the French lines north of Dinant in Belgium and at Mezieres in France. A wholesale debacle of the French Ninth Army ensued and immediately, General Gamelin, the Allied Supreme Commander, ordered a general retreat in spite of the fact that the Belgians and British were holding along their entire front. The French armies at once started this retreat and the Belgians and British

had of necessity to join. The Belgians fought a rearguard action protecting the Allied left flank until the line was again stabilized on about the 21st of May.

In the meantime, the Germans had thrust through to the Channel Coast at Abbeville, creating a panhandle of German advance which entirely isolated all the armies in Belgium from those in France.

The last tragic stages of this envelopment by the Germans developed between the 21st and 27th of May. It is with the period within these dates that this brochure is principally concerned.

The Belgians in these six days continued to hold off vastly superior forces protecting the British and French retreat toward the coast. The pocket within which the Allied armies were held constantly shrank under the gigantic mechanized and air attack. Within this pocket of less than 800 square miles were a normal civilian population of 800,000, an estimated number of over 800,000 refugees who had fled in the utmost confusion ahead of the retreating armies, about 500,000 soldiers of the Belgian Army, and about 400,000 of the French and British armies, or a total of over 2 1/2 million people. Obviously there may be discrepancies in the total numbers of those crowded into this zone at the time, because it is impossible to establish an exact number of refugees. The roads were crowded with them, impeding all action. Food and drinking water were running short, making it impossible to maintain all these people and armies. The Belgian army, separated from its arsenals, was rapidly exhausting its ammunition. The Belgian soldiers and refugees were without air protection.

The final seven tragic days stand out from the daily record.

May 21. General Weygand, now substituted as Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Armies, attended a council of commanders of the armies in Belgium, at the headquarters of King Leopold. The King informed General Weygand that unless the French army in France could break through the German Panhandle from the south the Allied Armies in Belgium

would be annihilated or reduced to a condition where further resistance would be impossible. General Weygand agreed to attack the German Panhandle from the south. It was agreed that the French and British armies in Belgium were to attack from the north, and that the Belgians were to extend their lines to protect their Allies' left flank, thus releasing British and French forces for this attack. The British made this attack but were repulsed. No effectual attack was made from French armies in Northern France.

May 22. The Belgian Army was holding a front of 56 miles and receiving the full shock of the German attack, carried out mainly by powerful mechanized units. The Allies were unable to furnish air support to the Belgians, whose lines were continuously and relentlessly bombed and machine-gunned by German planes. This German action continued with increasing intensity until the end.

May 24. Four members of the Belgian Cabinet called upon the King urging him to leave Belgian territory in order to strengthen the fugitive government wherever it might locate. The King replied that it would be cowardice and desertion for him to leave the army of which he was in command. There was no possibility of evacuating the Belgian army to England, as the British needed all available shipping for the evacuation of their own army. The Belgians were informed that they must expect to remain. The British and French asked the Belgians to protect their flank for another forty-eight hours. The ministers returned by plane to Paris, via London.

May 25. A meeting of the generals of the Allied armies in Belgium reaffirmed the inevitability of surrender of all but the forces which could be evacuated over the Channel. The King informed them he would continue to fight as long as he could to protect their evacuation, but gave notice that it was impossible to hold out much longer without more Allied aid in the air and without supplies of food and ammunition.

May 26. The Germans threw additional forces into the attack upon the Belgians. The lack of air support especially subjected

the Belgians, both troops and refugees, to enormous losses in killed and wounded.

May 27. All Belgian reserves were thrown into the battle and ammunition was largely exhausted. The Germans pushed back the French line on the Belgian right, and broke the Belgian line at Thielt. The Belgian military and civilian wounded had accumulated far beyond all possibility of proper medical aid. The British and French armies had started evacuation several days earlier.

May 28. Having sustained very heavy losses in protection of the retreat of his Allies and convinced that no further benefit to the Allied cause could be gained by the annihilation of his remaining troops and the massacre of vast number of refugees, the King as Commander-in-chief finally decided to surrender his Army. History will declare that he acted loyally and with immense sacrifice.

No event in recent years has united more completely the Flemish and Walloons in Belgium than the King's conduct of this campaign. The vast majority of the people in Belgium gave their immediate approval.

The documents in support of these facts are given herewith.

HERBERT HOOVER

(The above is the preface to a booklet issued by The Belgian Educational Foundation.)

# Our Foreign Relations

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

[*October 31, 1940*]

FOR some twenty years I served my country in positions of responsibility affecting the foreign relations of the United States. Knowing those responsibilities I have during this past seven years avoided criticism of Mr. Roosevelt's foreign policies except where they affected the vital safety of the American people.

Even in those discussions I have sought rather to uphold major principles than to criticize failures.

However, Mr. Roosevelt now comes before the nation and asks that we abandon one of the great safeguards on personal power in this Republic by re-electing him for a third term. He bases this demand and his friends base this demand largely upon his indispensability in the conduct of our foreign relations.

## MUST FORGET DOMESTIC FAILURE

We are told by the New Dealers that he is so indispensable to our foreign relations that we must forget their domestic failure.

They would have us forget that we have had for their whole seven years, and still have, some 10 million people unemployed, with 18 millions still on public relief. They would have us forget that all this time agriculture has been kept afloat only with government subsidies.

We are asked to overlook the decrease in national wealth in this decade for the first decade in our history. And they would have us forget the building up of dangerous national debt.

They would have us forget the gross neglect and fumbling of national defense despite repeated warnings.

They would have us forget their steady drift toward National Socialism and away from the freedom of men.

We are to forget all this because of Mr. Roosevelt's superlative conduct of our foreign relations.

Before we allow this blackout of domestic failure we should examine these foreign policies to see how successful they have really been. And we may ask the question as to whether these policies have not been as dangerous to the Republic as even the domestic policies.

When we are faced with the choice of a President of these United States we have not only the right but the duty to examine those questions. We must inquire if this country is being led into foreign war and we must inquire more deeply than campaign promises. However, even if these policies were good there are other men among the 130 millions of this Republic who can guide our country. But if these policies are not good, then what?

#### AMERICAN ASPIRATIONS FOR PEACE

Let us first state the long-established aspiration of the American people in their foreign relations. We want peace; we want the goodwill and the respect of other nations. We want to promote moral and economic movements for peace and prosperity in the world. We want to keep out of other people's wars. We want to be free from interference in our domestic life by other nations. We don't want any Fifth Column. We want to protect ourselves and the Western Hemisphere from aggression. And in a dangerous world we are determined to be armed to the teeth to defend ourselves and the Western Hemisphere.

#### A SEVEN YEAR CONTRACT

The whole world knows that we covet no territory of other nations. We do not wish to impose our ideology or our beliefs on any other race. We want to build up America within our

own borders. We want to devote ourselves to the abolition of want and poverty at home. We threaten nobody.

In 1933 when Mr. Roosevelt came into office the world believed this. Do they believe it now?

At that time the whole face of the world was turned toward peace. We had no enemy in the world. We were using our economic and our moral strength to promote the peace of the world. We needed only 150,000 men in an army and a modest navy to protect us. The world thought that perhaps we were idealistic and inconsistent, but they had no thought of threatening us. The entire world respected America. The entire world solicited our goodwill. Is that the attitude toward us today?

Where are we today after seven years? We are distrusted by most of the world. We have succeeded in securing the enmity of a very large part of it.

Even a military alliance has been formed which commands the resources of 500,000,000 people directed explicitly at pressure on us—at us Americans. We are of necessity arming—or we ought to arm—that we may protect our very borders. We are preparing a peacetime army of 2,000,000 men, of 25,000 airplanes, of 5000 tanks, of 2,000,000 tons of warships. We have to.

Can you rub your eyes and believe that there has been statesmanship in America when this has come to pass? No matter what can be said of the forces of aggression which are growing in the Old World; is there not some question here, some reason to inquire if this sort of statesmanship has been a success?

An examination of this subject must not be made in generalities.

My time this evening prevents the exploration of more than a few samples. But these should be enough to indicate the path along which the New Deal has been leading the country.

#### THE WORLD ECONOMIC CONFERENCE

In the spring of 1932 economic recovery from the inevitable Great War depression began. With this measure of relief from



the world panic, I consulted the Prime Minister of Great Britain, suggesting that the time had come when we might make a step forward by calling all nations of the world into an Economic Conference. The purpose was to stabilize currencies and foreign exchange and to remove trade barriers. Without this action recovery was insecure and democracies in the world endangered. The very calling of that conference gave hope and courage. It was reflected at once in rise of prices and increasing employment at home and abroad.

We were to hold the conference in January, 1933. In the meantime, we had set up experts to work out methods and details. When I was defeated in November, 1932, I asked Mr. Roosevelt to co-operate in expediting this conference. I suggested that he appoint, or join with me at once in appointing, the American delegates so that this most urgent service to us and to all mankind should not be delayed. That he refused to do. Therefore in one of the most critical periods of the world's history that conference, with its healing prospects, was delayed for six months. Meanwhile Mr. Roosevelt arranged that the Prime Minister of England visit the United States. On April 26, 1933, in a joint statement with Mr. MacDonald they announced their agreement upon vital questions that were before the conference. But two months later in the midst of that conference Mr. Roosevelt issued a public statement repudiating his undertakings with Mr. MacDonald. The conference crashed. And thus ended the possibility of extinguishing those economic fires upon which world conflagration has burned ever since.

Is this the sort of statesmanship that leads to peace and prosperity?

#### LAND DISARMAMENT

As a part of the healing forces which we were advancing in the world eight years ago there was being held a general land disarmament conference at Geneva of which we were a part. I had made a proposal to that conference providing for the abolition of weapons of aggression—tanks, bombing planes,

poison gas, big mobile guns, submarines. The purpose of that proposition was to increase the relative strength of defense of the little nations and to make aggressive war less likely. I also proposed a basis for reduction of land armies.

Those proposals were agreed to as workable by over forty of the nations assembled, including Germany and Italy. The conference adjourned in July, 1932, after appointing committees to work out the details.

Had that action been carried through to success the blitzkrieg of Poland, Belgium, Holland, and France could never have been possible. I do not say the conference could surely have succeeded, but we know that at least very little effort was ever made.

With Mr. Roosevelt in the White House the conference died. Was this the sort of statesmanship that makes for peace in the world?

Mr. Roosevelt did send a bombastic note to all emperors, kings, queens, and presidents, repeating that part of my proposal as to aggressive arms. You would have thought the idea was a new discovery. The potentates no doubt recognized that it made headlines in the United States.

#### RUSSIA

Now we may examine a sample of policies which bear upon preserving our domestic tranquility, peace abroad and appeasement of dictators all at one time.

Over a period of fifteen years, four Presidents, including myself, and six Secretaries of State, both Democratic and Republican, refused to recognize the Communist government of Russia or to have anything to do with it.

President Wilson's administration used such words as these about the Communists: "by force and cunning seized the government," "murderous tyranny," "terror," "bloodshed, murder." "They declare their existence depends on revolution in all other great civilizations including the United States." "They use the public revenues of Russia to promote this revolution

in other countries." There can be "no confidence in pledges given with cynical repudiation already in their mind." "We cannot recognize a government . . . determined and bound to conspire against our institutions."

Republican Presidents and Secretaries of State held to these views of President Wilson.

Recognition of new governments is more than an establishment of legalistic or trade relations.

When our neighbors choose to live a life of disrepute, we do not go to war or shoot them up. But we can hold up the moral and social standards in the world just a little better if we do not associate with them. Moreover we do not invite them to come into our homes and corrupt our family life.

However, in November, 1933, Mr. Roosevelt recognized the Soviet government. He made an agreement on a piece of paper that they would not conspire among the American people. He announced that the principal purpose was to "co-operate for the preservation of the peace of the world."

For six years their revolutionary conspiracies were allowed to run riot in the United States despite their pledged word. Hundreds of thousands of Americans were brazenly enlisted as their fellow travelers. The Communists supported Mr. Roosevelt in elections. Their vote was the deciding factor in the defeat of Mr. Dewey for Governor of New York.

On January 3, 1940, after six years of it, the unanimous report of the Dies Committee, consisting of Democrats and Republicans, a committee by the way that Mr. Roosevelt tried to discredit, said this:

". . . The Communist party is a foreign conspiracy masked as a political party . . . The party's activities constitute a violation of the Treaty of Recognition.

". . . The Communist party under instructions from the Comintern (Moscow) has from time to time pursued policies in direct violation of the laws of the United States . . . Moscow has from the very beginning of the Communist party in the United States supplied the party here with funds for its subversive activities."

That is the report of an important body.

Today the Communists comprise the dominant part of the Fifth Column in the United States.

Now let us look at the Russian government "co-operating . . . for the preservation of the peace of the world." How about the unprovoked attacks upon Poland, upon Finland, upon Latvia, upon Estonia, upon Lithuania, upon Bessarabia? Most of these were democratic states. Today they are slaves to Communism. It is true Mr. Roosevelt expressed our moral disapproval of these actions. But within the last two months, perhaps the last two weeks, we seek to appease Russia with machine tools which we badly need ourselves, and airplane gasoline. I presume this will stimulate some more of the same kind of "co-operation for the peace of the world."

Has not this foreign policy been a disaster to the domestic wellbeing of the United States?

Is this the sort of statesmanship which makes for peace?

#### PREPAREDNESS FOR DEFENSE

And now we come to our relations with the growth of aggression and the tragic war raging in Europe. It is a war that pulls on our sympathies and brings us sleepless anxieties. It plunges us further into the most difficult of problems.

The immense task of our government is to protect the American people from this conflagration.

In January, 1938, nearly three years ago, in a nationwide address, I said: "We must gear our thinking to the realities of an increasingly dangerous world. The greatest assurance from aggression against us is preparedness for defense."

Immediately after that address I visited Europe to gain more knowledge of the dangerous fires that were smoldering and their relation to the safety of the United States.

Upon my return in April, 1938, I repeated those warnings. I said:

"Germany and other countries are giving birth to a new philosophy of government and of life. . . .

"That has happened at other periods in history. Within the Christian era we have seen the rise of Christianity, the rise of Mohammedanism, the rise of Feudalism, the rise of the Reformation, the rise of Liberalism and the rise of Communism. And each of these ideas has carried a train of human conflict which includes war."

In that statement I outlined the brutalities and the dangers of totalitarian aggression. I continued:

"Every nation in Europe—Communist, Fascist, Democratic —is now building for war more feverishly than ever before in its history. In five years their expenditures have doubled from four to eight billion dollars annually. . . . Europe today is a rumbling war machine, without the men yet in the trenches."

I again urged that we keep out of these wars and that in order to do this it was necessary to be so armed that no one would think of coming across the Atlantic Ocean.

And as the result of that visit I advised the American people further. I said: "I found most nations in Europe convinced that we would be inevitably drawn into the next Great War as in the last. Some peoples were building confident hope upon it." And I pointed out that these ideas were stimulated by Mr. Roosevelt's "Quarantine Dictators" speech in October, 1937. I said the nations of Europe needed to be convinced that we were resolved to keep out. I urged that we "be blunt about it, that we have none of it, that these people should have no illusion as to our position. Otherwise they would be drawn into unwise decisions."

#### POWER POLITICS

Thus Mr. Roosevelt began steadily to involve the United States by dabbling in foreign power politics.

A few years ago, before this crisis reached its acute stage I attempted to describe that function. I said nations in Europe and Asia must play the game of power politics and balance of

power as a "sheer necessity for national defense and they play it for national aggression . . . It is a game of delicate moves. It is a game of guns. It is not a game of open covenants openly arrived at" ... I said we should never sit in that game. . . . I said with our form of government our interference could only befuddle the world, and that the stakes of such interference might be the lives of millions of our own sons.

Mr. Roosevelt's much discussed relation to the Munich agreement, by which Germany was given appeasement in the shape of a piece of Czechoslovakia, is a good example of all this.

On September 26, 1938, he very properly sent messages to all of the heads of states urging that they settle by peaceful negotiations and avoid war. That much was idealistic and contrasted to power politics.

But the question of importance is: Did Mr. Roosevelt or his agents bring pressures to sign this agreement?

For days after it was signed our headlines were full of eulogies by New Dealers that Mr. Roosevelt had saved the peace of the world. They were proud of this play of power politics.

A little later certain opinion in the United States condemned the Munich agreement bitterly. Then Mr. Roosevelt grew cold about it. That encouraged certain groups in England and France in their condemnation of it. Now whether this agreement was right or wrong, at least somewhere along this line Mr. Roosevelt was playing with the fire of European power politics.

One of the methods of power politics is hints, speeches, denunciations, cryptic assurances, and moral alliances. They encourage or they mislead people. They create hate. They disturb or change delicate balances of power and of action in the Old World.

Beginning with the speech on our quarantining dictators three years ago, Mr. Roosevelt has been continuously sticking pins into tigers all over the world. And that without seeming to realize that this requires a reserve of firearms.

All this is a different thing from dignified protest when

agreements with us have been violated. It is a far different thing from dignified expression of indignation at wrong in the world. To uphold moral standards in the world does not require playing with power politics.

Mr. Roosevelt has been playing at this game of Europe and Asia not alone by his attitudes, speeches, and statements but through his Cabinet officers and conversations of his diplomatic agents. I do not need to catalogue all of this kind of provocative statement against other nations. I do not need to recite the repeated billingsgate directed at the heads of states from the exalted position of the President of the United States. It has indeed secured world headlines, but it destroyed the moral influence of the United States and it fired the hate between nations.

Most of the newspapers of practically the entire foreign world today assume that we will join again in European war. Their only discussion is when. Foreign nations predicate their policies on our coming into this war. That may be news to the vast majority of Americans.

History alone will tell how much our playing of power politics may have created unjustified hopes or influenced action in Europe. Now we are faced with another example. One right recently.

#### THE ALLIANCE AGAINST AMERICA

A few moments ago I mentioned that part of the Roosevelt Stalin agreement was "to co-operate to preserve the peace of the world." But eighteen months ago Mr. Stalin made an alliance with Mr. Hitler relating to attacks upon the Western European democracies. Then the Hitler end of this partnership joined with Mussolini and with Japan to counter Mr. Roosevelt's power politics.

Thus for the first time in our history we are faced with a military alliance directed to bring pressure upon us.

It is directed against us not on one flank but on both flanks. By way of military statesmanship, a high corporal in the army

knows better than to invite attack upon his front and his flank at the same time.

Somehow this playing foreign power politics does not seem to be working in the direction of peace for the United States.

In fact, is this power politics the sort of statesmanship that makes for the peace of America?

#### THE DANGERS TO THE UNITED STATES

And here and now in the midst of these dangers America must summon reason to control emotion and resentment at the growth of these forces against us. The greatest quality of men in danger, second only to courage, is cool deliberate action. That is the first necessity of a nation. The thing we most need right now is a cool appraisal of what our immediate dangers are.

We may well explore what dangers there are of invasion of North America. Even with our unpreparedness today the combined dictators across the Atlantic and the Pacific could not hope to invade us with less than 2,000,000 men and all their equipment of tanks, guns, and airplanes. Such an armada or such two armadas would require about 22,000,000 tons of ships for transportation alone. All the dictators allied against us do not have half that number of seagoing ships. It would take three years to build enough of them if they had sole control of all the shipyards of Europe and if they had no other troublesome jobs on hand, such as fighting the British or the Chinese.

But suppose that they did have these transport ships and that they started right off, at once. These two armadas of a million men each say one on the Pacific and one on the Atlantic, would each be 50 miles long and 20 miles wide. That is a fair target for our submarine attack. After this gigantic flotilla got 500 miles at sea it could no longer be protected by their airplanes from attack by our navy. For the remainder of 2500 miles across the Atlantic and 5500 miles across the Pacific I assume we would be attacking these armadas with all the warships we possess. To protect them from this kind of annoyance the dictators must have a lot more warships than they possess at the



present time. That useful help would also take some years to build. In fact it would take more than three years to build enough to do that job.

Suppose these invaders possessed all these transport ships and these warships, they still would have some other obstacles to overcome. Several days before they arrive at North American shores whatever was left of them would meet our airplanes. When they reach the beach what is still left of them must face our coast defenses. When the remainder gets onto the beach they must meet our army. And they could not protect their landing with planes. Their planes could not fly across the ocean. They must be carried by ships. Today the dictators do not have airplane carriers to transport a single thousand of planes ready for action. Even today we have more planes than that. Air bases for attack upon us cannot be established until after invasion, not before. The net of all this reduces itself to sheer nonsense in any direct attack on us, and this calculation is based upon our present bad preparedness.

Seeing the difficulties Mr. Hitler has met getting across 25 miles of the English Channel, where he needed only scows instead of ships, where his whole air force was in action, where his passage was covered with land guns, I don't think we need worry further on that immediate point.

Some one however will bob up and say that Hitler may get the British fleet and the British shipping.

I do not believe—and most of our military authorities do not believe—that the British are going to be defeated in their heroic defense. Certainly the British don't think that themselves.

But putting all that aside, does any sane person think that if the English were to call for an armistice, they would hand their fleet over to Germany? Or that they are going to give over their commercial shipping? That presupposes the English are going to desert the nations of Englishmen in Canada, Australia, and South Africa. If that fleet is not sunk in fighting, it will never go to the Germans. That is not the character of the Englishmen in Great Britain. They have as much stamina as the Germans had at Scapa Flow. But I don't believe Great

Britain will be defeated in any event. Especially not if our industry furnishes them with all the guns and planes it is capable of producing.

It must be obvious to any coolheaded person that we can dismiss the immediate question of the danger of invasion.

But I want to divert for the moment to say that our ultimate problem of defense is larger than this. Our problem is to protect the Western Hemisphere. To do that we must have such defensive strength that no one will even entertain the dangerous thought of coming across these oceans. And we must be able to rely on our own right arm.

#### PREPAREDNESS

Our preparedness means far more than just soldiers, guns, planes, and ships. It means the organization of national efficiency in every direction in order that we can carry the burden of this armament.

But do you think that Mr. Roosevelt by temperament and experience is as well fitted to organize this imperative national need as Mr. Willkie is?

These results cannot be obtained by even 50 per cent by New Deal coercion of industry. It needs 100 per cent co-operation and it needs an organization better than headless boards and commissions.

#### CREATING WAR PSYCHOSIS AND HYTERIA

But to return to our subject of power politics. I have already mentioned that the chief reason being advanced for Mr. Roosevelt's third term is his skill in foreign affairs. I think I have somewhat dissipated the skill part of it in retrospect. But there is another bearing of Mr. Roosevelt's foreign relation activities.

Despite these cold facts as to our immediate military danger, the New Deal leaders, together with the loose warmongers, have pumped up hysteria of fear and hate among our people

far beyond even those justified by the great misfortunes of the times.

I know that passion and emotion must grow out of wrong and indignation. But has there not been a little overtime work upon some of these emotions?

Mr. Roosevelt since April this year and up, I might say, until about a month ago, has delivered over 53,000 words to the American people. Of these words over 38,000 have been upon war and foreign affairs. Incidentally there have been about 800 words on unemployment and 500 words on agriculture. There were over 4000 words in praise of the New Deal accomplishments.

Also you will find New Deal senators and congressmen using such expressions scattered through the *Congressional Record* as—"we may be attacked within hours, perhaps a few days." "Time is the essential factor, even 1 or 2 or 3 days might throw the advantage to the enemy." A Congressman rises to say, "Hitler may be coming at any moment." Four months ago a Cabinet officer opined that Great Britain may be conquered in 30 days and her fleet surrendered to the Germans. One statesman says: "The fate of the British fleet is uncertain" and he refers to "military reports that Hitler might try to seize bases in Canada and elsewhere before this winter."

We find generals berating Congress because those gentlemen want even three days to consider their gigantic proposals.

But the climax was an Administration approved speech by Ambassador Bullitt. On August 19 he rang a great tocsin from Independence Hall in Philadelphia. Mr. Roosevelt commended it as a great speech. Mr. Bullitt shouted: "The United States is in as great peril today as was France a year ago."

I might mention that a year before Mr. Bullitt spoke France was just 20 days off from being attacked. Mr. Bullitt continued: "The fighting line of war for enslavement of the human spirit is nearing our shores." If that is all true, Mr. Hitler must have been already out on the Atlantic on the way over with his armada. Mr. Bullitt spoke 73 days ago. On that statement, Hitler's ships are now 51 days overdue.

Mr. Bullitt continued: "Do we want to see Hitler in Independence Hall making fun of the Liberty Bell?" That truly makes us shiver and also makes us forget all about the destruction of Liberty by the New Deal.

All this and a flood of other statements are dressed up in the weasel words of alarm and fear which are difficult to pin down. What they mean by "imminent" danger of invasion seems to vary all the way from twenty days to six months.

We perhaps must make allowances because the New Deal has to do something heroic in order to induce the American people to swallow a third term. And they need to do something extra heroic to black out their domestic failure.

This idea of overtime work on hysteria has been hinted at by no less authority than one of Mr. Roosevelt's previous supporters—that is the Editor of *Collier's Weekly*. I pass his hint on this subject along as evidence of understatement on my part. He says:

"An exaggerated foreign war crisis is one of the best known devices whereby a political party in power in a democracy can take the voters' minds off of its mistakes on various home fronts and build up for the next election a cry about not changing leaders in time of peril."

That idea of detouring the public mind away from the mud holes of domestic life to foreign affairs was specifically recommended by Machiavelli 440 years ago.

But the overriding question is: Is fanned war psychosis the sort of statesmanship that makes for peace of our country?

#### WHAT COURSE SHALL WE FOLLOW?

This fanned hysteria has reached the danger point where reason may be lost.

Every polite caution and sober warning is met with the yell of "Hitler sympathizer," "appeasement," "the Fifth Column," "isolationist," "pacifist."

We might dismiss these political maneuvers and these unbalanced

statements were it not that they push this country steadily closer to war. And to these hysteria raisers I would like to give a word of caution on the consequences of war between the United States and Asia or Europe.

If we go to war that war must end either in a stalemate and compromise or alternatively it must be ended by the actual invasion of the enemy country and its disarmament.

It seems clear today that military victory cannot be quickly brought about by war in the air. As between great nations there is no such a thing as absolute command of the air. Cities may be reduced to rubbish heaps but the air seems unlikely to bring a military conclusion to the war.

It seems clear also that military victory cannot quickly be brought about by sea power, because science has made great nations more self-supporting than ever before.

It seems clear that victory cannot be brought by landing troops on the enemy shore, for the power of defense among great nations against this sort of action is too great.

I described a few minutes ago how impossible it is for an enemy successfully to invade us over 3000 and 6000 miles of ocean. It is just as impossible for us to invade the enemy at that distance for the same reasons.

And therefore complete submission of an enemy of these dimensions is now a job for years and years of exhaustion.

If we get into this war it is not an eighteen months' action. It is more likely to be another Thirty Years War.

And might I add something about ideological wars in general, as that is the kind of war we are being urged to get into. Ideological wars are no more capable of settling anything than the thousand years of religious wars of the Middle Ages. If we won such wars by exhaustion of the enemy we should be incapable of establishing democracy in its place. The way of life of a people must come from within; it cannot be compelled from without. The Communists are the most likely beneficiaries.

If we are to engage in war we must create a dictatorship at home. And there is no hope we shall get out of it for a generation.

If we are to preserve this way of life in the world it must be preserved in this hemisphere.

Our people do not want to be led into this present war. And we can stay out if we have the resolute will power to do so.

Wisdom often consists of knowing what to do next. To meet all these immediate dangers I give you a national policy. In doing so let me say I am not an isolationist. I am not an interventionist. I am neither a militarist nor a pacifist. I am not for appeasement. I am concerned with America first. I believe that the vast majority of the American people are just that also.

The policy I suggest is:

(1) Furnish all the support to England that we can within the law. And I emphasize within the law, for liberty lives by law. Congress makes the laws.

(2) Stop cultivating hysteria at home and sticking pins in tigers abroad.

(3) Make just one more talk and then stop talking.

(4) That one talk should emphasize that this nation wants peace with the world. It should inform the world that we are arming this country to the teeth; that we are organizing its economic strength in every corner, from the cellar to the garret; that after a year or two years, or whatever time that job takes, we are going to talk again. Then we are going to say exactly what we rightly expect the relations of other nations to be to us and our interests. Then we shall be talking in the one language which the world today understands.

(5) For the moment that would be enough statesmanship to keep us at peace.

#### CONCLUSION

Both Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie have promised the American people that they will not participate in foreign wars and will not send our Army, Navy or Air forces to fight in foreign wars outside the Americas except in case of attack. Moreover, Mr. Willkie says he will not take us into war unless he is directed to do so by the people through the Congress.

If we look back over this whole record of Mr. Roosevelt's relations with Europe and Asia there is hardly one act which has substantially contributed to our peace with the world. There are hundreds of acts which tend to drag us toward this war.

You are far more likely to get into war with Franklin Roosevelt than with Wendell Willkie.

# On American Liberty

*Broadcast from the Metropolitan Opera*

NEW YORK CITY

[December 7, 1940]

IN THIS time of stress your directors have decided to add to your great service to lovers of music and drama some discussion of the vast forces which dominate the world. I have been honored by their request to open these discussions, and to open them with a statement on American liberty.

There is something even more formidable than war and conquest which unrolls in Europe and Asia. Within it is a sinister revolt against a civilization based upon liberty and religious faith. They are laying waste the moral and spiritual structure of mankind.

Today thousands of the greatest musicians, the writers, the teachers, and the scientists have fled to the New World in refuge from that cataclysm. Here in the West they find sanctuary where the light of liberty still burns. Our life is being enriched by their presence. More and more we are coming to hold in trust the cultural values of the human race.

Here alone in the New World today remains the air which creative minds must breathe. Here alone remains free speech, free thought, free press, and free worship. Here alone is the dignity of men and women still respected and protected. Here in the Americas alone can the artist and musician enact the great dramas and the great music which is humanity's heritage from every race.



The word "America" has always meant to me even more than a land with political and economic systems of liberty. There is an imponderable in the word "America" which calls to something far bigger and greater than that. Being of the spirit of a people it is indefinable. Nor does that quality of America spring from its lovely hills and valleys, its wondrous coasts and mountains, nor the richness of the land.

It was born in those who came here seeking a new hope for humanity. And they have built something that has inspired and regenerated men and women over all these years.

Sometimes I think this high quality is mercy, compassion, kindness. Other times I feel its tempering metal may be a passion for justice. Sometimes I think its special quality is an alertness of mind, optimism, a high sense of humor and sportsmanship. At all times I know it is the recognition that it is human values to which the purpose of America is dedicated.

I know we often fail to hold to this spirit of America in our political, our economic, and our social systems. The drab, the greedy, the arrogant are depressing enough. There are many who are discouraged and in ill fortune. Our national life has all the frailties of human beings. But our failures give no ground for defeatism. So long as the soul of a people holds, with its hopes, its courage, its aspirations, and its ideals, then the Spirit of America will live. And it lives at every cottage fireside.

If this spirit which is born of human freedom is to be redeemed for the world, the burden is upon us for many years to come. We shall need guard it as never before from hate, from intolerance. We shall need hold to its compassion for those who suffer. We are fast becoming the sanctuary for the ideals of civilization.

I am not here dealing with the military defense of this sanctuary, yet I may remind you of that remark in the Old Testament of the Prophet Nehemiah:

Every one with one of his hands wrought in the work and with the other hand held a weapon.

Nor do I despair for the future of the Old World in the great long view.

And in this hour of despair in many of its nations we can give this comfort. Great races do not die from oppression. There is more to nations than their soil, their cities, their wealth, and even their governments. There is a soul in nations. That soul is forged in the instincts of their race, their traditions, their heroic struggles, their heroic men and women, their genius for art, for music, for literature. It is steeled in their sufferings. They may be held by armies; they may be oppressed; they may be impoverished. But the soul of a people cannot be crushed. From that their national life and their independence will rise again and again even from the ashes of their homes. They will rise again sanctified by their ordeal.

And in conclusion may I relate an incident vivid of the power of the drama and inspiring of hope for the future of liberty even in that place we might least expect. In recent Germany the audience attending a revival of Schiller's inspiring drama "Don Carlos" rose in applause to the impassioned appeal for liberty by the Marquis of Posa to King Philip II of Spain, where he said in part:

Man is greater than you esteem him. He will burst the chains of a long slumber and reclaim once more his just and hallowed rights . . . Grant us liberty of thought . . . Look round on all the glorious face of nature . . . See how rich it is grown through freedom.

## Some National Problems

*The Pennsylvania Society of New York*

[December 21, 1940]

I AM greatly honored to receive the gold medal of this great society. I am honored that you should think me worthy of it. I am glad to have a legal gold reserve at a time when that basis of credit is a criminal offense.

In normal times such occasions as this should be devoted to the lighter side of life. We might blow the bubbles of satire, hyperbole and wit. We might live for an hour in the land of allegories and fairies. We might soak our souls with optimism, and go home convinced of the perfection of life and human progress.

But there is little to be gay about when madmen destroy in a day what it has taken the sweat and blood and tears of mankind thousands of years to erect. The stupendous soundtrack of this terrible moving picture drives its horrors into every home in our land.

In this tragic atmosphere your committee suggested I should discuss some of the forces and problems developing today from a background of experience in the last war.

Now that I have divorced myself from politics for the balance of my life, I can devote myself to such discussion at least without partisan impulses.

A half-hour permits only a few points, and I shall hold them to domestic rather than foreign phases.

The ultimate course of this world chaos is unknown to us. But however transitory our conclusions may seem, still we must constantly grope for a basis of cool judgment and sober action

for our country. Believe it or not, there are always some people who can learn by experience.

Among the parallel phenomena with 1916-1917 is the ferocity of the discussion going on among our own people.

Indeed these are times when it is difficult to appraise and discuss with objectivity. The gargantuan forces in motion are not military alone. Within them are social, economic and political ideas which clamor to shape the world to come.

Again, as in the last war, we are deluged with propaganda from both sides. The real American interest is difficult to separate from these pleadings. But of more importance, the actual events arouse our emotions and our sympathies and our sense of outrage. Emotion without the temper of reason breeds intolerance. Intolerance breeds intellectual tyranny. From it we get declamation, not honest debate. We are afflicted with slogans: "war mongers," "appeasers," "pacifists," and what not.

Slogans are no basis for deciding the fate of our country. They do not make for national unity in time of danger.

Certainly it is a sign of a dangerously irresponsible mind in a nation when patriotic men are fiercely denounced as being the tools of Great Britain or pro-Nazi. And by way of pointed illustration I refer to two men—single-minded men in their devotion to our country. They are William Allen White and Colonel Lindbergh—both of whom have long since earned the gratitude of Americans.

The transcendent right of Americans, and their duty, is to express their position on war and peace. It is the greatest issue that can come to any nation.

For my part I want no single step taken relating to war that is not given time for public debate. As Congress has the final responsibility to declare war it should also debate and pass upon every step which may lead to war.

Our immediate and imperative task today is to concentrate upon preparedness. Our defenses should be so strong that dictators singly or in combination must be convinced that it is impossible

for them to cross these oceans. And we wish our industries to function for Britain, China and Greece.

The enormous preparedness program we have undertaken amounts in some ways to as great an effort as war itself. Many of its problems of economic organization are war problems.

It is so large an effort that it demands complete national unity. And a pertinent place for unity is in labor relations. In the last war employers and employees in essential war industries tacitly waived the right of lockout and strike in favor of arbitration. It should be done again.

We learned some bitter lessons on the method of organization of munitions and supplies in the last war. The principal one was that production could best be had by the mobilized cooperation of industry, not by force. Indeed that was one reason we came back to democratic processes more easily after the last war.

But we learned that there must be responsible, single-handed leadership, not the indecision of boards. The President announced a wise and important step in this direction this morning.

Finance of today's preparedness program will be far more difficult than in the last war. Prior to that time we were paying only 7 per cent of our national income in taxes. Prior to this preparedness program we were paying 21 per cent. Prior to 1917 our national debt was only 1 1/2 billions; prior to this burden it was already 43 billions. With this background, if we are to avoid inflation we must pay still more taxes. We must have a more constructive tax system. We must place more of the government borrowing directly upon the savings of the people and not by inflation of bank deposits. The ultimate end of inflation is revolution and today's fashion in revolution is National Socialism.

The necessity already to establish priorities for arms materials is the infallible sign that arms are beginning to trench into the other needs of the country. Thus we are face to face with how to carry the burden of arms without decreasing the standard of living.

There is involved in all this the problem of prices of manufactured goods. The moment we have extensive priorities for war materials we shall have scarcity in those lines of goods. Out of scarcity will come rises in prices. No law or other restraint has ever been able to fully control prices no matter how rigorously applied.

The only real answer is to avoid scarcity. Increased prices of manufactured goods may not be so material to the higher priced groups. But it inevitably increases the cost of living to the white collared, the unskilled unemployed, and the farmers, who do not gain from the preparedness program.

In the last war we had an unlimited market for the farmer. This war is having the reverse effect of further stifling his market. He cannot stand higher prices for manufactured goods and pay taxes.

And there is involved in all this also preparedness for economic defense in the world to come.

Whatever the conclusion of this war may be, it is certain there will be a hideously impoverished world. It will be a world largely without international credit, with unstable currencies, with little capital for development of backward countries. We shall be confronted with militant, governmentally organized competition.

There are some who hold that the solution of all these problems of production, prices, and taxes, standard of living and future competition is longer daily hours, and lower wages for manufacturing labor.

I support an entirely different alternative. That is to definitely organize an increase of our industrial efficiency and productivity.

Mr. Knudsen properly said that the key to immediate increase of production of munitions was to get our machinery working three shifts six days a week.

But the problem is wider even than that. Along the road of increased efficiency we can secure at least a contribution to remedy each of these complex difficulties.

That seems like a pretty wholesale panacea. Nevertheless

it is to some degree possible. But if we do it we must at once pour in any money needed for a program of greatly expanded scientific research. From that can come new inventions and new methods of saving of material and labor.

We must bring our plant and equipment out of its present slump of obsolescence. We must eliminate more industrial waste motion, and more waste of materials and men. We must apply every laborsaving device. We must remove every sort of restriction by both capital and labor which impedes or penalizes the use of better methods and better machines. We must maintain free competition so that lower costs will be passed along to the consumer at lower prices. And we must have constructive tax systems. We must have removal of unnecessary governmental restrictions which encumber production and lessen the initiative of men.

With sufficient increase of industrial efficiency we could lower costs, lower prices, increase consumption, and increase production. We could relieve the strain of priorities. We could take up some of the slack of unemployment. We could maintain our standard of living. We could prepare for the competition to come.

These methods do not mean more speedup or pressure upon individual workers. They do not mean longer daily hours or lower wages. They mean that we work our machines and our heads harder. And above all they mean definitely nationwide organized co-operation.

There is a problem of intellectual defense against encroachment of Nazi or Fascist ideas.

There are new forces behind this war that were not present in the last war. There is within it a revolt against a civilization that has been based upon liberty and religious faith.

These revolutionary ideologies are more than just dictatorships with Napoleonic ambitions. They are militant to implant their mystical social and economic order upon other nations. And I gather from their extensive remarks that they do not like democracy in any form. There is little fear that these ideas will substantially penetrate the American people by propaganda

Their few adherents are of course a disturbing public nuisance.

There is, however, another danger to us of these ideas. A fact is that the Nazi and Fascist economic systems are a resurrection of the methods of organization which were born in all nations which engaged in the last World War. That was the first war where the energies of the whole civil population were drastically mobilized to fight. Industry, agriculture, and labor alike were regimented and forced into action. A great degree of dictatorship had to be yielded in order to administer these forces. And intellectual life and civil liberty were at least indirectly shackled to the war machine.

Economic dictation and the mobilization of armies cannot succeed without some sacrifice of civil liberties. And in the last war this was the necessity of the self-governing peoples as well as the monarchies. All of which was some part of what we now call Fascism. It is the tragic jeopardy of democracy that if it would go to war it must adopt some part of the very systems which we abhor.

Therefore one of the problems of democracies preparing for defense or war is to safeguard against the impairment of civil liberty and representative government. That is not without difficulty in the midst of impatience and intolerance at the slow processes of democracy.

Likewise, a democracy which goes to war must look forward to how it will come back again to full life after war is over.

It is easier to regiment a people than to unregiment them. They can be deprived of their liberties by a ukase, a command, or an administrative order. It is a long and painful climb back to freedom. We found it was tough enough after the last war.

The necessities of war organization even in democracies create vested personal power, vested economic interests, vested habits, and vested ideas which may be impossible to throw off a second time. For democracy is still suffering from the debts and dislocations of the last war. It is suffering from the older



difficulty of trying to adjust the clashes of the industrial revolution with our original revolution of political liberty. It is involved in social problems which drive for solution even in war.

And regeneration through free speech will be greatly silenced through the intolerance of war psychosis.

Moreover, after this war is over, it is certain that the forces pressing for economic dictatorship will be strong. These pressures are inevitable from the aftermath of poverty, economic disorder and suffering which we know from our last experience will haunt peace when it comes.

We need to think these things through.

There are other and tremendous problems which force themselves upon us from this present world war.

The leaders of both our political parties have pledged themselves to keep us out of this world war unless we are attacked. They have pledged themselves to extend aid to Britain short of joining in war, and within the law. I believe the country supports these policies. But it will not be easy to determine where the borderlines are. And yet these borders of action must be determined soon in the interest of national unity.

And there are the gigantic problems of food, of famine, of pestilence in the defeated democracies. They confront the world today on even a far greater scale than they did in the last war.

Governments may deprecate, some cartoonists may sneer, some columnists may argue. But the hard, inexorable, stark fact is that before the next harvest millions of innocent children, women and men in Belgium and the other occupied democracies will be faced with starvation and disease. That fact cannot be dismissed. Nor can remedy be found overnight after these hideous calamities are upon us. They require months for organization. It is not my purpose to discuss that question here. But a great body of Americans will continue to search for a method of their saving. And there is no need to feed Germans in that saving.

And there is another phase of this war in which the experience of the last war rises to haunt us. When it is all over, what then?

Lord Lothian, in his last impressive address, wisely remarked that these world evils "grew out of the despair . . . from long years of war, defeat, inflation, revolutionary propaganda . . . unemployment and frustration."

What sort of organization is this world to have if all this is not to be repeated on even a vastly wider scale? Can America find the answer?

These are but part of the problems which confront us. One thing is certain. This war will come to an end sometime. If civilization is to survive its aftermaths, this nation must hold itself strong not only in economic and social life, but in national unity and spiritual determination.

Upon us lie the burdens of clear thinking, of justice, of righteous conduct. We are not free agents who can jog along in our comforts and conveniences without a thought of the future of mankind.

Destiny has so ordered the course of events that much of the world's hope lies ultimately in our hands. We are the ultimate hope and sanctuary of liberty.

# The Lease-Lend Bill

*Press Statement, New York*

[January 10, 1941]

THE first thing Congress has to consider is the suggestion of enormous surrender of its responsibilities. No such powers were granted in the last war. So far as I know, no such surrender has been made by the British Parliament either in the last war or this war.

We all wish our industry tuned up to maximum output for our defense and to aid other countries to defend their independence. But the practical surrender of power to take these steps that are possible under this legislation is something else. It enters the field of preservation of democracy in this country.

*Letter to the Honorable Sol Bloom*

New York, January 15, 1941.

Honorable Sol Bloom  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Congressman:

I notice in the press some reference by you to my appearance before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in connection with the bill now being considered.

First, let me repeat that I am in favor of extending every practicable aid, short of war, to Britain to enable her to maintain her independence. I do not approve of our joining in the war.

There is a phase of immediate importance upon which I take the liberty of addressing you.

There is unfortunately growing up in the country a bitterness of discussion which it seems to me in the interest of national unity could be allayed by the Committee. This division lies largely in the interpretations and implications in respect to the powers proposed to be conferred in this bill and its meaning.

For example, citizens of high patriotic thought and experience, who desire to support the President, believe that under the bill and even without any supplemental action by the Congress:

That battleships and other naval vessels could be given away;  
That our defense could be vitally impaired by giving away Army equipment;

That equipment and materials provided in the bill could be transported through the war zone in American ships convoyed by the American Navy;

That commodities and articles could be purchased in other countries with our money;

That alien ships now in sanctuary in our harbors could be seized;

That it opens American ports to repair of belligerent vessels and makes such ports bases for belligerent operations and may become the objective of them;

That the program of gifts to Britain could begin before the very considerable resources now available to the British Government in the United States had been first called upon as payment or collateral;

That the bill could cancel parts of the labor laws, the Johnson Act, the Neutrality Acts, The Hague Conventions and possibly other laws;

That it empowers involvement in war as distinguished from a declaration of war by the Congress.

There are many other questions which have been raised, among them time and expenditures limits.

It seems to me urgent that these matters should be at once clarified because the public mind is apprehensive and confused.

If the Committee would at once draft into the bill positive

NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 10, 1941

65

definitions of what these powers are and specifically exclude what they are not, I am sure such an early action would enable concrete debate and eliminate much controversy and bitterness. As I said, it would greatly contribute to national unity.

Yours faithfully,  
Herbert Hoover

# The Question of Peace

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

[*March 28, 1941*]

I HAVE been asked to speak to you and through you to a large group of young people on some of the moral and spiritual problems which now confront our country. Any discussion of them in these days involves questions of war and of the peace to come. And now they are the transcendent problems before youth. I shall therefore discuss for a few moments some of the moral, spiritual and social questions that dominate modern war and the making of peace.

Today we are pledged to give Britain the tools of war and our full economic aid. That is settled and done. Our national duty is to unite in making a good job of it. And to do it with good will.

The action of Congress has, however, enormously changed the shape of things. The aid to Britain combined with our own preparedness program forces us a long way into a war economy. Apart from these steps, our indignation at gigantic wrong to the democracies; the repugnance of free men for the whole totalitarian ideology; the steady impact of foreign propaganda; the constant agitation of a minority of our own citizens for all-out war—all press upon us the mental and spiritual attitudes of war. In a fog of emotions and appeals we are fast driving into the psychosis of war.

Whether we take the final fateful step or not, we have already made three positive appointments with destiny. One is that we will sit at the world's peace table. Another is that we face the problems of war emotions and war psychosis. The

other is that we shall meet the financial, economic and social aftermath of a war.

America yearns for peace in the world. The freedom of men comes only in peace. It diminishes in war. The abolition of poverty and want comes only in peace. Poverty and want increase in war. Yet the world does not know, and we do not know how world peace can be made and maintained. The world does not know, and we do not know, how in the face of steady world impoverishment, we are to abolish want. We do not see our way. Today, over these questions, we are frustrated, confused, unhappy and fearful. Our unity of ideas extends only to a resolve to defend ourselves and a fervid wish that the struggling democracies shall win.

My purpose here is not to offer you a panacea for these confusions and problems. I wish to stimulate your thinking. For now is the time to think hard and think fast. We cannot wait until the appointments with destiny are upon us.

We joined in an exactly parallel war twenty-five years ago for the same purposes and under the same impulses. Even with victory, we failed to get military, economic, or spiritual peace.

The failures of the last war to achieve peace root not only at Versailles but also in the forces generated in the war itself. They rooted deeper than that. They rooted in age-old hates and in the fires of imperialism. But we can get some light and some guidance from the experience and failures of that war and that peace making.

It is over twenty-two years since that World War ended. The youth of America today does not know of that war from its own experiences.

I am perhaps one of the few living Americans who had full opportunity from high places to see intimately the moving tragedy of the last World War. I saw it from its beginnings in 1914 all the way down through the long years which have not yet ended. I saw it not only in its visible ghastliness, but I lived with the invisible forces which moved in its causes and its consequences.

My country and foreign countries have honored me greatly over these years. There is nothing more in office or honor that the world could give to me. I can therefore add objectively to those experiences. I favored our entry into the last war so that I speak as neither a pacifist nor a militarist but rather as an analyst.

#### SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF MODERN WAR

If we would see what the moral and spiritual forces are that we have to meet, we must consider the nature of total war.

The World War was the first total war of modern history. It was the first Great War after the mechanical age. Prior to that time wars were more nearly contests between armies and navies. Civilian life proceeded with little interruption except near the actual scene of battle. The armed men represented a small part of the whole population. Their equipment was comparatively simple. Its preparation involved the energies of only a small part of industry. That last world war was the first time that the complete energy of the whole civil population on both sides was mobilized to fight and provide materials. It was total war.

Perhaps the most striking difference of total war from the old wars was that formerly armed men fought only against armed men. There were certain chivalries and sportsmanship. There was a real desire to keep women, children and noncombatant men apart from its shocks. In total war the basis has shifted in large measure, from war between armed men to war by armed men upon civilians. In the last war for the first time systematic and organized terrorization and killing of civilians became a part of this strategy. Cities, villages and homes were ruthlessly burned. Unarmed seamen and innocent passengers were drowned without a chance. Fire and explosives were rained on women and children from the skies.

Three times a day among 300 million people wherever a family gathered to eat they had less because of the enemy.



Nowhere in Europe were people free of fear for their lives on land or sea.

#### TOTAL EMOTIONS

In the course of that total war there developed in the civil population on both sides three fierce and total emotions. These were hate, intolerance, and a spirit of exalting crusade.

From the sufferings of civilians blazed first indignation, and finally a fanatic hate. It enveloped the minds of every man, woman and child. And this hate was not directed solely to leaders of nations, it was poured upon every individual of the enemy nation. Soldiers fighting on the front held far less hate than civilians at home.

The second of these emotions from that total war was total intolerance. National unity was essential in the face of total national danger. But impatience at discussion rose rapidly to rabid intolerance. In the democracies part of that intolerance ran quickly to the suppression of free speech and free press. The democratic governments had no need to impose restraints on free expression. The crowd howled down the most objective statement, the most constructive criticism. They denounced it as the paid voice of the enemy. And intolerance went further. It persecuted inoffensive citizens.

The third great emotion of that war was a crusade of ideologies, of philosophies of government and of life. The ideology of Germany was much the same pattern as the one now in use. It was not so well perfected in phrases and method as this one. But they used most of the slogans we now hear. On our side we went to war to defeat "Might makes Right," and "The enslavement of the individual to the State." We said we would make the "world safe for democracy." It was to be "a war to end war." We said the end of war was that enemy nations must change their way of life to freedom and democracy and peace. The most sublime passions of our people were summoned in action and sacrifice for this purpose.

All these emotions were stirred on both sides of the conflict by the total power of government. That total war gave birth

to governmentally organized propoganda. The hates of the people, their courage, and their aspirations could not be allowed to lag in the face of reverses and suffering. The atrocities and total wickedness of the enemy had to be constantly illustrated. All governments, including our own, engaged in it. The heads of those bureaus in most governments have written their confessions with pride in the lies they invented. Every government justified to itself that total emotion is essential to win total war.

To show how deeply these total emotions dominate total war, I may recall that after this had gone on for over two years in the last war President Wilson endeavored to bring about a negotiated peace. His representatives sought my views on its practicality. I felt that hope of negotiated peace was futile. The civilians on both sides cried out in hate and suffering for vengeance and crushing victory. I advised that no statesman or leader dared propose the necessary compromises which must be the basis of negotiated peace. And this proved to be the case.

And incidentally, I may observe another effect of these impelling emotions in total war between nations of large resources. Such war can apparently end only by exhaustion or revolution on one side or the other. And the victor in this race of exhaustion is only one lap behind the vanquished.

Once total war is joined it apparently can have no intermediate stops.

#### SOCIAL CURRENTS

There are economic necessities in total war that create vast social aftermaths. The World War of twenty-five years ago was the first time the freedoms of business, labor and agriculture were suspended. Industry had to be expanded to meet war production. It had to be constricted in its service to civilian living. To direct these activities dictatorial authority had to be lodged in the governments. In the democracies we used soft phrases to cover these coercions. We talked of co-operation, voluntary action, but underneath we had to show "or else."

The Government increased production both by going into business itself, and by government dictation to private owners as to what they must do. Whatever the fine phrases were in which we wrapped these actions, the cold fact was that government in business was Socialism, and government dictation to private owners was Fascism. The word Fascism had not then been invented. The freedom of labor and the freedom of the farmer were driven a long way down that blind alley. Where people attempted to stand on their so-called rights, propaganda, intolerances and penalties of law were directed to drive them to cover. Taxes which expropriated savings, pressure loans and inflation were necessary. All that is the method of Fascism.

Is it to be the tragic jeopardy of democracy that if it would go to war it must adopt the very systems which we abhor?

#### FINDING THE FORMULA OF PEACE

One of the emotional and intellectual currents of the last total war was the hope for peace that would make total war impossible again. The people of the democracies wanted armies and navies reduced if not abolished. They were resolute that some method must be found for justice between nations. A thousand ideas came forth. But there was no adequate discussion of how these ideals could be attained. The common expression was victory first. We had a daily reiteration of our high aims. Indeed within them was the hope of a better world.

#### THE PEACE

With all these ideas and these emotions we went to the peace table. The American people at large were totally unprepared for the problems of peacemaking. And hate sat at that table. Statesmen were not free agents. The victorious peoples demanded revenge and reparations for their wrongs and sufferings. The men who represented England and France at that conference had just been elected on the slogans of "Hang the Kaiser," "Pay every farthing," "Revenge," "Reduce them to impotence forever." The allied leaders were consciously or

unconsciously dominated by the bitterness of their people. They had to get their treaties approved at home. Reason could not be restored in the face of total emotion and total suffering. And although our American sufferings were far less than the others, yet we were slow to demobilize our war hates.

I recollect having had the temerity a few days after the surrender of the Germans at the Armistice to say we must at once take down the food blockade on their women and children. You would perhaps be surprised if you read the universal condemnation I received, not only in the Allied countries, but in America. They demanded more starvation after the war was over. Starvation is the mother of generations of hate.

Also remember Sherman's march to the sea. It has bred hate in our own Southern States for 80 years.

From all this the lesson is that hate, once aroused by the suffering of civil populations, outlasts even victory.

After the last total war the consequence was a treaty which in part sowed the dragons' teeth of the present war. President Wilson and his men sought valiantly to moderate it. The world hoped for a while that through the high-minded formula of the League of Nations the failures of the peace could be remedied when hates died. But the hates and fears lived on.

#### AFTERMATHS

Then came the aftermaths of that total war.

Experience proved that liberty, freedom and democracy could not be imposed on nations by battle. All over Europe nations did come to the mourners' bench and appeared to be converted, but soon some were backsliders. Indeed, it was proved that intellectual ideas rooted in a thousand years of racial history cannot be uprooted with a machine gun.

Every nation was impoverished. There were millions of maimed and orphaned. Millions of homes and tons of ships were destroyed. War production had to cease, industry was dislocated, and millions of men had to be demobilized. Unemployment and its thousands of miseries were inevitable.

The victorious governments which had some financial strength left carried through these burdens.

The vanquished governments could not do so. Their unemployment, starvation and a thousand miseries bred revolution. They staved off the day of economic retribution for a few years by financial legerdemain. But finally the former enemy countries collapsed and dragged even the victors into bitter depression. In the defeated nations the people in renewed misery demanded the existing system be turned out, whatever it was. In those countries the man on the soap box had the solution of all ills. His phrases contained only one idea in many formulas —to take away from those who still had something. And in the chaos of agony came the man on horseback. The treadmill of the world started all over again.

#### RECREATING FREEDOM

And at home it was a difficult task for the democracies to demobilize their wartime regimes. We had given no thought to, had no plans for, the moral and economic demobilization or the unemployment and financial aftermaths. We had no plan, no solution. It is easier to regiment a people than to unregiment them. Great vested interests and vested habits were created which pressed for perpetuity. Millions held government jobs. The thousands of people in authority were reluctant to give up power. Factories had thrived on government orders. Farmers liked the government prices. It was only the resolution of President Wilson and the men immediately around him who forced what we now call Fascism to retreat. Nevertheless our Government remained in many kinds of business. And of more vital importance, the ideas of war Fascism remained. When in later years confronted with difficulties, the people demanded that the Government resume these war methods. We saw many of them reappear in soft phrases to make them look like democracy.

All this is but a bare skeleton of the last total war. It takes no account of the millions who died.

In the present war, pressure of starvation and air attack are far more diabolic than last time. Compassion is far weaker than even last time.

#### THE PROBLEMS OF PEACE

Today whether America joins in all-out war or not, we are faced with the same gigantic problems.

The great sacrifices which America will make are motivated by the hope of real and permanent peace.

And I urge upon youth that you study again these experiences for the light which they give upon our course for the future.

We will sit again at that peace table whenever it comes about. Hate will again also sit at the peace table.

The ghastly failures in peacemaking and in economic life after the last total war may be excused on the ground that those who led the world were groping in the dark without the lamp of experience. We have had that experience. And these failures rise now with great questions that must be answered.

And in the study of these questions, let me suggest you examine the causes of failure in the treaty of Versailles. You will find that a large part of them were failure to allay hate, failure of economic peace, failure to give opportunity of proper elbow room and of growth to the aspirations of peoples. It failed to secure disarmament and to prevent world inflation and bankruptcy. Peace must come from the prosperity and the hearts of men. It cannot be held for long by machine guns.

The immediate questions which arise are these:

Are we giving aid simply to assure the independence of Britain and the others who are fighting against aggression? Or are we extending our view to remaking the world?

How are we going to hold down destructive hate that makes constructive peace so difficult?

How are we to keep alight compassion for the injured and starving?

How are we going to settle the relations of the twenty races in Europe?

How are we going to secure that liberty and freedom and democracy be accepted by those races whose whole racial instincts rebel against it? Are we going to police the world?

How are we going to save a world ravaged by famine and pestilence?

How are we going to restore economic prosperity to an impoverished world?

How are we going to assure the proper elbow room for growing people?

How are we going to find refuge for the oppressed?

And here in America——

How are we going to hold down intolerance during this period which makes free speech and free press impotent to correct wrong and to develop constructive debate?

With far more difficulties than last time, how are we going to demobilize our war Socialism and Fascism in America and restore freedom again to men?

With far more exhausted resources than last time how are we going to provide for our own employment and economic recovery after this war?

In fact, how are we going to make a peace that will be a permanent peace?

These questions must be answered. Some of them need answers today. The others cannot be dismissed on the ground they must await the outcome of the war. There will be no time then. The answers are vital to the moral, spiritual and economic welfare of our youth. They will determine your whole lives. And to that end American youth should begin to think now, for it is you who are involved.

We cannot expect the British people in their desperation to devote much thought to these ends.

America, however, today stands a certain distance apart from that scene. We do not have the distraction, suffering and the engrossment closer to the battle fields.

I am one who prays with all my being that America's sons should not be sent to this war. If God grants that we become no more deeply involved than we are today we may be able to

bring a more constructive and warning voice to the peace table. If our moral reservoirs are not drained by the full passions of war we may bring sanity and compassion. If our economic resources are still partly intact, we may be able to contribute something to restore another and better world. If our faith in democracy is held high amid the storms of war economy we may yet keep the lamp of liberty alight.

Whether the fates determine that we step fully into this war or not, these same questions must be answered. I bid you to think and think fast. For our common purpose must be that our country moves in the moral, the spiritual and the social paths that will keep it unimpaired in its freedoms, its Christian ideals powerful and impregnable.



# The Immediate Relation of the United States to This War

*A Statement to the American People*

NEW YORK CITY

[*May 11, 1941*]

FOR the last six months I have remained aside from the controversy on whether we should join in this war. I have been waiting to see the progress of our preparedness. I have wanted to see the situation abroad develop more fully. I had believed that the President was earnestly endeavoring to keep his promise to the American people of October 23:

. . . We will not participate in foreign wars and will not send our Army, Naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack.

In the past ten days we have had many speeches and much propaganda, the meaning of which is to drive the American people into this war. One who has been honored by his country as a member of America's War Council in the last world war and as its Commander-in-Chief in subsequent troubled years must learn something of the principles of national defense and our setting in the world.

It is therefore my duty to speak out of my experience. I hope that, by sober discussion of the facts, I may contribute something of thought in this most fateful decision. I am not speaking

as the representative of any party, of any group and committee, or any association. And despite the depth of emotion that I feel, I hope I may speak without passion and with respect for the views of my many troubled fellow citizens.

I do not need to express again my abhorrence of the whole totalitarian movement or its dangers to the world. That there be no misunderstanding, let me state at the outset that I support provision of the maximum tools of war to Britain; that I am convinced we can give this maximum during her next critical months only if we keep out of this war; that putting our navy into action is joining this war; that the whole European war situation is in transformation; that America is as yet unprepared even for adequate defense; that our people are not united. To go in now is neither wise nor for the interest of either Britain or ourselves.

As I have listened to these recent speeches it has constantly recurred to my mind that the problem before Mr. Roosevelt is far more difficult and complex than many of these speakers imagined. In the anxiety and emotion of the moment many do not recognize the stern facts.

#### THE NEW PROPOSALS TO JOIN THE WAR

It is now proposed that we should put the American Navy into action. That is a straightforward, understandable proposal which boldly makes clear the meaning of words like convoys or patrols. That is joining in this war, once and for all. From here the steps would be automatic. Our Navy must attack German submarines, ships and planes, if it is to be of any use. To make it effective then we must expand naval and air bases abroad. We must equip these bases with expeditionary forces. And that is war for long years to come.

#### WE ARE NOT YET AT WAR

There are those who say we are already in this war. That is not true. We are in a position of risk. But war has not been

declared between ourselves and the Axis. Diplomatic representatives are still maintained on both sides. Our treaties are still in force. There is no killing of men between us. If this war were ended tomorrow, it would not be necessary for us to make a new peace with Germany.

I am not arguing the spirit of our relations with Germany. I am only discussing the situation which exists. But it is a certainty that we shall be at war the moment our Navy is put into action. We are in the war when we send our boys either by air or by sea or on expeditionary forces with intent to shoot at the Germans. Let us not coddle ourselves by thinking otherwise.

It would be more consistent with American honesty and American courage for us to face the straight issue of a declaration of war by the Congress as the Constitution provides than to creep into an undeclared war. It is due our people that the Congress should vote on the real question which underlies all this: "Shall we declare war on Germany or Italy or Japan?" In a national debate on that issue the whole of the facts could be placed before the American people and the people could reflect their views to the Congress. That question once openly determined by the only open process democracy knows, and then our people would accept that decision—whatever it might be. The full facts and the truth are the way to achieve national unity.

#### FACING THE FACTS

We must face some hard facts. And there is among them the transformation of the military and political situation abroad. There is our own unpreparedness. There is the practical aid that Britain now requires and requires at once. There is the lack of unity of our people.

This is no time for wishful thinking. Upon our decision depends the fate of our nation. It is the time, of all times, for a sober and frank appraisal of new facts and new situations.

## THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE WAR

The first hard fact is the transformation of the character of this war. No one can deny the grim possibility that Hitler may take Suez, Iraq, North Africa and the Mediterranean. This would not, however, cut the vital lifeline of Britain. It might even release that British fleet to protect their Atlantic lanes. In any event, Hitler can occupy all of Continental Europe.

And from all this area he will get ample food supplies and vital raw materials for the German people. True, he is blockaded by the British fleet, but the blockade cannot starve the German people or cut off their vital raw material supplies. It is only the people in the occupied democracies who will starve. Having been disarmed to their very carving knives, they cannot revolt.

A second phase of this transformation is that substantial army fighting seems likely to go into the background for many years. The British armies cannot invade Hitler's Europe. Nor do I believe with all the 6,000,000 men that Hitler commands and his superior air force that he can now cross the Channel to England. To invade Hitler's Europe would require us to prepare 5,000,000 men in addition to the British army. This time to invade Germany we would need to land them quickly and that might take 40,000,000 tons of ships to carry our army over the Atlantic. And they might not be able to land even then. It would take ten years to build those ships. And Hitler could not start toward the United States without equal preparation.

Therefore, with this transformation it does not appear that this war can be brought to a conclusion by armies or navies for years and years to come.

The undetermined weapon against Hitler is air power. And the character of air war is also being transformed. It is rapidly emerging to be long-range bombing with fighter planes to defend against the bombers. Accurate action in destruction of industrial and military objectives by daylight is no longer possible because of the efficiency of fighter planes on both sides.

Manufacture of more and more planes will thus continue on both sides. But so far there is no effective answer to night bombing. It serves mostly to destroy large objectives, the cities and harbors, reducing them to rubble and killing civilians. And in this destruction Hitler has to fly only one-third the distance that the British have to fly, to reach his point of attack.

And there is a transformation in the German blockade of England. The long-range bomber is developing as a primary weapon in the attack upon harbors and upon ships. Submarines are today partly scouts, sending word to the air forces. Naval protection of Britain's sea lanes is now subsidiary to air protection.

This moving transformation of the relation of army power, sea power and air power presents new situations which are not yet clear. They involve many new considerations. They plainly indicate that America would be joined in a long, long war without a clear method of conclusion. And they emphasize England's immediate need which I will discuss later on.

#### THE SITUATION IN THE PACIFIC

The second hard fact we must frankly face is that in the last war Japan was our ally and we had no need to defend the Pacific. But Japan is now openly allied to the Axis. She only awaits a favorable moment to realize her ambitions in Asia. That opportunity comes to her if we go to war in the Atlantic. Even if she does not open war upon us, her action and attitudes will be so potentially dangerous to us that we must instantly divert our energies to strengthen our defenses in the Pacific.

#### OUR UNPREPAREDNESS

The third of these hard facts that we have to face is our unpreparedness. We have been slow to organize for defense, as is always the case in democracies.

We are not prepared to go to war. Our industry will not be tuned up for another eight or ten months to produce enough

of the tools of war to equip our own defense and at the same time supply the needs of Britain. We do not have 300,000 men who are sufficiently equipped with planes, tanks and guns to meet 300,000 Germans, to say nothing of victory over 5,000,000 of them. We will not even have 1,500,000 men so equipped for probably another 12 months. We have no substantial air force of the type now being used in this war. It is true we have a magnificent navy, but even that is not yet big enough for the job which it may have to undertake if we join in this war.

And preparedness for war consists not alone of men and tools and munitions. It also embraces the spirit of a people. This war is a total war. That means all energy of a people must be mobilized. We must have a united people to make successful total war. We are united in resolution to defend the Western Hemisphere from military aggression. We are united in building whatever of a war machine is necessary for this purpose. We are united in our condemnation of aggressor nations. We are united in wanting to help England defend her independence.

But beyond this we are a divided people. Do I need to prove this disunity? There is an obvious large majority of people who oppose the sending to foreign wars of our boys either on our Navy or on convoys or airplanes or expeditionary forces where they may have to shoot or be shot at. These oppositions are strongest in our youth and it is youth who must die. There is no unwillingness in them to die to defend our Hemisphere.

And to have a united people the Government must be united with the will of the people. A divided people cannot act effectively in the supreme issue of total war. That failure in unity was part of the disaster of France. The first necessity is to follow an objective upon which our people will agree.

History will assess the condemnation or the praise for the policies and the methods which have brought us to these dangers. That is not the question now. The question is what to do from here on.

## AIDS TO BRITAIN

Our every sympathy, our interest is to assist the heroic defense of England. We have pledged ourselves to give Britain the aid of our factories and our farms.

Her most critical period is right now. It is during the next months. What the urgent need of England is as expressed by her leaders time and again? Plainly she needs bomber planes to guard our sea lanes. She needs bomber planes and fighter planes to offset the attacks upon her cities and her harbors. She needs tanks, munitions and food. She needs merchant ships to replace her losses. She needs minor naval warships to guard her sea lanes.

We are today giving her only a part of the scant production of our industries and retaining the other part for our own preparedness.

If we join this war we must join in earnest. We shall lose it any other way. If we join we must at once increase our army to 3,000,000 or 5,000,000 men. We should have to use a larger part of our immediate manufactures to supply our own army. We should have to use a larger part of our air production to defend our own coast cities. We should have to at once increase our protections for the Pacific Coast and our island possessions. We should have to use a larger part of our production of fighter and bomber planes for them. We should have to hold merchant ships in reserve to carry troops to protect them. We are not building enough merchant ships now to meet British needs. We should have to use our light naval craft to convoy and protect our own sea lanes, especially in the Pacific.

In net, if we join this war we must use a larger portion of our present scant production for our own equipment and defense. We should have to do this at once. And that means if we join in this war we must give Britain less tools of war during her most critical period.

If we stay out of this war we can take more risks in parting with our tools of war.

The British have said time and time again that if we give them the tools they have the manpower to repel invasion, they have the men to man the warships, the merchant ships, and the airplanes.

#### THE COURSE WE SHOULD PURSUE

Today we are confronted with not one problem but many. What is the constructive American course amid these problems? Is it not clear that we will give fewer tools to Britain if we join in the war? The solution is not for us to go to war but to give her every tool that will really aid her regardless of our own preparedness. There are risks in this course but it is the least perilous road we can now take. This solution will not please extremists on either side. Common sense and stark truth rarely do. But I am convinced that here lies the road to national unity that is so essential to America at this time.

#### SOME OTHER QUESTIONS

We must also think other things through. And there are some other very disagreeable questions that must be answered before we take the plunge to war. We cannot refuse to face the facts of the situation when the fate of the nation is at stake.

We wish to aid Britain, but we must face the fact that if she cannot maintain the independence of the British Isles with the tools and policies I have mentioned, it cannot be maintained by our joining in the war. If we are in the war and should Britain fail, we would be left to carry the war alone. And that war against Nazi controlled Europe will have to be fought at a distance of 3000 miles and for years and years.

In that event, are we going to blockade Europe? If so, are we going to starve the 40 million people in Great Britain? And how will we bring such a war to a conclusion?

#### WE MUST NOT BE SWEEPED OFF OUR FEET

What the course of the American people may be in this conflagration of the world cannot rightly be determined now. We



cannot appraise all of the factors. At the present we cannot judge the effect of the transformation going on in this war. But there are some things we can state with assurance.

Right now we need calm thinking. We need reason. We need tolerance. We need to approach these problems with deliberation. Until this picture is more clear it is folly to gamble with the fate of a nation. Strong men do not need to rush. We must not be swept off our feet by the profound depth of our emotions. By no hasty or emotional act must we jeopardize the aid to Britain and the future of America.

#### THE PRICE OF WAR

Finally we must not forget the price we shall have to pay if we join in this war.

It means the sacrifice of our most precious lives and the hopes of millions of mothers and wives. It means the sacrifice also of our own liberty to a dictatorship of our own, inevitable in total war.

If we go into war, we must pass through postwar bankruptcy. The savings of the people will be lost. The endowments of our universities, colleges, hospitals will be destroyed. And when the day of transformation of war into peace comes the Government will not be able to support the unemployed and the farmers. In this gulf all major industry must be operated by the Government. When we go to the peace table, hate will again as before sit at that table endeavoring to destroy the hope of any real peace among men. Liberty will not recover on this continent for a generation.

But if despite this entire price we are compelled to act with out military power, let us be thoroughly prepared. Let us make our determination within the frame of our Constitution by the decision of Congress. And when that decision is made, there will be no disunity in America.

The Germans know all about our slow preparedness. They need have no momentary satisfaction in our unpreparedness. That will be forthcoming. The potential might of this nation is

the strongest thing in this whole world. If necessary, we can raise and we can eventually equip an army of as many millions of men as we need. We can make more ingenious tools of war and we can operate them better than any nation in the world. That strength is always here in America. The defense of the United States is not dependent upon any other nation. America cannot be defeated.

# A Call to American Reason

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

[June 29, 1941]

SIX WEEKS ago I made a statement to the American people upon the relation of the United States to this war. That address has received large approval. It has naturally been disliked by the extremists. That is the psychosis of war. That disease has two outstanding symptoms. Those who catch it lose their reason in the fever of emotion. And in that fever intolerance rises to a pitch where it seeks to frighten men from free speech by defamation.

Since making that address four momentous events have happened which greatly changes the shape of things. They must be incorporated in American thinking. There is the war between Hitler and Stalin. There is the final proof that in certain vital circumstances air power is ascendant over sea power. There are the provocative actions in the sinking of the *Robin Moor*. Propaganda of fear or hate to force us into war has been intensified. It comes from foreign sources, from Cabinet officers and American organizations. They urge step after step of executive action which would drag us into undeclared war.

There are those who argue that we are already in this war. The Constitution of the United States provides that Congress has the sole authority to declare war. It is equally their responsibility to see that this country does not go to war until they have authorized it.

The only reason for not submitting the matter to the Congress would be that Congress could not be trusted. Or that the

people, through them, should not be allowed a voice. No President in a democracy should take that responsibility, for there will be no unity of spirit in an executive war. If Congress decides to go to war, then we willingly give all and we willingly surrender all our freedoms necessary to win that war. And until Congress shall by Constitutional action declare war, no man in America may demand the end of debate on this issue of Peace or War.

In these six weeks, opposition against joining in this war has grown stronger in the American people. Yet we have moved officially nearer to war. And let me say at once that President Roosevelt has held steadfast to his promises not to send "our Army, Navy or Air Forces to fight in foreign lands outside America except in case of attack." We have not yet taken the irretrievable step into war by firing a gun.

The arguments given for our joining in this war during the past weeks have crystallized into seven categories. The first is that it would more greatly aid Britain if we go into the shooting stage of the war than for us to remain as an arsenal. The second is that Hitler means to attack the Americas and we should attack first. The third is that the American mission of freedom requires we destroy these totalitarian ideologies and impose the four freedoms on other nations. The fourth is that a free America cannot live in the same world with dictatorships. The fifth is that our economic future will be destroyed. The sixth is that the sinking of the *Robin Moor* constitutes an attack on the United States which requires war. And the seventh is that we must go to war to impose permanent peace on the world.

The American people should weigh wars just as they would weigh any other issue. They should weigh them on the realistic scales of benefits and losses both material and spiritual.

No man can tell what the kaleidoscopic changes in this appalling situation may be. We must constantly reappraise its dangers. The constant question is what we should do now. But there are certain courses of practical statesmanship; there are certain eternal principles to which we must adhere. There are

certain consequences to America and civilization which we must ever keep before our eyes.

I shall speak again without emphasizing the emotion that arises within me when the whole destiny of my country is imperiled. I can hope to appeal only to reasoning people. And it is cold reason, not eloquence that America needs today.

#### AID TO BRITAIN

I shall first weigh the problem of aid to Britain before I deal with the other arguments.

In my last address I insisted that we could give Britain more aid if we stayed out of the war. I suggested that until our production increases we should scrape the bottom of the barrel. That would be more than she now receives. I stated that if we join the war we must retain a larger part of our production for our own immediate defense. Thus Britain would get less than she does now.

To prevent these supplies being sunk I proposed that we hand over to Britain the same convoy warships we should use if we joined the war. If she operated them, it would do her as much good as if we did it.

The recommendations were based upon just plain mathematics of what would get the most supplies to Britain, not emotional dialectics.

The bomber planes which Britain wants so badly are flown over the Atlantic and therefore are not sunk by submarines. The figures now disclosed by the Maritime Commission, the Government Departments, the Red Cross, all of them show that less than 4 per cent of the supplies shipped from American ports to Britain have been sunk.

These percentages of loss could become very much larger and still the net supplies to Britain would be greater by our staying out of war.

Furthermore, many of these ships are being sunk from the air. No amount of American naval protection could stop that.

There is also the problem of Japan. We must not forget that

she is under contract to Hitler to attack us if we join in this war. For her to enter would be a disaster to Britain in two ways. She would cover the seven seas with raiders sinking more British supplies. And we would need at once to retain all the air power and ships we can produce to protect our own coasts and to drive her off the seas.

In view of these disclosures and these reasons, the answer to those who argue that it would aid Britain for us to join this war is that it would do her more harm than good.

Let me add a word upon Britain's magnificent defense to those who say Britain is lost. She has not lost a square yard of her empire. She has managed to maintain an extraordinary portion of her exports of manufactured goods over the seven seas with all the labor and raw materials that implies. She still draws a large part of her food supplies by long voyages to the Southern Hemisphere. She has apparently not found the need to concentrate her lifeline on North America which was done to economize shipping in the last war. She is by no means in the extremity of a siege. The war between Hitler and Stalin relieves her of immediate pressures.

#### REVOLUTION IN MILITARY POWERS

Before I apply the weights of realism to the other arguments for our joining this war we must take account of military developments in the war itself. They profoundly affect America's relation to this war.

It is more than ever evident that there has been a shift in the relative strength of military power just as revolutionary as was the invention of gun powder to armored knights of old.

Comparatively small mechanized armies are now dominant over fortifications and mass armies. Air power has now demonstrated its superiority over sea power in certain circumstances.

During the past six weeks the *Bismarck*, a first-class battleship, was first crippled from the air. In the Battle of Crete the British were forced to withdraw their naval forces in the face of air attacks from nearby land bases, with the loss of four

cruisers and several destroyers. Other warships have been put out of action in the last month from the air by both British and Germans.

One result of this shift has been to assure a sort of zone around the shores of nations where bombing airplanes render attack by naval vessels very much more difficult and often impossible. The shift has added greatly to the powers of American defense.

Hitler today occupies or controls all the Continent of Europe outside Russia. Unlike the last war, there is no arena of land operations. His whole strength would need to be met on the beach somewhere. And he controls every mile of the beach.

Japan is still under agreement to attack us if we join the war. She becomes far more potent to destroy our interests in the Pacific the moment we become engaged in the Atlantic.

It is too early to forecast the military consequences of the inclusion of Russia in the war. It does not seem likely that it will bring the end any nearer.

#### CAN AMERICA BE CONQUERED?

With these weights we can examine the second argument for joining this war. This argument is that Hitler will eventually make a military conquest of the Western Hemisphere and we had better attack first. There are two questions here. First, can America be conquered, and second, can we conquer the Axis?

The Atlantic Ocean is still 3000 miles wide. For either the United States or Germany to gain victory gigantic armadas of warships and transports, must be set afloat. Enormous armies must be transported all at once and ready for attack on the beach on either side. Neither enough warships nor transports exist today to do that from either side. It would take ten years to prepare. These armadas could be protected by air power only in the first part of their journey. And then naval power becomes effective. When they get closer to the shore air power comes into action. And it is now demonstrated that enough air

power is almost complete defense against surface ships. And after that there must be the battle on the beach. England can prevent Hitler's crossing even 25 miles of water.

Those who assert that the Germans might capture and use the British Navy against us must now recognize that the proved vulnerability of war ships from bombing planes removes most of that argument.

There is no important military man who tells me that we and Britain combined could short of long years prepare, transport and land enough men or machines in Europe to overcome Axis land and air power. And not a military man of substance believes the Axis could do it to us.

There is here also the element of Japan. She is 6000 miles away from continental United States and a conclusive grip upon each other's throat is even more improbable.

Even with the development of long range planes, the Germans or Japanese cannot make an effective air attack upon us. They could do some terrorization. But that does not win wars. Certainly after the exhaustion of this war the Nazis are not coming for a long time. If we are prepared they won't think of coming.

In any event the answer to the argument that we may be conquered by the Axis is simply that, if we prepare, America cannot be brought to subjection by any combination of military power.

As relative military power stands today, there appears no method of bringing this war to a conclusion except by years and years of destruction and exhaustion. Sea power is ineffective through blockade to bring conclusion because Hitler has supplies of food and raw material or is on the way to get them. Britain has the seven seas open. Armies cannot be effectively landed across water against air power. The defenses against daylight attack preclude the destruction of munitions works and thus manufacture goes on. The night air raids reduce cities to rubble and kill civilians but that does not bring the war to conclusion. The end of stalemate becomes part a question of morale and stamina.



If we enter such a war we only increase the moral and economic wastage of the world. If we stay out, we preserve much for the reconstruction of the world.

And in considering all the possibilities if we go to war, we must contemplate that the British might not be able to hold out during the long years that this war would go on. Then we would be left with no possibility of bringing the war to conclusion except by a compromise peace.

#### IMPOSING THE FOUR FREEDOMS

The third argument of those who would have us join in this war is that we must destroy the whole dictator ideology and impose the four freedoms on other nations.

That is, we must go to war to impose the ideals of democracy against the ideals of despotism. That is an ideological war. It is an ancient holy war. We may weigh it in both the scales of American idealism and the scales of realistic practicality.

#### WHAT OF RUSSIA?

In the last seven days that call to sacrifice American boys for an ideal has been made as a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. For now we find ourselves promising aid to Stalin and his militant Communist conspiracy against the whole democratic ideals of the world. Collaboration between Britain and Russia will bring them military values, but it makes the whole argument of our joining the war to bring the four freedoms to mankind a gargantuan jest. We should refresh our memories a little.

Four American Presidents and four Secretaries of State beginning with Woodrow Wilson refused to have anything to do with Soviet Russia on the ground of morals and democratic ideals. They even refused diplomatic recognition. They did so because here is one of the bloodiest tyrannies and terrors ever erected in history. It destroyed every semblance of human rights and human liberty; it is a militant destroyer of the worship

of God. It brutally executes millions of innocent people without the semblance of justice. It has enslaved the rest. Moreover, it has violated every international covenant; it has carried on a world conspiracy against all democracy, including the United States. And do I need to prove that it continued doing this down to seven days ago?

When Russia was recognized by the United States in 1933, the Soviet entered into a solemn agreement that they would refrain from any propaganda, any organization or from injuring in any way whatsoever the tranquility, prosperity, order or security in any part of the United States.

Seven years later, the Dies Committee reported unanimously and specifically that the Communist Party in the United States is a Moscow conspiracy, masked as a political party; that its activities constitute a violation of the Treaty of Recognition; that under instructions from Moscow the Communists had violated the laws of the United States; that throughout the entire time they had been supplied with funds from Moscow for activities against the American people and the American Government. The Dies Committee only confirmed what most Americans already know. Is the word of Stalin any better than the word of Hitler?

On August 22, 1939, Stalin entered into an agreement with Hitler through which there should be joint onslaught on the democracies of the world. Nine days later Stalin attacked the Poles jointly with Hitler and destroyed the freedom of a great and democratic people. Fourteen days later Stalin destroyed the independence of democratic Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. Ninety days later on came the unprovoked attack by Russia on democratic Finland. Is that not aggression and is not every case a hideous violation of treaties and international law?

Stalin has taken advantage of the very freedoms of democracy to destroy them with the most potent Fifth Column in all history. He contributed to the destruction of France. He has daily implanted class hate in America and a stealthy war against our institutions.

In these last weeks it is declared not only by public officials

but by labor leaders themselves that the strikes which hamstring the defense of the United States have been Communist conspiracies. Thus Russia has continued her mission of destroying our democracy down to last week.

We know also Hitler's hideous record of brutality, of aggression and as a destroyer of democracies. Truly Poland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, France and the others are dreadful monuments. But I am talking of Stalin at this moment.

One of the real compensations America received for our enormous sacrifices in the last war was from the large part we played in establishing the democracies of Finland, Poland, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. We nursed them in their infancy. We spent hundreds of millions to help them grow to manhood. Does America feel quite right about aiding Stalin to hold his enslavement of them? That is where power politics has carried us. No doubt we will make good our promise to aid Russia. But the ideological war to bring the four freedoms to the world died spiritually when we made that promise.

If we go further and join the war and we win, then we have won for Stalin the grip of Communism on Russia and more opportunity for it to extend in the world. We should at least cease to tell our sons that they would be giving their lives to restore democracy and freedom to the world.

Now let us explore the practical side of an ideological war. I agree that the world would be vastly better if the whole totalitarian idea were extirpated. But those who still cling to this as the mission of America should ask realistically how much of a job it is. Especially in the face of this revolution in military weapons and this actual military situation.

Such a war means that Hitler must be defeated. It means Mussolini must be defeated. It means the War Party in Japan must be defeated. It means that Turkey, Spain and Portugal must be defeated. It means that unless Hitler first disposes of Stalin we must defeat him also. Does any sane person believe that by military means we can defeat two-thirds of the military power of the whole world in even years and years? It would be another Children's Crusade.

We cannot slay an idea or an ideology with machine guns. Ideas live in men's minds in spite of military defeat. They live until they have proved themselves right or wrong. These ideas are evil. And evil ideas contain the germs of their own defeat.

Hitler's real weakness would be in peace. His invasions have won not the loyalty but the undying hate of two-thirds of the people under his control. They have known self-government and liberty for centuries. They are people of great spiritual and intellectual resistance. They cannot revolt in arms against tanks and planes but they will never accept a new order based on slavery. And these aggressions have won the fear and hate of all the rest of the world. Conquest always dies of indigestion.

The whole Nazi ideology and the Nazi economic system are based upon coercion of the individual, the group or the class. Those coercions can be held in preparing for war or during war. They cannot be held in peace. Even if Hitler got peace the Nazi system will begin to go to pieces. Therefore, we do not need to despair that these evil ideologies will continue forever on this earth.

#### CAN WE LIVE WITH DESPOTS IN THE WORLD?

And there is the fourth argument that America and the Western Hemisphere cannot live with despotism in Europe. It would not be pleasant, but it can be done. The strong men of this Republic carried this democracy in the weakness of its infancy through a whole world of complete dictatorship, a world of imperialism, a world of aggression. Have we less stamina, less courage, than they?

#### WHAT OF OUR ECONOMIC LIFE?

And there is the fifth argument that if dictatorships continue in the world our economic life will be strangled and die. I have expounded this subject at great length elsewhere. I may say here that this country is 93 per cent self-contained. While I do

not relish it and do not believe in any event it will be needed, if it is needed then we can make it 97 per cent self-contained. And the cost of it would be less over twenty years than one year of war.

I suppose even totalitarian Europe would want to trade. At worst we would have to set up defenses so that they do not take advantage of us. But totalitarianism will die of its own false principles and that storm will pass.

#### THE INCIDENT OF THE "ROBIN MOOR"

Some groups seek to represent the incident of German sinking of the *Robin Moor* as a *casus belli*. If that ship had started for a German port with that cargo Britain would have rightly seized her as contraband, according to Britain's own definition of contraband. If British captors could not have taken her to port then under international law they would have the right to sink her. There is no freedom of the seas in trading with any belligerent. The difference here is the brutal treatment of the passengers and crew who, although finally saved, were left in jeopardy by the Germans. That was an outrageous violation of international law and humanity. The President is right to protest violently. But an incident of this kind standing alone is not reason for a calm nation to go to war. It can get satisfactions by patience.

#### MAKING PEACE IN EUROPE

The seventh category of arguments is that we must join in this war to impose permanent peace on the world. Suppose we join the war. Suppose we have victory over Hitler. Suppose we should march down the Unter den Linden. What happens then? It is possible to say right now what would happen.

Within a week after Germany is defeated each one of twenty nations in Europe will necessarily declare its national independence. Each one will set up a government of its own. Within another week each will begin to organize an army. They will occupy their utmost boundaries. In order to get

revenue and to protect jobs for their own people, each one will again set up its tariff walls. And these nations will at once coagulate into groups and combinations for power politics, intent on increasing their strength at the peace table. There will be reparations and territory to divide.

All this is what happened before the Peace Conference in 1919, and it will automatically happen again. Moreover, many nations will have suffered greatly. Hate and revenge will sit at that peace table.

No responsible statesman on the democratic side has yet stated how or by what plan this inevitable result of victory is to be molded into permanent peace. We are asked to go in blind as to the ultimate purpose of this war.

If we stay out and retain our economic and moral resources we shall be able to contribute to the rehabilitation of the world and we may be able to make an affirmative contribution to a method to end war and bring about a better world.

#### DICTATORSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES

And what happens in the United States during and after a war that must take years and years even if it were won? We must at once establish further centralization of authority amounting to practical dictatorship in the United States. We will disguise its name, but total war cannot be won without it. We must bring about unity by force. We must regiment industry and labor. Intellectual life and civil liberty must be shackled to the war machine.

The necessities of war organization require vast taking over and operation of industry by the Government. War organization creates vested personal power, vested economic interests, vested habits and vested ideas. We have a taste of all this already in organizing preparedness only.

It is easier to regiment a people than to unregiment them. They can be deprived of their liberties by a ukase, a command, or by administrative order. It is a long and painful climb back to freedom. Does any American believe that these vast powers

vested in government will be restored to the people if we join in world war?

When we came out of that last war our national debt was about 10 per cent of our national wealth. Instead of that we shall have a debt equal to 50 per cent of our national wealth if we ever go into this one. The only answer is to inflate wages and prices by huge amounts in order to make it bearable. That would rob every present life insurance policy, every savings-bank deposit, and every college endowment of its buying power. That would be the ruin of the saving classes in the United States. No such event has ever happened in history without moral degeneration and the wreck of the whole form of government.

After this war is over it is certain that the forces pressing for continued economic dictatorship would be stronger than ever.

Lord Lothian in his last impressive address wisely remarked as to the dictatorships in Europe that these world evils "grew out of the despair . . . from long years of war, inflation . . . unemployment and frustration." What profit to us is it to destroy totalitarianism abroad and create it at home?

#### AMERICAN PREPAREDNESS

There is a reason for keeping out of this war that the proponents of war constantly ignore. We are not prepared. A coolheaded people would first prepare themselves before they rush to battle. We do not yet have 50,000 mechanized troops. Our planes could repel attack on this side of the Atlantic but most of them are obsolete for fighting in Europe. And we should likely be fighting a two ocean war with a one ocean navy. Can we not listen to the experience of France and England in launching unprepared war?

The administration of our preparedness program is not yet efficiently organized. Over a year ago I expressed the hope that we start such organization with the experience we had gained in the last war. I recommended that some capable citizen be placed with full responsibility for our whole armament program

gram. That has not yet been done. We are still confused in a mass of committees, boards and commissions.

If anything calls for us to keep out of war now it is just this unpreparedness. And we should arm to the teeth. When we are armed, then the voice of America will be heard and it will **be** listened **to**.

#### THE SUM OF ALL

Now what sort of conclusions does this all add up to? For the situation as it stands today we should hold to our undertaking to be only the arsenal and engage in no shooting. But watch and arm. The reasons are: Because we can be of more service to Britain if we stay out of this war.

Because these two continents, the one that Hitler now commands or would even command with Japan in, and the other which the United States possesses, are unable to reach each other's throat—that war can be ended only after long, long years of exhausting strain.

And the end of exhaustion may be compromise peace; it certainly means misery, poverty, frustration and possibly revolution.

Because the moment we begin shooting in the Atlantic then Japan is under obligation to begin shooting at our interests in the Pacific—if she carries out her contract with Hitler. She cannot win but it is usual to build up one's reserves before taking on two wars.

Because we cannot impose the four freedoms unless we can win military victory over not only Hitler and Mussolini, but Stalin, Matsuoka, Franco and several others. Joining in a war alongside Stalin to impose freedom is a travesty.

Because even supposing there were victory over Germany, there is no declared war aim or method that assures the bringing of permanent peace to the hates and diverse interests of Europe.

Because of necessity we shall be compelled to set up practical



dictatorship in America. We shall be compelled to go on with it for years after the war is over. Freedom would return to America but this generation would not see it again.

Because we are only partly prepared.

Because if we prepare, as we must prepare, there need be no fear in the American heart that the Axis one and all will ever conquer this Hemisphere. The whole shift in these weapons of war adds to our defensive strength.

#### A PROGRAM FOR AMERICA NOW

No man can see what the future may bring. Whatever that future may be, only one defeat can come to America. We have no need to fear military defeat if we are prepared. Our only defeat would be if we lost our own national freedoms and our potency for good in the world.

There is no course we can pursue amid these stupendous dangers that is perfect, or without risks, or that may not require change. But let me propose for reasoning people a course for us at this time which avoids the most destructive forces and holds fast to the most constructive forces. And that program is neither defeatist, nor isolationist, nor interventionist.

1. Give every aid we can to Britain and China but do not put the American flag or American boys in the zone of war.
2. Arm to the teeth for defense of the Western Hemisphere, and cease to talk and to provoke war until we are armed.
3. Uphold Congress steadily in assuming the responsibility to determine peace or war.
4. Stop this notion of ideological war to impose the four freedoms on other nations by military force and against their will.
5. Devote ourselves to improving the four freedoms within our borders that the light of their success may stir the people of the world to their adoption.
6. We can hope a peace table will assemble some day, whether it is the result of stalemate or victory. The world will be glad to have America sit at this peace table.

When that day comes the other nations will be sufficiently exhausted to listen to the military, economic and moral powers of the United States. And with these reserves unexhausted, at that moment, and that moment only, can the United States promote a just and permanent peace.

7. We should go to the peace conference without the hates which come with war. We should go with a plan thought out and matured. We should prepare a new concept of human relations that will give the world some hope of permanent peace.

FINALLY

Here in America today is the only remaining sanctuary of freedom, the last oasis of civilization and the last reserve of moral and economic strength. If we are wise, these values can be made to serve all mankind.

My countrymen, we have marched into the twilight of a world war. Should we not stop here and build our defense while we can still see? Shall we stumble on into the night of chaos?

# The Crisis

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

[*September 16, 1941*]

AFTER ten weeks of observation I wish again to speak to my countrymen upon America's relation to this war. I shall speak analytically and dispassionately, for cool thinking is needed now as never before. And I speak solely for myself and not for any group or organization.

Since ten weeks ago the military scene in the world has enormously shifted. New objectives for the American people have been advanced. The Navy has been ordered to start shooting. Our people are more bewildered and divided than before.

No one will deny that if we keep up this step-by-step policy it will lead inevitably to sending our sons into this war. Nor will any one deny that the realization of the objectives set before us leads to that same fate. It is the ultimate end of this road that must be looked at. And that I propose to discuss tonight.

But before I proceed, let me make certain matters plain.

If we would preserve the very spirit of free institutions American boys must not be sent to death without the specific declaration by the Congress. Congress should not be eliminated. And in the support of free institutions this debate must continue until Congress shall declare war.

Debate on war and peace ought to be lifted above intolerance and accusation. I believe in the patriotism of all Americans of every faith and racial origin. I do not believe in smearing of men or attacks upon groups. Those who sincerely and openly

advocate sending our boys into this war are entitled to respect. And those who oppose it are entitled to like consideration.

I hold, and 99 per cent of Americans hold, that totalitarianism, whether Nazism or Communism, is abominable. Both forms are unmoral because they deny religion, and there is no sanctity of agreement with them. They are abhorrent because of their unspeakable cruelty and their callous slaughter of millions of human beings. I abhor any American compromise or alliance with either one of them.

#### THE WAR SITUATION

A cold survey of this world situation will show that the dangers of ultimate totalitarian success are very much less than even ten weeks ago. The fratricidal war between Hitler and Stalin is daily weakening both dictators.

Hitler may gain from Russia some supplies, but he now faces all the rest of Europe exhausted of its pre-war stocks of food and material. Although he has won unprecedented military victories, he has kindled behind him a consuming fire of hate. It is now evident that he has failed to convert to Nazism the 200 million people that he has invaded. He cannot recruit a division of dependable soldiers among them. They hate him. If he occupies all Russia it will add another 150 million haters. Of the 160 odd million people in Germany and its Allies, many are becoming weary of war and of death. The Hate of Hitler will be more terrible than the blizzard was to Napoleon. His kingdom cannot live, even though he has no military defeat on the Continent.

We are assured that Hitler cannot cross the English Channel with his armies. And England is even more impregnable because of this breathing spell for production of more planes, tanks and ships and our increasing aid in war tools. Her loss of ships and supplies at sea has greatly decreased, largely due to her more effective air patrol. And she daily becomes stronger in air attack upon Germany.

The actual dangers to America are less today than at any time since this war began. Less than even three months ago.

Thoughtful men agree that the revolution in weapons makes the Western Hemisphere impregnable from invasion by Hitler if we are prepared. A statement of mine on this some time ago was challenged. But it has been more than confirmed by Colonel Phillips of our United States Army General Staff, who recently wrote:

"The bomber has made the American coast impregnable to invasion.

"And this still would be true if our Navy were inferior to that of any invading power.

"It makes it possible for this country to insure not only its own continental territory \* \* \* but \* \* \* to insure the impregnability of all North and South America."

And I may add that if Hitler had all the shipyards in Europe he could not in five years build an armada big enough even to start across the Atlantic.

Hitler is on his way to be crushed by the vicious forces within his own regime. Patience for this is far better than spending the lives of American boys.

Under any American policy, whether interventionist or non-interventionist, in either Europe or Japan, if we have common sense we will concentrate upon the building up of our production, give Britain her tools and await the development of all these forces, both East and West.

#### FREEDOM OF THE SEAS

Mr. Roosevelt spoke last Thursday night upon the freedom of the seas and the recent incidents.

The President is right in vigorous protest at firing upon American warships. He is right in protest at sinking American merchant ships without adequate protection of their crews, even though they were all carrying contraband.

But any definition of freedom of the seas in wartime is

largely academic. Britain could not accept the President's definition and carry on an effective blockade.

And the President's policy of edging our warships into danger zones, of sending American merchant ships with contraband raises the most critical of all questions. These steps to war are unapproved and undeclared by the Congress. That is not in accord with the spirit of representative Government and it should be remembered that these incidents are the consequence of violating the spirit of the Neutrality Act. There are other ways than going into this war to secure reparation for transgression of our just rights and respect for them.

#### ESTABLISHING FREEDOM AMONG MANKIND

The basis of argument of those who would have us send our sons into war has greatly shifted in the last two months. The increasing emphasis is upon our moral obligation to send our boys to war in order to establish freedom for all men.

President Roosevelt on January 6 of this year stated that we seek "everywhere in the world" freedom of speech and expression, freedom of religion, freedom from fear, freedom from want. He has emphasized this many times since.

On August 12 the President and Prime Minister Churchill issued their Atlantic statement. They expanded these points by nine more to a total of thirteen. They are: no annexations, self-determination, self-government, equality of trade, social advancement, some sort of freedom of the seas, abandonment of the use of force, and disarmament of aggressor nations, and permanent peace.

Two weeks ago Mr. Roosevelt again referred to this question and "our responsibility to build a democratic world."

I believe in the aspirations for freedom and peace in the world. I have myself urged and prayed and worked for them over a quarter of a century. I pray that they may yet come to mankind.

But today the realistic questions which confront us are –

Can America impose these four freedoms upon Europe and Asia by sending our sons into this war?

Can America impose the nine new points on the world?

Shall we not lose in America all these freedoms by the very necessities that arise if we send our sons into this war?

Here, my countrymen, you should listen to the stern voice of American experience.

Before the last world war we were indignant as we are now at aggression by dictator governments. Our sense of compassion and justice was aroused on behalf of the victims. We believed the New World could bring to the Old World a new order of justice, right and freedom. We would make the world safe for democracy. We would fight a war to end all war.

I advocated joining in that war. I occupied highly responsible positions in the war, and in the peace and its aftermaths. I was part of these events. I can speak from facts, from record, from personal knowledge.

President Wilson twenty-three years ago in his 14 Points and supplementary provisions not only declared every one of all the Churchill and Roosevelt principles and freedoms, but he included still more freedoms and protections. He reflected the whole idealism of America.

We won that war. But we lost the peace. At least so far as our high purpose of freedom and permanent peace was concerned.

Europe degenerated into a hell, the brew from which poisons the earth today.

It is the causes of this failure in the last world war that is important for us to examine now.

The causes of that failure of only twenty-three years ago lie far deeper than the viciousness of the Treaty of Versailles, or the failure of the League of Nations. The causes of that failure lie deep in the invisible forces which dominate and vibrate through the races which comprise the millions of people of Europe.

To many Americans, Europe consists of magnificent cities,

cathedrals, art, music, literature, great universities and monuments to heroism and human progress. Men among them have fought and died for liberty, and to lift the dignity of men. From them all we have received magnificent heritage of human thought.

But other forces make the fates of these people. Here are 400 million people on the continent divided into twenty-six races. They are crowded cheek by jowl in an area less than two-thirds of the United States. Suppose each of twenty-six of our states had its own language, its own racial inheritance, and its own economic and political problems. And supposing through all these races for centuries have surged the forces of nationalism, of imperialism, of religious conflict, memories of deep wrongs, of age-old hates, and of bitter fears. Suppose each had its own army and around each of these states was a periphery of mixed populations that made exact boundaries on racial lines hopeless. The outcries of separated minorities would be the implacable and unceasing cause of war. Suppose they all had different forms of government and even where it was a democratic form still it was class government. That would be Europe.

The standards of living of these great masses of people in Europe are at the very base of the struggle for existence. Economic rivalry, setting up of barriers to trade, the desire for elbow room in growing nations, and the pressure of low living standards all combine to force quarrels and grabs for territory for exploitation of other parts of the earth. And periodically there boils up among these people some Pied Piper with silver tongue, calling some new Utopia. Or the new Man on Horseback calls his race to wars of aggression and ambition. Indeed with a vicious rhythm these malign forces seem to drive nations like the Gadarene swine over the precipice of war.

In contrast, here in America during these four hundred years since our beginnings we have grown steadily apart from the ideas of Europe. Every one of our ancestors came here to get away from this dread turmoil. Ours has been a continent of magnificent resources from which we have obtained a greater ease of life. Freed of European hates and fears of great armies



on our borders we have developed new concepts of liberty, of morals and of government.

Mr. Wilson's 14 Points and his supplementary provisions had before the Armistice been formally accepted by both the Allies and the Germans as the basis of world peace. One of the most painful chapters in American history was the antagonism to these ideas by Allied statesmen the moment that the war was won.

But the whole concepts which the New World brought to the Old were at conflict with the grim forces that faced these European statesmen.

The victorious Allies in Europe were impoverished. They had suffered dreadful butcheries and wrongs. They demanded revenge, punishment, colonies, and money. Their statesmen, representing their peoples, were not free agents to make peace upon President Wilson's basis. A thousand years of history, fear and hate demanded and obtained seats at that peace table. They will sit at the next peace table of Europe. And America will be just as much foreign to that table as it was before.

President Wilson made a valiant fight for his new order for mankind. But it was the collision of warm idealism born in a New World, against the glacial forces of the Old World. The treaty would have been worse but for Mr. Wilson.

It was not the League of Nations which brought calamity in the world. It was the eternal malign forces of Europe.

Mr. Churchill has himself, with his usual bluntness, said three years ago, "Hitler's success, and, indeed, his survival as a political force, would not have been possible but for the lethargy and folly of the French and British governments since the war."

American ideas of freedom and government are the result of slow growth in the hearts of a people. It takes decades and centuries. They cannot be imposed by words, no matter how eloquent. They cannot be imposed by force. They cannot be imposed upon nations by treaties any more than they can be imposed by battle. We tried it once under the most perfect setting of triumphant victory over aggression, and with all the power and prestige of America.

The stern voice of experience says that America cannot impose its freedoms and ideals upon the twenty-six races of Europe or the world. We should not again sacrifice our sons for that proved will-o'-the-wisp.

#### MAINTAINING PEACE

Maintaining peace is a separate problem. While we cannot impose freedom, America can and must take part in maintaining peace in the world. We can contribute more to it if we are not exhausted morally, economically and militarily by sending our boys into this war. I hope to discuss it at some future time.

#### DESTROYING THE FOUR FREEDOMS AT HOME

The first trench in the battle for the four freedoms is to maintain them in America. That rests upon fidelity not only to the letter, but to the spirit, of constitutional government. Failure of Congress to assert its responsibilities or for the Executive to take warlike steps without the approval of the Congress is a direct destruction of the safeguards of freedom itself. We are on the way to weaken these freedoms in America – not to strengthen them.

Freedom of speech and expression is being stifled by war phobia right now in the United States.

Incidentally, there is a fifth freedom. That is economic freedom. Freedom for men to choose their own callings, to accumulate property in protection of their children and old age, freedom of private enterprise that does not injure others. The other four freedoms will not survive without this one.

A large number of the men administering our preparedness program do not believe in this freedom. With a long war – and it will be long if we put our boys into it – then their methods, together with the inevitable debt, inflation, unemployment and demoralized agriculture, will make us over into State Socialism, probably under some other name.

And listen, my countrymen, to another voice of experience. Freedom from want was never won by a war.

The last world war cost us 40 billions in debt and taxes in three years. Since then we have paid another 40 billions in interest and in support of its disabled, its widows, its orphans and its veterans. We may assume one-third of our people are today under housed, underfed, under clothed and undereducated. And the last war was largely the cause of that poverty. These people have no freedom from want. But had we used those 80 billions for them instead of war we could have given every family of them a modern five room house as a gift with all the gadgets. We could have given every person of them as a gift a whole outfit of new clothes once every year since that war. We could have given every family of them as a gift seven pounds of meat and seven pounds of bread every week since that war. We could have wiped out the one room school houses. We could have built a modern clinic in every backward county. And we would still have money left. Freedom from want comes alone from keeping out of war. Underfed, under housed, under clothed, undereducated people are the inevitable product of war.

There are certain backgrounds upon which all freedom in America must rest.

Russia is rightly defending herself against aggression. But when it comes to sending our sons into this war we are confronted with something else. We need to take a long look now before we leap. Russia is also an aggressor nation against democracies. And what happens to the millions of enslaved people of Russia and to all Europe and to our own freedoms if we shall send our sons to win this war for Communism?

#### ANOTHER AMERICAN EXPERIENCE

Twenty-five years ago and again today are not the only times we have been troubled by these eruptions of dictatorships in Europe.

Some Americans have perhaps forgotten that we had a

vigorous interventionist movement in the United States urging us to join with England in combat with Napoleon. That interventionist movement was led by Fisher Ames, a journalist of that day, one-time member of Congress, and said to have been prevented only by illness from becoming President of Harvard University. The leader against joining in war was one Thomas Jefferson.

Fisher Ames thought Jefferson was reactionary and did not realize the modern forces. Ames insisted that Napoleon would dominate the world, including the United States. He was full of pungent phrases. I give a collection of them. He said: "I am sure we are to be subjugated by Bonaparte." "Let not the men in power in America deceive themselves. If Bonaparte prevails [in Europe] we will be his vassals." "We shall be reduced to slavery." "In case Europe accepts peace and chains we of the United States are ripe and rotten for servitude and tribute." "Britain fights our battles." "One single hope of security is the British Navy." "If Russia is disarmed how long will it be before England will be done for?" "We are infatuated enough to think America is a hiding place for liberty."

And Ames had some accomplishment in name-calling. Generally he felt Jefferson and Madison and Monroe were the Fifth Column of that day. He says of them, "Our noisy liberty men are eager for power and perfectly indifferent about the fall of the country."

And in those times ours was a puny nation of less people in it than in New York City today. Except for the Fisher Ames the Americans of that day were not scared.

#### A PROGRAM OF ACTION

As the situation stands today, we can sum up certain bases upon which American policies should be predicated:

1. If we prepare we cannot be invaded nor our economic life be dangerously impaired.
2. England can prevent invasion of her shores if we give her

the tools, and even give to her warships, without our sending our boys to death, either on ships or land.

3. Hitler is on the way to be crushed by the vicious forces within his own regime.

4. We have proved by bitter experience that it is a futility for us to try to impose freedom and justice upon the world by war.

5. The ideas and ideals of the West can grow and spread abroad by our demonstration in our own country. They will die in the world if the freedoms shall become weakened or die in America.

6. To send our sons into this war must also be weighed in the scales of future America. Should we not weigh in this scale the dead and maimed? Should we not weigh the one-third of underfed, undernourished, underhoused, undereducated Americans for another generation that will be inevitable? Should we not weigh the loss of our own freedoms?

And where do these facts, reasons and conclusions point?

What is the constructive policy for America? Is it isolation? Is it intervention? Neither is possible, and neither is wisdom.

We must have impregnable defense. This defense must include the other twenty nations in the Western Hemisphere. That is not isolation.

We must give the tools of defense to the democracies. That is not isolation.

We should reserve our strength that unexhausted we may give real aid to reconstruction and stabilizing of peace when Hitler collapses of his own overreaching. That is neither isolation nor intervention.

We can do our greatest service to civilization by strengthening here in the Western Hemisphere free institutions and free men and women. That is not isolation. It is a service to all mankind.

But to send our boys out to kill and be killed, that is intervention.

We hear much urging to national unity. We could easily get unity

If we stopped calling names.

If we directed our preparedness policies to the minimum interference with economic freedom.

If we gave aid to democracies alone of Europe and Asia, and gave it generously.

If we stopped provocative steps that may take our sons into war.

If no warlike steps be taken and no agreement be made that is not submitted to the Congress. If the Congress decides for war then we accept it.

I believe real unity can be had among the American people in these proposals.

Let us never forget we came over the ocean to this oasis of liberty. We extended this oasis greatly by mighty streams of freedom. They were dug and built by the toil of our fathers and defended with their blood. Are we now to march out into the desert of European war and see the wells of freedom dried up behind us?

*PART II*

RELIEF TO  
THE OCCUPIED DEMOCRACIES

# Starvation in the Occupied Democracies

*Press Statement*

[August 11, 1940]

SOMEBODY must raise a voice for food supply during the coming winter to the 27,000,000 innocent civilians, mostly women and children, in Norway, Holland, Belgium and Poland. Possibly France also will be in difficulties. This subject needs clarification. It is impossible to understand what the Administration in Washington means by statements that they do not have any facts, or why they recall an Ambassador because he states a fact. The obvious truth is that there will be wholesale starvation, disease and death in these little countries unless something is done about it.

The situation is obvious, because the Belgians are always dependent upon imports for from 60 to 70 per cent of their food, the Dutch 30 to 40 per cent, the Norwegians 20 to 30 per cent, and Central Poland, as now set up, about 30 per cent. France imports about 15 per cent. Their food must come over their borders, either from other parts of the Continent or from overseas. The situation will be even more acute than these figures imply, because the farmers and villagers consume most of the domestic production and the cities mostly live on the imports. The native production degenerates during war by inability to import feed for animals.

These little nations are being ground between the millstones of the food blockade—Great Britain and Germany against each



other. They are blockaded by Germany from Continental supplies and by Great Britain from overseas supplies. The Germans blame the British blockade. The British say the fault is the German invasion.

If these little nations are allowed to keep their accumulated stocks of food and their present harvest, the situation will not begin to be acute until some time in the fall and will become fatal in the winter or spring next year—as domestic supplies are exhausted.

Something must intervene if these people are to be saved. There is no reason why it should not be done again by a neutral non-governmental organization as was the case in the First World War that case as applied now would require:

1. That Germany agree: (a) To take none of the domestic produce of these people, (b) To furnish an equivalent of any food already taken, (c) To permit imports from Russia and the Balkan States, (d) To allow free passage of ships without attack, (e) To permit adequate control of distribution by the organization, so as to enable it to assure that those guarantees are carried out.

2. The British to agree that ships carrying cargoes solely of food for these people should be allowed to pass their blockade so long as the guarantees are fulfilled.

The de facto or fugitive governments of Holland, Belgium, Norway and Poland should finance such an organization with their resources in the United States and elsewhere, which are considerable. It would probably cost \$20,000,000 a month at the start and \$40,000,000 a month before the winter is over. This sort of method applied to the then circumstances worked for four years from 1914-19. It can be done if there is the goodwill to do it.

# Reply to a Statement of Support of the British Refusal to Allow Relief of the Invaded Democracies

NEW YORK CITY

[*October 6, 1940*]

I DO NOT understand that the statement issued by a group of sincere citizens in reference to food for the little democracies in Europe which are now occupied by German armies can be construed as opposition to saving the lives of millions among these people. That statement is rather an expression of a desire that nothing should be done that would injure the British cause. I do not think that any one wishes to do that. At least it would be wholly impractical to secure such an agreement.

The problem is not one of America feeding Europe, as some headlines would imply. The problem arises from the appeals of the Belgians, the Dutch, the Norwegians, and the Poles of Central Poland, that some agreement be brought about by which, with their own money, they be allowed to import food from other parts of Europe, if there be any, and from overseas, with an international organization supervising the operation and protecting their supplies from the operating armies. Such an agreement would have of necessity to be made by some third party, with the British on one hand and the Germans on the other.

These 30,000,000 people, of whom 10,000,000 are children, have always been dependent upon imports from over their

borders from somewhere, and without such imports they see a catastrophe during the present winter, in which some ten or fifteen millions of people in their cities may die or be permanently injured by famine and disease. They can see no hope of obtaining enough food from the greatly reduced production of Europe. They are not asking for American government appropriations, or for charity or ships, or for even the right to purchase food in the United States. And so far as I know, they have not asked for the intervention of our government. They are hoping some outside group will aid them in working out an agreement by which they can be saved. They know that such solutions were found in the last war, which proved successful, and they plead for solution now.

This is no doubt a side issue in the gigantic problems with which the world is confronted. But with the rising tide of famine in these countries, the problem will constantly grow more vivid. The American people are interested by their deep sense of humanity, by the fact that these democratic peoples have fought, sacrificed, and suffered for the very things we stand for, and the fact that fifteen or twenty millions of our citizens are relatives or descendants of Poles, Norwegians, Dutch and Belgians.

From the strongly expressed sympathies of those who signed this morning's statement, I believe that if any one plan is not workable they would equally with all of us hope that some way may be found. It is a problem for co-operation and not controversy.

# America and the Famine in the Five Little Democracies

POUGHKEEPSIE, NEW YORK

[*November 15, 1940*]

I WISH tonight to present to the American people the plight of some millions of children, women, and men in the little nations of Finland, Norway, Holland, Belgium and Central Poland. I am not making any proposals as to the French, although they are indeed suffering, because of the present obscurity of their food and political situation. And let me emphasize again that I am not talking about feeding Europe as the headlines so often state. I am talking only of the five small democracies.

I am asking for no gifts, no government appropriations, and no use of American ships. I am not going to discuss ideologies or who is to blame. I simply wish to present the case of these people to America. I will suggest that their lives and infinite suffering can be saved. And I will suggest that we have a moral responsibility.

I have postponed discussing this question at length for the past two months because I did not wish so tender and difficult a subject to be stained with any color of partisanship. That election is behind us and my obligation to participate further in partisan questions is ended. It is a problem that calls for cooperation and not for controversy.

Tonight I wish particularly to lay this question before the educational and religious leaders of the United States, for upon them rests a heavy duty in American moral leadership.

I do not have sufficient time on this occasion to review all the many factors that bear upon this subject. I have stated the details more fully in today's issue of *Collier's Weekly*.

I may first summarize coldly those facts of background as to which I believe there is no longer any dispute.

1. Those five little nations of Finland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and central Poland comprise about 37 million people, of whom about 15 million are children. About one-half of these people live in towns and cities. They are of all religious faiths – about 13 million are Protestants, 3 1/2 million are Jews, and more than 20 million are Catholics. And they have a right to live.

2. These little nations – all of them – sacrificed and fought against overwhelming odds to maintain freedom and their democratic ideals.

3. They normally obtain a large part of their food supplies from outside of their borders in exchange for their products. Most of their food imports have come overseas from the Western Hemisphere, Africa, etc. Central Poland is a special case. Her plight is due to the Russian seizure of her agricultural provinces.

4. The domestic production of these little countries, if it could be justly distributed, would apparently take care of the rural and village populations. In any event, the farmers and villagers will hold on to it grimly. In consequence the burden of shortage will fall on the town and city populations, with all of their millions of children, women, and noncombatant men. They will reach the acute stage some time this winter or next spring.

5. Supplies which could preserve their lives cannot be obtained in the German occupied areas of Continental Europe because of the decreased harvests, war destruction and the blockade. Moreover, short of supplies, the Russians, Germans and Italians are not likely to aid.

6. The only hope lies in restoration and protection of their domestic food by the Occupying Army and in the import of food

from overseas through the British and the German blockades under full safeguards.

7. All of these little countries have a certain amount of liquid resources safely outside of their own borders from which they should be able to pay for their food and they can provide their own ships.

8. The British contend that the German Army has occupied these people in violation of the laws of God and man and that it is the German obligation to feed them or evacuate their armies. The Germans assert that these people (except central Poland) have always lived largely by imports from overseas, and that the British blockade is the cause of their starvation.

I feel as deeply as any one on the moral questions here involved. And I boil that these things can be.

But I am trying to face an existing situation with action and not with debate over responsibilities. Whoever is right or wrong, these little nations are ground between these millstones. And the stark fact of oncoming famine remains.

9. Their plight is similar to that of Belgium and northern France in the last war. That 10 million people were occupied by the German Army. They were blockaded by the Allies. One purpose of both combatants in that war—just as in this war—was to starve the enemy. Their distrust of each other was just as great as it is now. Yet the Belgian Relief Commission under my direction secured protective agreements from all belligerents and those agreements were faithfully adhered to for four years. About one billion dollars' worth of food supplies were imported to those people from overseas and another billion dollars of their own domestic produce were requisitioned and distributed justly among them. The British people generously supported that effort with hundreds of millions of dollars and were completely satisfied that there were no unheeded violations of these agreements. I am able to say this not only because Americans were in charge upon the ground but because the rigorous watching of the British Government found it so and have certified to it time and again. And, they were chiefly

concerned that the food did not go to the German army. The lives of those 10 million people were saved by this effort. We therefore have an outstanding demonstration of the practicability of such an action.

10. Some three months ago leaders of these little nations asked that I raise a voice to the world on their behalf. They asserted that devastating famine and pestilence would be upon them with winter. No man can receive such an appeal of human misery without action.

11. I proposed a plan as the basis of agreement by the war governments. These proposals were that the Germans, on one hand, agree (a) not to take any of the domestic products of these people and to furnish the equivalent of any food that may already have been taken; (b) to permit such imports as can be had from other parts of Europe; (c) to allow free passage of food ships without attack.

On the other hand, the British to raise the blockade so as to allow one food ship at a time to pass so long as the guarantees are fulfilled. And finally both sides to agree to adequate control of distribution by a neutral organization to assure that these agreements are carried out.

12. The safeguards in these proposals were not fully understood by the British people. In any event the plan was not received favorably by the Government of Great Britain. I indeed had little hope that they would be favorably received at that time. Then the Battle of England was in the balance. The British were fighting desperately and heroically to save their own homes. They could give little thought to such necessities. It was hard for the world to believe in the realities of famine that was still months away.

The British have now demonstrated the effectiveness of their defense. The people of Brussels are already on a ration of 7 oz. of bread a day. Typhus already rages in Warsaw. Holland is killing its animals for lack of feed. Now the time has come when I am compelled to raise the question again, for three

months would be required for organization and there is no time to be lost.

#### THESE NECESSITIES CANNOT BE SILENCED

And the problem I am putting to you tonight cannot be ended by saying hush, hush. As famine and disease rise with the cold winter and the bleak spring, the cries of these people will rise above any censorship, above any smug statement in comfortable drawing rooms or offices. And in America and other neutral countries there are 20 millions of people descended from the Finns, the Dutch, the Norwegians, the Poles and the Belgians. They will not be quieted by polls of American public opinion or the conclusions of the wise. While all the argument and the blame and the recrimination are going on, these suffering people are a moving appeal for human help.

#### AMERICAN RELATION TO THE QUESTION

American public opinion and American moral leadership have responsibilities. They have unfortunately already assumed such responsibilities because, through misunderstanding, American views on this question are being misrepresented in Europe. Let me explain this.

After my proposal was made last August, a poll of American public opinion was made on the question:

"If there is starvation in France, Holland, and Belgium this winter, should the United States try to send food to these countries in our ships?"

About 62 per cent of Americans were reported as opposed. I was surprised that even 38 per cent approved because the question put to the American public implied hundreds of millions of American money. It implied sending of American ships through the war zone. It implied the using of American food. And it did not include my stipulations for protection from seizure by the German Army.



That was not the proposal that I had made to the world on behalf of these suffering people. I did not propose that American money should be used, or that American ships should be sent into the war zone, or that necessarily American food should be supplied, and I did propose that adequate protections should be given so as to see that there was no food benefits to the Axis countries.

This presumed attitude of the American public opinion has been further reinforced by the statements of various groups. I do not challenge their sincerity. But their opposition must be based on a lack of understanding of the facts, or of the problem involved, or of the tragedy which impends, or the protections which we know from our wide experience can be given.

These actions have become important because they have led to the belief both in America and in Great Britain and in these agonized five little countries that the American public opinion is against any effort to save the lives of their millions of children. It is a sad day when those who have looked to America as the great moral reservoir of democracy and compassion are now being disillusioned that this light has gone from the world.

These millions of suffering people know it is possible easily to answer the arguments which are raised in opposition to their salvation.

There is one group who contend that we should use American food to feed our own people. Such persons do not realize that we have vast surpluses of food in the United States; or that our government is daily offering to sell this food abroad at less than our domestic prices to get rid of it. In any event, if any question of source of food should arise, there are ample food supplies to be found in South America, where they earnestly want to sell it.

There is a group of persons who close their minds with the idea that the Germans would get the food and that it would help the Germans to win the war and that therefore the subject should not be further discussed. They obstinately refuse to believe the fact that such an effort was successfully managed in the last war, and that the occupying army did not benefit.

They do not realize, moreover, that such an operation is conducted in such a way that there would be only a small stock of food supplies on hand in the occupied area, at any one time. This stock would not exceed 120,000 to 140,000 tons. The German nation consumes about 1,400,000 tons a month. If they seized it all, they would be getting only a three days' food supply. That would not prolong the war very much. In any event, under any such violation the whole work would have to stop as hopeless.

Driven from these positions, this sort of people then fall back on the argument that agreements made now would be less likely to be respected than those in the last world war. But agreements with belligerents during war are not to be based only upon altruism, humanitarianism, or goodwill. With people who are desperately fighting in a great war, agreements must be based on self-interest.

When the food supply falls to famine levels, people don't lie down and die from starvation. Long before they get to that point their physical resistance is so lowered by malnutrition that they die of disease. The children weaken first, the women and old men next. The common cold turns to pneumonia. Influenza seems to become very much more virulent and deadly in its passage through nonresistant populations. Typhoid and smallpox are more prevalent because of lowered resistance. Typhus always appears, for when a population is approaching famine levels; it will eat all of its fat supplies and thus deprive itself of soap. Soap is the greatest disinfectant that the human race has discovered. With the absence of soap, lice at once spread, and from lice come typhus.

It is to the interest of the German Army that these cesspools of disease and contagion are not created. And it is to the interest of the whole world that they are not created. For contagion, once it starts from such cesspools, will spread regardless of borders or nations or ideologies. You may remember the malignant influenza epidemic during the last war which first appeared in starving central Europe and spread over the whole world. Such an operation as this is in the interest of

Great Britain and America. If confidence in the ideals of democracy is to be upheld in these peoples now is the time to hold it.

There is another group who say that the British blockade is the great instrument in the fight against totalitarianism and that it must not even be opened for a single ship. This idea is based upon an illusion. That is that a blockade is a sort of earth embankment and that if a single hole is permitted it will automatically enlarge until the embankment is swept away. A blockade is nothing of the kind. It is a notification that traffic cannot pass except by permission. That permission is in the control of the dominant sea-power. It can be extended and withdrawn at will, ship by ship.

As a matter of practice, permissions are in operation against Spain today and daily these permissions are given for food ships to pass through to those people. It is even suggested that we collaborate in thus relieving the dire distress of the Spanish people. I should like to see it done. But if so why should we discriminate against the others?

In any event, what is proposed here is that we should be given an opportunity to try to save these people. The American opponents of this action cannot say that if such agreements are set up and faithfully adhered to, they would still insist that millions should be condemned to die. If the food supplies cannot be protected from the German Army, it will be evident at once, and the operation would be justifiably ended.

I simply refuse to believe, and I am going to continue to disbelieve, that American public opinion when it understands is going to condemn 15 million people to die, upon flimsy arguments and informal polls.

#### THE ORGANIZATION OF RELIEF

The word "relief" as we give it in America connotes individual service such as that performed by our multitude of home relief organizations. The problem we are discussing is the mass food supply of a people. The operation required in these countries

is Food Administration, not individual relief in the ordinary sense. That means control of native as well as imported food.

When we talk of relief of these starving people we are not talking quantities which envisage themselves from our home experiences. Our public relief allowances today average about \$50 per month for a family of five. It is drastic enough. But what I am talking about is supplying less than \$5.00 per month worth of raw material in food to a family of five or about 10 per cent of our American practice. Even that would require that these little nations should find over \$400,000,000 for the winter and spring. But I believe it would provide the margin between death and existence. It will barely tide them over above the famine levels.

I had originally proposed that the American Red Cross should undertake this work. I have been informed however that they do not feel that mass feeding of peoples is within their province. There are however other agencies which could be used. Obviously the leadership in such detailed negotiations and the subsequent guardianship of the guarantees need the informal co-operation of our government and the governments of the other neutral states. That is not a job which I wish to undertake. But there are many men available for such service. I must however raise the issue.

#### THE MEANING OF WAR

We are today living in one of the darkest hours that has ever come to humanity. After discussing these questions in comfortable American rooms and after good meals I often come away wondering if it is possible for our people to learn the meaning of modern war.

To state the cold statistical fact that two-thirds of the peoples of the world are at war illuminates little of its dreadfulness. It is the most inhuman war of history. There was a time when war was carried on exclusively by soldiers and sailors. Brave men fought with brave men. They held to the ancient chivalries

for the protection of women and children and noncombatants. But modern warfare has transformed all this. It consists today mainly of armed men fighting against noncombatants. Blockades, rains of explosives from the air, sinking of ships without warning are the major destructive operations. The strategy is to terrorize and break down the resistance of the civilian population that they may beseech peace at any price.

I am perhaps one of the few living Americans who had full opportunity to see intimately the moving tragedy of the last Great War from its beginnings down through the long aftermath of famine, pestilence and depression. During that war and for a year afterwards it was my appointment to care for the hungry, the homeless, the frightened and the helpless. In the service of those war years, I moved constantly in and out behind the trenches on both sides of the conflict. I witnessed its misery and its backwash upon civilians in its most hideous forms. I saw the nightmares of roads filled for long miles with old men, women and children dropping of fatigue and hunger as they fled in terror from the oncoming armies. I saw even then the terrors of a score of air raids, with the women and children flocking to the cellars in futile hope of escape. I saw the dreadful effect of the blockade in starvation. I have seen the women and children of whole cities practically at the exhaustion point of food. I have seen the raging of pestilence that is the implacable companion of famine. I witnessed their sufferings in over 20 nations.

When one speaks of war to me, I do not see the glorious parade of troops marching to tunes of gay music. Nor do I think of great statesmen planning and worrying in their chancelleries. Nor of army captains calculating their strategies. Nor do I think of those dazzling chambers where the peacemakers of the world meet to settle the affairs of mankind. In retrospect we always dwell upon the glories of war—the courage, the heroism, the greatness of spirit in men. We weigh its purpose in the destiny of nations and social systems. I myself should like to forget all else.

But I cannot forget the faces of the hungry, despaired, and

terrorized women and little children, who are the real victims of modern war. I cannot forget the unending blight cast upon the world by the sacrifice of the flower of every race not only in the trenches but in the cradle. All that was dreadful in the last war beyond any words of mine. But it is far worse and there is far more of it in this war. It is not alone the vast increase in air power. But there is an increase in its ruthlessness and brutality. And while in the last war only one little democracy was invaded, today there are all these others. Truly the four Horsemen of the Apocalypse – War, Death, Famine, and Pestilence – have come to them in a terrible host.

Can you believe that American public opinion or the spiritual leadership of America has so lost its bearings as to be opposed to even an effort to aid those who lie in the ditch?

To show that American opinion is not indifferent to their sufferings is their only hope today.

There are things in this world that are not silenced by ideological argument or armchair strategists or declamation as to who is responsible. They are not to be settled that way because of the teachings of Christ which has resounded down these two thousand years. That teaching gave to mankind a new vision and part of that vision was mercy and compassion. The greatest Teacher of mankind did not argue and debate over the ideology and the sins of the two thieves. And he thundered scorn at the priest and the Levite who passed by.

# When Winter Comes to Europe

*Collier's Magazine*

[November 23, 1940]

*(Issued November 15)*

FAMINE and pestilence are on the march in Europe in this second winter of this Second World War. They will not come to the belligerents but to the innocent victims of the war. Famine will come particularly to Finland, Belgium, Norway, Holland and Central Poland, who fought and suffered for the Allied cause. Of these 37,000,000 people, more than 15,000,000 are children.

Their normal supplies are stopped by the German occupation on one side and the British blockade on the other. Unless some sort of method can be set up with the belligerent governments by which aid may be extended to these victim nations, the world will witness this winter a death roll from famine far greater than during all the four years of the last World War. It will witness the death or stunting of millions of children who surely have a right to live. Death will come to the weaker of the men and women.

As famine and disease rise with the winter, the cries of these people will ascend above any press censorship, any war hysteria, or any government official. And in America we have 10 or 12 millions of citizens who are of these racial stocks, many of them with actual relatives in these countries. These racial groups have long since organized themselves into a multitude of relief committees seeking aid for their people. They will not be silenced. Throughout the world in the colonial possessions

and in other neutral countries are millions of people of these racial groups. They are not content to see their families suffer without effort to save them.

This problem has been under debate in all parts of the world during the past few months. No man or group of men can end this question by saying, "Hush, hush." Nor can it be ended by emotional controversy over who has the responsibility for this situation. My views upon that subject are probably as strong as those of any one. But the starving people will be there just the same.

#### THE TRUTH ABOUT EUROPE'S FOOD

Therefore, we had better calmly explore the cold, hard facts and seek for remedy.

There are many sources from which the facts as to food supply on the continent of Europe can be checked. All of the European countries, outside of Russia, carry on accurate production statistics. The necessary food imports of each country over long terms of years before the war are well known. Most of the countries on the Continent are today rationed and it is possible to check back their food supply from the amount of the ration. In any rationing of the civil population the government never withholds any food that it can afford to give because no government wants either to deprive its people or lower their morale unnecessarily. Thus the ration can always be taken as the index to the maximum supply available. And in many of the countries of Europe the various American relief organizations have experienced men who are able to formulate independent conclusions. To all these sources I have full access— and some experience. That experience consists of having directed the food supply to some 23 nations during or after the last World War.

First, we may dismiss Russia from our considerations. Russia has been without adequate food supply for years. Scarcely a year has gone by in which the population of the larger cities has not been rationed. Rationing means inadequate supplies.



Russia during the past year has acquired Bessarabia, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Eastern Poland and East Finland. All of these areas normally produce a surplus of food. It must be assumed that the Russian people will absorb this surplus. These sources are thus cut off from the rest of Europe.

The Communist government, of course, could unquestionably deprive its people of food in order to trade it for military advantages. If there is any export of a surplus it would go mostly to Germany rather than to any other area. But it is difficult to believe that Russia will be a source of any great quantity of supplies to other parts of Europe during the forthcoming winter and spring.

#### THIRTY PER CENT SHY

Taken as a whole, the 325 million people in Europe now outside of Russia normally bring in approximately 15 per cent of their food from outside. This includes direct import of food, import of feed from which food is made, or food from fisheries not now available. All that is now effectively stopped by the British blockade. Moreover, the inevitable effect of war is degeneration in farm production because of the mobilization of man power, lack of fertilizers and the destruction of battle.

This year, also, the crop of breadstuffs over parts of Europe is short because of the hard winter. Apparently, taken as a whole, the production is down about 15 per cent. Our Department of Agriculture reports that the wheat crop alone is down by 340,000,000 bushels. And wheat is only one of the bread grains that are thus affected. Combining the shortage due to blockade with the shortage of production, Europe, outside of present Russian boundaries, has a supply about 30 per cent below normal.

The British Minister of Economic Warfare on October 2 insisted "that there would be no famine on the Continent provided the Nazis distributed fairly the available food."

This means a universal reduction of food supplies to all these 325 million people to 30 per cent below normal even if

equally distributed. Whether populations like Europe, where the normal food intake is little above absolute necessity, can get through with 30 per cent reduction in essential foods is very doubtful. It has never been really tested. It is not, however, important to elaborate this point because the food supply cannot be evenly distributed. We can well explore this distribution question in more detail.

The largest area in Europe is greater Germany itself, with 90 million people, where the domestic production this year is about 85 per cent of the normal food supply of that country. Does anybody believe the Germans will reduce this to a 70 per cent basis in order to distribute it over other countries?

Then there are the Balkan states—Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria—with 50 million people. This area normally produces a considerable surplus. In 1939 this area produced 14 million tons of bread grains. This year, 1940, the crop is less than 10 million tons. That is apparently less than their need for home consumption.

It seems unlikely, therefore, that there will be any consequential export surplus from the Balkan states. In any event, they will naturally retain a 100 per cent food supply for their people if they produce it within their own borders. No country will reduce its people to a 70 per cent basis or any other basis below normal in order to export supplies. In other words, these nations will use 100 per cent if they can produce it.

The 45 million people in Italy produce somewhere in the neighborhood of 90 per cent of their normal food supply. Is it likely that Italy will reduce its people to a 70 per cent basis in order to divide up with other nations?

The 40 million people in Spain, Portugal and Greece are short of food. So long as Spain and Portugal remain neutral they can import food from overseas. Sweden, with 6.3 million people, is very nearly self-supporting. Switzerland imports nearly half her food but has accumulated considerable reserves. While there may be privation, it does not appear that they will be plunged into the area of famine.

The situation in Denmark is not yet clear. Her 3.7 million

people ordinarily import large quantities of feed and export meat and fats. The blockade has made it necessary to kill a considerable amount of livestock. She should have a fat supply but may have some shortage of breadstuffs.

Thus about 245 million out of the 325 million total will apparently have enough to get through on restricted rations. But they will not be giving away much to the other nations.

France, with her 42 million people, presents an uncertain situation. She is normally almost self-supporting in her food supply, especially if her North African possessions are included. This year, however, due both to the mobilization of man power and the destruction of battle, there is some substantial reduction in crops. It is both claimed and denied that the Germans have taken considerable quantities of food from the occupied areas. These occupied areas are the more fertile parts of France, but the crops are both less and greatly destroyed. The so-called Free France is the most sterile part. Certainly, unless some aid is given to the 15 millions of French people and refugees in this area, there will be very acute suffering. In any event, at the time this is written the amount of available food is not clear.

#### THESE WILL BEAR THE BRUNT

There remains Finland with 3.7 million people, Norway with 3 million, Holland with 8.7 million, Belgium with 8.3 million and Central Poland with 14 million. Here about 37,000,000 people have a different story. They have the full impact of the European shortage.

Finland must import a considerable part of her breadstuffs. The destruction of her war has created a shortage in fats. She has an Arctic port open and until recently was allowed to import food in supplement to her sparse domestic production, But with the German placing of troops in Finland, the British are hesitant to allow food imports. There may be a sad time before this brave country.

If we calculate the values of feed imports as they result in human food, as well as direct food imports, Belgium normally imports 50 per cent of its food supplies. Holland imports 30 to 40 per cent of its food supplies. Norway imports from 50 to 60 per cent of its food supplies. "Central Poland"—the industrial area, which is now separated from its agricultural provinces by the Russian annexation—must import 20 to 40 per cent from over its borders. The crops in all these countries are below normal from war causes.

Nor is the position in these little countries as simple as it might appear even from these percentages. The agricultural population in any country will retain close to 100 per cent of its families' normal food supply. No government yet has been strong enough to get away from the farmers food that deprives their wives and children. Moreover, the agricultural villages get the second call on the farm products, because of their close relation with the farmers. Thus in these countries the agricultural and village population will absorb a very large portion of the domestic production.

The consequence in these small countries is that the main impact this winter will concentrate upon cities and towns. That means a total of about 15 to 18 million of peoples in these places will sooner or later be practically without food. They are the sort of final resting place of the European shortage. The surplus native production over the farmers' needs will supply the cities and towns for a certain period following the harvest. But if the cities live on these supplies during the fall, then even more complete catastrophe comes with the winter and spring.

The essential foods to prevent famine are breadstuffs and fats and there must be some provision of milk for children. A population can get over a famine period only if it has a supply of both breadstuffs and fats. Holland and Norway have normally imported considerable feed from over their borders, through which they have raised more cattle and hogs and sheep than their own soil would sustain. Holland normally

exports fats from these sources. Norway exported some dairy products but imported other fats. With the German and British blockades these countries are without sufficient feed and are compelled to kill a considerable part of their animals in order to preserve a nucleus for the future. It would appear that the Dutch may be able to sustain on their own feed enough animals to provide their people with a fat and meat supply over the winter. They, however, must have imports of breadstuffs. The Norwegians, the Finns, the Belgians and the Poles, on the other hand, must import fats as well as breadstuffs.

Barely to tide over above the famine level, it would seem that this group of little nations must import monthly a total of 10 or 12 million bushels of breadstuffs, about 30 million pounds of meats and fats from somewhere outside their borders. And also there must be preserved milk for the children in the cities of Belgium, Norway, Finland and Central Poland.

It is impossible to conceive the source of so much food from anywhere on the Continent. A large part of it must come from overseas and thus through the blockade, either from North or South America.

When the food supply falls to famine levels people don't lie down and die from starvation. Long before they get to that point their physical resistance is so lowered by malnutrition that they die of disease. The children weaken first, the women and the old men next. The common cold turns to pneumonia. Influenza seems to become very much more virulent and deadly in its passage through nonresistant populations. Typhoid and smallpox are more prevalent because of lowered resistance. Typhus always appears, for when a population is approaching famine levels it will eat all of its fat supplies and thus deprive itself of soap. Soap is the greatest disinfectant that the human race has discovered. With the absence of soap, lice at once spread, and from lice come typhus.

This problem of great cesspools of contagious disease not alone concerns the victims directly but it also concerns the entire world.

CONSIDER THE NEXT GENERATION

These conditions are already beginning to show up. In Brussels, the bread ration is only seven ounces per day per person, being about one half of the normal. In Warsaw, typhus has already appeared.

But beyond contagious disease and death are the stunted bodies and debilitated minds of the children—that is the generation we next have to live with.

The word "relief" as we use it in America connotes individual service such as that performed by our Red Cross and our multitude of relief organizations. The problem we are discussing is the mass food supply of a people. The operation required in these countries is food administration, not individual relief in the ordinary sense. Food administration means requisition of the native food supply beyond the need of the farmer's family. It means purchases abroad and the management of ships, cars, barges, flour mills, bakeries, dairies, abattoirs, retailers and restaurants. It means setting up soup kitchens to get the maximum use of meat and fats. It means that all the food must be rationed equally so that rich and poor share alike. It means all machinery for issuing ration cards to every person, every month. It is a tedious and heartbreaking job. But in this fight against famine in any nation there rises the highest devotion of a race. For it is a fight to save the race.

The world has had experience with this problem under precisely the same conditions that exist today. In 1914 the Commission for Relief of Belgium was created under my direction. It was a body without nationality. It secured permissions from the British to operate through the blockade and guarantees from the Germans then occupying the country, protecting the food supplies. It set up all of the machinery mentioned above and operated it for four years in relief of ten million people in Belgium and northern France.

In that undertaking we created a central committee of devoted Belgians for Belgium and Frenchmen for Northern

France. They controlled the central warehouses and the food in transit or in manufacture and distribution. Every province had a similar committee in charge of the provincial warehouses into which imported food was poured from the central warehouses. Into them also was brought all the harvest beyond each farmer's own need. Every city and commune had its committee and its own distribution stations from which food was issued to the ration card holders, the soup kitchens and the child feeding stations.

Every member of these committees was Belgian or French. No one was allowed a ration card but Belgians or French. Every pound of food was receipted and accounted for to its final destination. Over all were the American and other neutral supervisors and protectors. There were over 50,000 Belgians and French. They were mostly women and nearly all volunteers. The first purpose of organization was an ironclad system by which none but Belgians or French could even touch the food. And no food could escape without its being known.

Over eleven billion pounds of food was imported to Belgium through the blockade during that war and distributed together with the domestic food. Nearly 900 million dollars was spent. None of this food went to the Germans. Where there were occasional infractions it was replaced from German stock under agreement.

I can say this unhesitatingly, and there is the proof of it in a great series of reports and books written by many who participated, including statements of the American minister to Belgium and the British prime minister. It was attested by the detailed accounts of every pound moved, which accounts are still preserved. And to doubting Thomas's I may point out that the last war was also a war where starvation was a major strategy. The British Government contributed over 100 million dollars and the French Government over 200 million dollars to the Belgian Relief. Their intelligence services functioned all over the occupied territory. Their representatives outside Belgium inspected every letter, every report, and every item of movement. These governments would never have

paid this bill month by month if they were not satisfied that the Germans got none of the food. Nor would they have paid the bill unless they were satisfied that the Germans received no military benefits from it.

When the armistice came, the people in Belgium and Northern France were found to be in good condition, the people over the German border were near starvation.

#### STARVATION AS A WEAPON

It is only the foolish who say that the hates and distrusts of the combatants were any less in the last war than in the present war. One major strategy of the present war is identical with that of the last World War: that is to cut off the enemy's food supply and starve her civil population until public health and morale break. The British therefore are maintaining a vigorous food blockade on all the area occupied by Germany and Italy. The Germans are trying to destroy British food supplies with submarine and air sinking of her food ships.

In the last war the Allied blockade did, after four years, reduce German food supplies to a point that greatly damaged morale and contributed to victory.

But in their preparations for this war the Germans and Italians have greatly increased the food production within their own boundaries. Germany within her own territory has lifted her food production by 20 per cent in the past 15 years, thus rendering herself nearly self-sufficient. Taking the situation as now developing, there is much less prospect of starving Germany and Italy out in this war than there was in the last.

The prospects of starving out Great Britain are even much more remote. One million tons of shipping in constant operation between Great Britain and North America can carry the food they need and despite all the sinkings the British still have more than twenty times that amount of tonnage.

Altogether the part that starvation will play in the determination of the outcome of this war is much less than in the last war.



But it may mean the vast destruction of children, women and men in the little nations who also fought. The position of the small countries of Norway and Holland is worse than in the last war. They were neutrals then and imported their essential needs. Belgium is faced with identically the same disaster from which it was then rescued. Finland drew from Russia in the last war. Poland suffered dreadfully in the last war—millions of lives being lost by famine and disease.

#### PROBLEMS AND ANSWERS

With this background we may consider the present problem of these countries:

1. Something like 18 million people in their cities, mostly women and children, will be without food before the winter is over unless it is brought in from somewhere outside their borders.

2. With the situation in Russia and the Balkans there is little if any surplus to be had from there. The Germans and Italians are unlikely to reduce further the already reduced food supply of their own people.

3. If there are any supplies from the Balkan states, they ought, for transportation reasons, to be used for Poland. Finland is unlikely to secure much from Russia. Her hopes are also from overseas.

4. Belgium, Holland and Norway have always obtained their major imports from overseas. There appears to be no hope for them unless that door can be opened.

5. The people in these countries have appealed that these doors be opened.

6. These people fought and suffered for the cause of democracy in the world.

7. They have a right to live. The world to come needs their lives.

In response to their appeals that I raise a voice on their behalf, on August 11 last I proposed the following plan:

"If these little nations are allowed to keep their accumulated stocks of food and their present harvest the situation will not begin to be acute until some time in the fall and will become fatal in the winter and spring next year—as domestic supplies are exhausted.

"Something must intervene if these people are to be saved. There is no reason it should not be done again by a neutral non-governmental organization as was done in the First World War that case as applied now would require:

1. The Germans to agree:

(a) To take none of the domestic produce of these people.

(b) To furnish an equivalent of any food already taken.

(c) To permit imports from Russia and the Balkan states.

(d) To allow free passage of ships without attack.

(e) To permit adequate control of distribution by the organization so as to enable it to assume that these guarantees are carried out.

2. The British to agree that ships carrying cargoes solely of food for these people should be allowed to pass their blockade so long as the guarantees are fulfilled.

3. The de facto or fugitive governments of Finland, Holland, Belgium, Norway and Poland should finance such an organization with their resources in the United States and elsewhere—which are considerable. It would probably cost 20 million dollars a month at the start and 40 million dollars a month before the winter is over.

"This sort of method applied to the then circumstances worked for four years from 1914-18 and can be applied again if there is the goodwill to do it."

There are people who refuse to believe that agreements and organization can be formulated that will not result in feeding the Germans. They refuse to accept any previous experience as evidence that it can be done. To them may I suggest that whatever is done in war rests not upon altruism or humanity? It rests upon self-interest of the belligerent nations. One can expect nothing more when their women and children are being daily slaughtered. But it happens to be in

Germany's self-interest to the extent that such relief prevents a cesspool of contagious disease with dangers of their own infection. To the British there is a measure of self-interest in the fact that it preserves the goodwill of millions of the nationals of these little nations.

And there is a more direct interest. If these people are not fed, their skilled workmen, to protect themselves and their families, will accept jobs in Germany to make munitions, for there they will be both paid and fed.

Those who are timid about the Germans' seizing the food under these circumstances could bear in mind one protecting circumstance. The total stock of imported food under such an operation would not exceed 140,000 tons in all these countries at any one time. About this amount is necessary in order to maintain regularity in distribution. But as Germany consumes 1,400,000 tons a month, if the Germans seized it all, it would be only a three-day supply. And if they seized it, then the operation necessarily and automatically ends. Therefore, the danger amounts at most to prolonging the food life of Germany by three days. And Germany seems to have enough food to live for years anyway.

It is assumed by many that the Germans have already taken large amounts of food from Norway, Holland, Belgium and Central Poland. My own advices are that it has not been substantial, simply because no large stocks of food are carried in these countries. The domestic food largely rests on the farms until it is needed. Nations that feed themselves by imports do not carry large stocks for the reason that food is perishable and the services of daily supply are open in peacetime. Be that as it may, the proposal above is conditioned upon a return of the equivalent of any food taken.

#### WHY AMERICA HAS AN INTEREST

It is true America is not in this war. We have no right to dictate its policies. But we are daily asked to aid in "every way

short of war." Many Americans will have little enthusiasm for this support if this war is to be fought on the basis that not even an attempt is to be made for the saving of these people.

These little nations fought and sacrificed for the preservation of democratic institutions. That they are to be deserted without even a trial at their relief is not a pleasant argument. And the more do these arguments become potent when experience shows that they can be saved without prolonging the war a day or giving important military advantage to either side.

And there is even a more positive American interest. As I have said, there are some 10 or 12 million Americans who are descendants or relatives of the Finns, the Norwegians, the Dutch, the Belgians and the Poles. They have a concern for the welfare of these people that will be satisfied with no arbitrary decisions.

And in the final analysis, among those whose fates we are discussing are millions of children. Yet some would think military gains or losses are to be calculated in terms of their life or death. Nor am I oblivious to the suffering children of other nations. But does that justify the abandonment of these? Should Americans decide that these millions of children and women are to be a sacrifice that must be made to protect America in this war?

We hear much of the purposes for which this war is being fought. They include the upholding of the standards of Christianity. One of the major distinctions of the Christian faith is mercy and compassion. The parable of the Samaritan has played a large part in the moral foundations of all these nations and has a live hold upon the hearts of their people and our people. And compassion is part of the woof and warp of democracy. From this ethic have sprung our vast fabric of benevolent institutions, the relief of our unemployed, our hospitals, our solicitude for the weak and the unfortunate. Today the Christian world is confronted with preserving the lives of 10 or 15 million people.

We cannot as a Christian nation dismiss our concern that

some solution is found by which they may be saved. And the parable of the Samaritan has pungent implications other than the compassion of the Samaritan alone. Perhaps some will remember the condemnation, which has echoed over centuries, of the priest and the Levite who passed by on the other side.

# The March of Hunger in Europe

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

[*February 16, 1941*]

WE ARE here not to discuss the raising of money or the collection of gifts. We are here to discuss a question of public policy, of world policy in relation to a starving world.

The consequences of great wars are always famine and pestilence. It is said that after the Thirty Years' War half the population of Europe died of starvation and disease. The Napoleonic Wars brought their burden of hunger and starvation to every part of Europe.

And in modern civilization famine is inevitable on a wider and wider scale than ever before. The machine age has vastly increased populations in Europe. They are more dependent upon each other and upon nations overseas for food. The control of food has become a major strategy of modern war, second only to military action. The whole process of war brings not only destruction of food at sea and by armies, but far worse, it stifles production. The mobilization of arms and munitions takes man power from the farms. Fertilizers are turned to explosives. The fishermen can no longer venture to sea. The animal products of meats, fats, butter and milk degenerate rapidly for lack of labor and the blockade on feed. The people make it worse by eating the capital of their herds of hogs and cattle.

The World War of twenty-five years ago brought hunger to 300,000,000 people. It was only the intervention of the United States which then saved Europe from starvation and disease.

Hunger in the present war is coming faster and with more violence than even in the last war. After a year and a half of the present war nearly 100,000,000 more people are short of food than after three years of the last war. Government rationing of their people is the infallible proof of short food supplies. Today nearly 300,000,000 people are already on rations. And the rations in all these masses of humanity except in Germany and Britain are more drastic than at the end of the third year of the last war.

Should this war last four years the situation in all Europe, except perhaps Germany and England, will be far worse than last time. Thus the world is faced again with gigantic problems of famine and pestilence.

Out of all this creeping famine, the most immediate danger and the greatest suffering are among the 70,000,000 people of the democracies which have been overrun by the German armies. The small democracies with 40,000,000 people were greatly dependent upon imports from outside their borders. Much of their food was destroyed by retreating armies and by battle. The German Army has taken part of their supplies. Today they are ground between the millstones of the occupying army and the blockade.

I could debate with great emotion who is responsible for their plight. That is not the question before us. Its answer would not allay the immeasurable stark tragedy of tens of millions of innocent men and women and children. And it is tragedy to those who have fought and suffered for the ideal of free nations.

The one hope of millions of these people for life is that some one, somewhere, will raise a voice on their behalf. If they are to live, an agreement must be reached by some neutral body on the one hand with the Germans by which their domestic food supplies can be protected from the occupying armies, and supplies can be imported from other parts of Europe, and on the other hand, co-operation by the British by which supplemental supplies can be imported through the blockade.

It is to raise a voice on their behalf that this Committee on

Food for the Small Democracies has been created. This committee now comprises over 600 of the leading men and women of America. Local communities have sprung into being in more than 1500 cities and towns. It is the purpose of this Committee to urge that in some way, somehow, a solution be found. And here I wish to thank the one thousand public bodies who have in the last 60 days urged us to persist, have given encouragement to us; and demanded that these people have relief.

We are not wedded to any particular plan. We know there was successful relief for 10,000,000 people in Belgium and northern France occupied by the German Armies during the whole four years of the last war. That proves that if there is co-operation it can be done again without military benefit or loss to either side. That relief saved the lives of 10,000,000 people.

I am aware that the difficulties seem almost insuperable. But by the strength of American will and public opinion we did it once when the problems were equally great. And we met the same oppositions. I am not likely to forget the obstruction of the bloodthirsty amateurs and the military minded of that time. Nor do I forget the men of great vision who gave us aid and support.

I have lived to see in Great Britain the applause of every Prime Minister of that time. They have eloquently recorded the fact that relief not only caused them no damage but that it established confidence in the ideals of their peoples and lifted the ideals of the whole world.

One purpose of this Committee is also to expose to the world the facts as to the food situation in these helpless countries. And amid the promoters of propaganda, this is indeed badly needed. Even a reliable journal only last week published a statement that the Dutch had prepared a four years' reserve before the invasion came. The actual facts show there was just 12 1/2 per cent of truth in that statement.

Knowing the approaching exhaustion of Belgian food, this Committee sent a commission of three Americans, experienced in famine problems, to make an exhaustive examination and



report on that country. Two weeks ago this group of able Americans reported that within a month the cities and towns of this entire nation of eight million men, women and children would be practically without food unless supplies were brought from somewhere.

The Commission reported that the stock of breadstuffs would be exhausted in a month; that the people in desperation had already eaten two-thirds of all the hogs and were eating into the dairy herds. They state that the present ration is only one-third that of Britain and Germany, and that even this ration cannot be maintained for more than a month or six weeks. It is still seven months until the next harvest.

The situation in Norway, Holland, Poland and Free France will parallel the Belgian situation later on, certainly before the next harvest.

Finland presents also serious problems, but not being occupied by hostile armies its solution is not so difficult.

All this is no discussion of temporary empty stomachs. It means extinction of millions unless something is done for them. And all this is but a simple statement of the desperate plight of those people. It should be stated in terms of pathos and tragedy.

You are aware that this Committee has made proposals to the belligerent governments that completely organized food control should be set up for these people on the lines of the last war. Those proposals would have given time to organize prevention. These plans are the ultimate necessity. But a distracted world is slow to believe. We were reluctantly compelled to conclude that it must be confronted with ghastly reality before action could be hoped for. That ghastly reality has arrived in Belgium. Furthermore, while I do not agree to the grounds for the rejection of our previous proposals, yet if these peoples are to be saved, we must seek to meet these objections by proving our case in action.

Therefore, a few weeks ago we secured that there be laid before the British and German Governments the following suggestions:

First: That we make an initial experiment in Belgium to test out whether these people can be saved without military advantage to either side.

Second: That this test comprises the feeding only through soup kitchens, where the people come to get their food and thus there can be no question of feeding Germans.

Third: That at the beginning we provide for one million adults and two million children with bread and soup, the children to receive special food in addition.

Fourth: That the German Government agrees that there is to be no requisition of native food.

Fifth: Both Governments to give relief ships immunity from attacks.

Sixth: The whole to be under the supervision and checks of some neutral body.

It is my belief that the Germans should co-operate to secure some breadstuffs from sources under their control. But meats, fats, and food for children are also necessary to save life. Of these there are no adequate sources of supply on the Continent. They must come from overseas—and that requires the co-operation of the British to pass the blockade.

If we can make this experiment work, then this plan can be extended to larger numbers in Belgium as the need develops and to the other democracies when their turn comes.

These Governments have this plan under consideration. I believe the American people hope it may be accepted.

There are major questions which are rightly asked by the American people.

First, will the relief of these countries prejudice the defense of Britain—that is, will the Germans gain in food supplies?

Second, who will pay for and transport these supplies?

Third, would it take food from Americans?

Fourth, what interest has America in the question anyway?

On the first question, let me say that my original proposal months ago stipulated that any effort must be based upon cooperation from Germany to provide some part of these supplies from the continent of Europe, and, second, to stop the

drain on native supplies by their armies. The sum of these actions would result in no gains in food supplies to Germany. It might require some sacrifice to them. To those who say this cannot be done, the reply is simple – at least let us try and if we fail that ends our effort. To those who say the Germans, even if they made such agreements, would yet violate them, there is also a complete answer. They kept these agreements in the last war, but if they should not do so again then we have failed and we quit. And I may add that it is possible to measure accurately the military damage to Britain. The maximum violation would be the seizure of the whole of our imported stocks. From the experience with relief, in the last war, we know the imported food can be limited to two weeks' stocks within those countries. If this plan was ultimately extended to all these countries and all the stocks were seized, it would amount to less than three or four days' supply for the whole of Germany.

But on this whole opposition on military grounds I am able to give you the highest military authorities in the world. Your Chairman, Mr. Chauncey McCormick, has received tonight the following telegram from General John Pershing. He says:

I wish to send my greetings to those who are endeavoring to find a method by which food supplies can be furnished to the democracies in Europe occupied by the German armies. There is no doubt millions are in jeopardy unless they are given aid from somewhere. From my own war experience and some knowledge of the problems involved, I have every confidence that the salvation of these people can be worked out along the lines proposed by Mr. Hoover without military loss or benefit to either side. The interest of this committee in maintaining American ideals and the friendship to America of these nations by saving these millions is worthy of every support.

Your chairman has also received greetings from Admiral William V. Pratt, who dealt with the blockade in the last war and long commanded the United States fleet. Admiral Pratt said:

I wish you would extend my greetings to your meeting in furtherance of aid to prevent wholesale starvation among the people of the

occupied democracies in Europe. I have no hesitation in saying that this aid can be given under Mr. Hoover's proposals without any damage to Great Britain. Taking the long view of the future of constructive forces in the world and America's relation to it, it is of vital importance to America that Mr. Hoover's plans be carried through. Not only is the need pressing now, but what is of equal or more importance, an organization must be perfected now to start a more extensive campaign when the war is over. Only America will be able to meet this emergency.

That ought to end that part of the opposition.

The answer to the question of payment for food and its transport is also simple. Most of these democracies got their gold and other liquid resources out in advance of the invasion. They have the cash resources with which to pay for their food. They can secure its transport without using American ships in the war zone. They ask no charity. They need no appropriations from our Government. A small financial credit to Finland and Poland should be given, but that would be infinitesimal in the light of other foreign loans being made in this war.

The answer to those who think the American people might be deprived of food by this relief is also simple. We have surpluses, some of which are rotting today and others for which our farmers have no market. Yet if we do not wish to part with these surpluses there are vast supplies in South America.

The remaining question is—"What interest has America in this matter anyway?" I shall leave the humanitarian part of that answer to the last, but it is not the least.

I am opposed to the whole philosophy of dictatorship. I want to see a world of free men and women. Here are six or seven nations whose whole philosophy of life and government have been and are yet opposed to totalitarianism. If the spirit of free men in the long years to come is to survive on the continent of Europe, it will be among these people devoted to freedom by their every instinct. Over centuries they have maintained their systems of free men from subjugation, time and time again. They have done it not by military action but by sheer moral and intellectual resistance. If the democracies

of the west are to say to them now—as some of our citizens have said to them—"We will make no effort to save your millions of women and children, that they must die or grow up with stunted minds and bodies," then there is little encouragement to them to hold last to our ideals of life. If confidence in the ideals of democracy is to be held, now is the time to hold it.

And there is a reason of goodwill toward America. We have to live with these nations now suffering from invasion, for centuries to come. We must want their goodwill. During and after the last war, we saved starving millions in twenty nations of Europe. As a result, there came to us a lasting goodwill from these people of those countries which have never been extended to a nation in all history. Is it not worth some effort to preserve that?

We are asked for aid to Britain of stupendous dimensions. I believe we should give to them that aid generously and including ample food. But if that aid is to be given to preserve free nations, have we not a right to suggest that these other free peoples—friends of America all our national life—be allowed also to live? I sometimes think the world is to be saved from everything except starvation.

There is a question of contagious disease. When the food supply falls to famine levels, people do not lie down and die from starvation. Long before they get to that point their physical resistance is so lowered by malnutrition that they die of disease. The children weaken first, the women and old men next. And the infection from these cesspools of contagion is spread over the world irrespective of boundaries or ideologies. We are interested in that.

And there are 10 or 15 million Americans of descent from these races. They cannot, and will not, forget the peoples of their birth.

And overriding all this there is the question of humanity. There are things in this world that are not silenced by ideological argument or declamation as to who is responsible. They are not to be settled in these ways because of the teachings of Christ which have resounded down these two thousand years.

The greatest Teacher of mankind did not argue and debate over the ideology and the sins of the two thieves. And he thundered scorn at the priest and the Levite who passed by that man in the ditch. That teaching gave to mankind a new vision and part of that vision was mercy and compassion. And this question is today the test of our religious faith. For compassion is one of the major foundations of Christianity. Without compassion there would be no legislation for the underdog. Can any man, or any woman, who believes in the teaching of God say that he does not wish us to succeed in this task? Will not future Americans have lost something if we do not hold to American ideals and American faith now?

Can you believe that American public opinion or the spiritual leadership of America has so lost its bearings as to be opposed even to an effort to aid those who lie in the ditch of war?

I am aware that 3000 miles away in the surroundings of our American homes it is difficult to envisage what all this means.

I am perhaps one of the few living Americans who have dealt with famine among millions of people. During the last war, it was my appointment from the American people to represent their hearts and their religious faith in saving tens of millions from starvation and disease. I moved continually among those hideous scenes. I have seen the agonies of famine. I have listened to the pleadings of children, the fierce demands of mothers for the right of their children to live. I have seen relief stations and hospitals filled with its consequence in distorted minds and bodies. I have witnessed it in twenty nations. I have seen Generals of armies, to whom dead on the battlefield brought little emotion; melt into tears in the face of these spectacles. I have seen starvation's unending blight upon the world. I know starvation in the last war had a large part in the causes of the world's agony today. I had hoped it would never again come to the world. But it has come, and I would be untrue to myself and to my country if I did not fight it to the end.

# A Reply to British Refusal to Permit Relief

NEW YORK CITY  
[March 10, 1941]

## STATEMENT

FOLLOWING is a copy of a statement by Ex-President Herbert Hoover made in behalf of the Executive Committee of the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies.

It was based upon a statement released in Washington by the British Embassy on March 10.

In transmitting this to the members of the National Committee, Mr. Hoover said in part:

*"We feel strongly that the American people have a deep interest in this question and, a full right to debate and express their views.*

*"We must remember that this war may go on for years and that the plight of these peoples and the mass of children will become steadily worse."*

## MR. HOOVER'S STATEMENT

The British Ambassador has courteously furnished me with an advance copy of the British statement. The American people have a right to know the views upon it of myself and the Executive Committee on Food for the Small Democracies. Before giving those views, we wish no misunderstanding of our sympathy

with the British cause, or that we have any doubt that the original plight of the people in the small democracies is due to the German invasion.

We believe that the British statement was prepared before they were fully informed upon the undertakings we have now secured. And, in this light, our full proposals in no way impair the British war effort. At the same time they uphold the ideals of democracy to the world and these little nations. They would save the lives of multitudes of children and others.

Our recent surveys show that the food situation in the occupied democracies is far worse than the British statement would seem to indicate. The Belgian ration is already down to 960 calories, or less than half necessary to maintain life. Supplies to maintain even that will be exhausted this month. Reports show many children already so weak that they cannot attend school.

#### SHORTAGE OF FATS ACUTE

We do not agree that there are enough supplies on the Continent to care for these people or that the supplies will ever be evenly distributed. Devastation by the German Army and the blockade combined has caused considerable shortage of bread supplies everywhere, but more acutely a shortage of fats. No people—American, Belgian or British—can survive without fats, meaning meat, dairy products, vegetable oils, etc.

British reports state that the fat supply of the Continent as a whole has been reduced 40 per cent. Our reports show over 40 per cent. And, as the Germans are not likely to reduce their fat supplies below fighting levels, the shortage falls even more violently upon the occupied democracies. And the Belgians are the first to be exhausted.

In order to check our own information again, I requested a committee of experts, comprising John Lee Coulter, former member of the Tariff Commission, Professor J. I. Falconer of Ohio State University, Professor Asher Hobson of the University of Wisconsin and Doctor E. V. McCollum of Johns Hopkins



University, to review objectively all of the data, not only our own investigations on the ground in Europe but also the data of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, British reports and actual rations on the Continent. They fully confirm our conclusions.

While the occupied democracies formerly secured a large part of their fat supplies directly by imports from overseas, or indirectly through import of feed, we make no contention that blockade is not a part of war measures. However, the stark fact is that millions of children, and the weak, are threatened with stunted bodies and death in the occupied lands—unless relief is brought to them.

Our original plan of relief was based on the successful methods of the last war. The British felt they could not accept that plan. In the meantime, the British Government agreed that supplies to French children could be taken through the blockade by the American Red Cross, and thus admitted that the blockade could be opened. Also, Secretary Hull, on December 11, in a public statement, suggested that relief organizations ask Germany to contribute food.

#### ALTERNATE PLAN

In all those lights we proposed a new and limited experiment in Belgium, by which 1,000,000 destitute adults and 2,000,000 children should be fed by soup kitchens. This called for 1,000,000 bushels of bread grains per month from German sources, 20,000 tons of fats and soup materials, and special food for children through the blockade. If this experiment was successful, then it could be extended to other democracies when their inevitable food crises approached.

In January we submitted our plan to the Belgian Government in London, and on January 30 they urged it strongly upon the British Government. At the same time we began negotiations with the Germans, who responded on February 26, and their undertaking was transmitted to the Belgian Government.

On their part the Germans have already shipped 800,000 bushels of bread grains into Belgium. They are now initiating a shipment of 3,200,000 bushels. They also agree that there shall be no interference with imports, any requisition or absorption of native food; that ships will be free of attack; that a neutral commission shall supervise relief on the ground and see that agreements are complied with. We do not believe that the effect of this undertaking has yet been fully considered by the British Government.

A further part of the plan is that only ships not available to the British shall be used, and that the cost of imports from overseas is to be paid by the exiled Belgian Government. Thus no burdens are imposed upon either America or Britain.

#### REPLY TO BRITISH POINTS

These arrangements answer British objections:

1. No food goes directly or indirectly to the Germans. If the Germans furnish their part of the supplies, it will amount to more food values sent into Belgium than they could possibly have taken from Belgium or fed to their own army. The effect is to reduce, not increase, German supplies.

2. It would, in fact, increase their transportation burdens by the amount of imports.

3. If the guarantees and contribution of food from the Germans are not carried out, then the whole operation would be at once withdrawn. If the guarantees are violated, then the time by which the war could possibly be extended can be measured. The maximum benefit Germany could obtain would be seizure of the imported stocks—and those on hand at any one time in Belgium would not feed Germany for one whole day.

4. It would not be furnishing food to persons working for the Germans, since it is limited to the destitute (and thus necessarily the unemployed) and to children.

5. It would not be using ships otherwise available for the British.

6. The plan could result in no military loss to the British, or military gain to the Germans.

GENERAL PERSHING

General John J. Pershing said on February 16:

There is no doubt millions are in jeopardy unless they are given aid from somewhere. From my own war experience and some knowledge of problems involved, I have every confidence that the salvation of these people can be worked out along the lines proposed by Mr. Hoover, without military loss or benefit to either side. The interest of this committee in maintaining American ideals and the friendship to America of these nations, by saving these millions, is worthy of every support.

ADMIRAL PRATT BACKS AID

Admiral William V. Pratt, who dealt with the blockade in the last war and long commanded the United States Fleet, also said:

I have no hesitation in saying that this aid can be given under Mr. Hoover's proposals without any damage to Great Britain. Taking the long view of the future of constructive forces in the world, and America's relation to it, it is of vital importance to America that Mr. Hoover's plans be carried through. . . . Only America will be able to meet this emergency.

This committee wishes to make it clear that none of its members seeks to administer any relief. The American Red Cross has been given permission by Britain to import supplies through the blockade for French children, and this committee would favor the extension of their fine service, or those of the Friends' Service Committee, to the Belgians.

The purpose of this committee is to raise a voice for those millions of helpless among the little nations who have been our lifelong national friends. We believe it is a duty of the American people to interest itself in prevention of such catastrophes.

We have no hesitation in saying that such action will uphold democratic ideals in the world.

It is no false humanity which saves the lives of countless children. The committee has evidence that millions of Americans wish it to continue efforts toward finding a solution by which the lives of these helpless people may be saved.

*PART III*

SOCIAL, EDUCATIONAL AND  
SCIENTIFIC QUESTIONS

# It Needn't Happen Here

*American Mercury*  
[July, 1940]

TODAY 10 million of our people are unemployed. Eighteen million destitute are on relief. Agriculture is propped up with government subsidies. Government expenditures excluding recoverable loans have increased over 225 per cent in eight years of peace. The deficit has nearly doubled the debt of even the Great War. Taxes are breaking the backs of those who have jobs. The initiative and enterprise of our industrialists and merchants are confused and weakened. Our national income is about 25 billion dollars less annually than it should be—and in consequence one-third of our people are living below decent standards.

To those concerned with the causes and cures of this, there is something to be learned from the disorganization and march of revolution in Europe since the World War. No one will say the situations of the United States and Europe are wholly parallel but nevertheless cause has about the same reaction in all human beings and their organizations.

The World War was followed abroad by the revolutions which usually come to the defeated. Most of those countries shed the last remnants of their feudal garments and donned the clothing of fully representative democracies. Their hopes were focused upon the successful systems of victors in the war.

After the rise of the new democratic formations there came continued and violent social, economic and governmental upheavals. In the end some dozen countries have gone over to dictatorships or totalitarian government in some form.

These totalitarian revolutions can be divided into two groups. In the first is Russia, which except possibly for a few months never enjoyed any system of liberty. And also there is Spain, where democracy was overthrown in the violent clash between the Communists and Fascists. In the second group are those wherein democracy was overthrown without much bloodshed. In this group some 250 millions of people in these many nations have in the past 20 years surrendered all constitutional guarantees of personal liberty—and most of their freedom gained over two centuries. Even before the Great War the nations in this group had economic, social, and governmental foundations in systems of liberty. Some more, some less. But by the tests of free speech, free press, free public meetings, and of trial by jury they had most of the spiritual and intellectual liberties. They had won these rights by bitter struggles over two centuries. In all these countries the economic systems have long been much the same as ours. They were based on the right of men to choose their own callings, to acquire and retain private property for the security of their families and old age. They were systems of free private enterprise. The spread of education in some of these nations was perhaps less developed but they are people of high intelligence and not ignorant. My purpose is to explore the antecedent social and economic forces in motion in countries where there had been practically a peaceful rise of dictatorships or totalitarian forms. For therein lies a lesson for the United States.

#### REVOLUTIONS AWAY FROM DEMOCRACY

To observe these forces better, I revisited Europe two years ago after nineteen years' absence. A unique opportunity was offered me by invitations from many European governments and municipalities who had over some years wished to show appreciation for some services I had been able to render their people in war years.

I accepted these invitations as I wished to see what the vast

turmoil on that continent might contribute to our own national thought. I was able to discuss these questions with the heads of some fourteen nations, their cabinet officers, and their leading men.

What were the impelling forces which led to this gigantic revolution in which liberty was abandoned after all this blood and suffering over two centuries?

I soon found there was a rough pattern in this absolute movement away from systems of liberty. It was not always parallel in timing in different countries or in the sequent steps or the final form. Every race moves within its own characteristics and varied national forces are present.

But the impulses which carried them over the edge of the precipice were the same.

The first outstanding fact was that *this stupendous revolution in ideas and, government in these many nations had, been taken at the will of the people themselves*. Totalitarian government or dictatorship in some form, whether understood or not, was welcomed by these peoples as relief from their confusions. The proof of that is that it all happened with the initial loss of life of less than one thousand persons.

It is true that once the government was transformed, some men protested and found their destiny in exile or prison or execution—when it was too late. Nevertheless, the moment of these revolutions in almost all of these nations was accomplished not by military coups d'etat. *The dictatorship was established by powers conferred upon the man on horseback by Parliamentary leaders or confirmed, by electoral action*. Every important dictator in Europe today obtained his right to rule by legal delegation from once self-governing people. Liberty committed suicide.

What were the immediate sufferings of these peoples which precipitated this gigantic overturn?

*The universal pattern was the general despair of the people that democracy could solve their economic and governmental problems*. Peoples gave up hope of any way out except by the appointment of a dictator who might force a way through the



labyrinth of difficulties in which democracy seemed to have lost itself.

What were the accumulated difficulties in these last moments of democracy? They were simple enough. In every country unemployment had become chronic. Inflation and devaluation had wiped away savings. National standards of living were sinking. Productivity was diminishing. A large part of the people was living in extreme poverty. Governments in frantic efforts to relieve the unemployed were piling up deficits and debts. Collapse of government credit was threatened or had already taken place. The vitality, the hope of the people was starved. The hope of youth was stifled.

Finally disorder broke out. In some cases workers seized industrial plants. In some cases governments were no longer able to take care of their unemployed. From it arose the first demand of the human instinct—the restoration of order, discipline, and productivity.

This was the situation before the collapse. But what were the antecedent causes of this lack of productive work, this chronic unemployment, this stagnation of agriculture and industry, this disintegration which exhausted governments and enthroned despair?

There were many causes. It is true there were the lingering effects of stupendous destruction of war, there were the debts, inflation and greedy speculation and manipulation, the lack of vision in peace treaties, and the explosive fuel of nationalism.

But out of the miseries from the war and postwar instabilities there had been the growth of great pressure groups. Industry, farmers, labor, business groups, all pressed their claims. They demanded relief or subsidy or privilege, each for itself. To these pressure groups were added subversive forces. All of them actively influenced elections. Representatives of the people were elected upon their successful bids for support of enough of these groups. Political parties disintegrated into blocs. Legislatures became impotent of any but negative action and quarrels.

The effect of the subversive revolutionary forces of Communism

Socialism, Fascism cannot be overlooked, but their weight was only to add to other and deeper confusions. Their leaders of course conspired to wreck the free system in hopes of control out of its debacle. They took advantage of tolerance and freedoms of liberal institutions to mislead the people. They preached of class hate, they exaggerated every abuse, they blamed every ill that swept over their borders on free institutions, and they besmirched every leader opposed to them.

All sorts of other discordant leadership sprang into being.

There were the sheer demagogues who to attain personal power used the universal devices of their profession ever since Ancient Greece. Those are promise and defamation.

There were the political leaders who desperately compromised with any principle, because their motive force was personal ambition for power.

There were other leaders who stood staunch but were overwhelmed by the tides of popular discontent.

There were the starry-eyed who believed government could direct economic life of millions through "Planned Economy." Their ideas were part Fascist, part Socialist, part economic freedom. By magic economic panaceas they would dissolve all human troubles. They professed to be devoted to civil liberty, free press, free speech, free worship, free courts, and all of the protections of the person which have been built up over centuries. They had the hallucination that they could have a dictated economic system and maintain the other freedoms. They were the totalitarian "liberals."

#### THE MIXTURE OF SYSTEMS

And if we look underneath these records of tragedy one constant force of disintegration was universal.

In effort to cure social and economic ills the nature of free enterprise upon which productivity depends was lost sight of. *The planners thought they could mix totalitarian economics into systems of free enterprise.*

The motive of Planned Economy was to make the system

over instead of to remedy its weaknesses. Part of "Planned Economy" was government competition in business with the citizen. Part of it was government coercion and dictation to men of goodwill in the conduct of business and agriculture. Part of it was governmental subsidy and privilege to special groups. Part of it was governmental manipulation of credit, of price, of production. Part of it was inflation, mostly through devaluation and government expansion of credit, which undermined the savings of the people. All of it was accompanied by government deficits and debts.

The net result was to create hesitation, uncertainty, and fear in every avenue of free enterprise. It made impotent the individual judgment of men. These poisons weakened their initiative and enterprise, the vitality and productivity of free enterprise. With every weakening, governments were forced to further and further steps. Unemployment became chronic, the governments piled up further laws, further deficits, and debt, in frantic efforts to care for the unemployed and to pay subsidies. All bureaucracy expands automatically. All officials seek more authority. Power feeds on itself. And power soon affirms that the end justifies the means.

*Totalitarian economics injected into free enterprise choked the productivity of the nation. The mixture is worse than either system alone.*

When democracy began to destroy free enterprise, it destroyed itself. It devoured its own child.

#### Dictatorship

In their misery, sanity and reason in the people gave way to sheer rage at the apparent impotence of free government.

None of these people started dictatorships with the intention of sacrificing liberty. When the dictator was vested with powers to take over the economic system for the state, whether he intended to suppress civil liberties or not, inherent forces drove him to it.

When the dictator set about his compulsory economic system

he found it impossible to dictate and leave men free to criticize or to organize in such fashion that they could criticize or oppose. He found that it was necessary to suppress the intellectual and spiritual liberties. Furthermore totalitarian government could not tolerate any rivals. It could not tolerate opposition political parties. All voluntary action, labor unions, Chambers of Commerce, farmers' organizations, and even the church organizations were dissolved because they were potential with criticism and opposition. Courts could not be allowed to interfere with the powers of government. Men could not be allowed trial by their peers. All that meant the abolition of the precautions and safeguards of liberty. The final stage is the rise of new Caesars. And the last refuge of tyrants is war.

These causes of defeat to liberty are the clearer if we look at what happened in the countries which finally resisted totalitarianism. In Great Britain the totalitarian "liberals" made great progress in mixing the economic systems under Labor Government. But labor as well as the other groups finally realized the approach to the precipice and by joining in a "coalition government" saved the country, restored free enterprise, restored employment, and rebuilt the national income to the highest in their history. In France the totalitarian "liberals" under Blum brought the country to the ditch, but it was rescued by the national effort under Daladier. Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, Scandinavia, and Finland refused temptation and have prospered until the present war.

#### THE AMERICAN SCENE

Do I need point out the analogies of these pre-dictator periods to some recent years in America? The mixture of government dictation into free enterprise, the rise of pressure groups, of the starry-eyed, of the subversive, and at times the lapse of legislatures into impotence? We too have devaluation, credit inflation, deficits and swelling debt. We find ourselves in the economic demoralization outlined in the opening paragraph of this article.

And we too have a confused and an uncertain people. Men's moods are haunted with the thought that the golden age of America is over.

And do I need point out that this movement to a compulsory economic system in America did not burst like the morning with the New Deal? Our totalitarian "liberals" had been preaching it for years. For instance, all of those who for years fought to keep governmental regulation of business confined to regulation of the traffic and to cure of abuse, and not extended to dictation, or who fought the idea of governmental entry into business in competition with the citizen, incurred perpetual denunciation as "reactionaries."

Nor did these ideas of power economics come alone from the academic or journalistic wing of totalitarian "liberals." Well do I remember another instance—the real birth of the NRA. It first appeared in a discussion before the National Electric Light Association early in the depression, in 1931. Each industry was to be dictated to as to prices, production and wages by government authorized boards. Thence the Chamber of Commerce took it up, and placed the proposal before its component bodies by referendum. Upon the plan receiving a majority (most of whom did not realize its full import) it was formally laid before me at the White House. I could not do otherwise than describe it as leading straight to economic Fascism. Later some of the traditional Republican business world who had been interested in this idea gave their support to Mr. Roosevelt in the election of 1932. They supported its passage into law by the New Deal in 1933. And then the Supreme Court found it a violation of primary liberties.

But ours is not a country for despair. There is no ground for defeatism that liberty is lost in America. On the contrary there are the sure foundations of hope and confidence. Many of our totalitarian "liberals," who now realize where these ideas have led this country and what their ultimate is abroad, are deserting that mixed compulsory and free economy. The American people are realizing where it leads from bitter experience.

We can recover from that experience. For we have more fat on our bones than those nations which had been stripped by the Great War. We can stand more shocks. We have a deeper tradition of liberty and a sounder system of liberty than those nations who still carried over a class inheritance from Feudalism. We have no threat against our national independence which necessitates the devotion of so impoverishing a portion of our income to arms as European nations. We have no need to send our sons into European war and thus plunge ourselves into that immediate totalitarianism which is the inevitable need for organization of modern war. We have the powers of new invention and discovery which can give a new era of industrial progress. Our people have not lost their energies and their recuperative powers. They will move forward again to employment when confidence is restored.

And we are not quitting the fight.

# Annual Convention of the Boys' Clubs of America

NEW YORK CITY

[*June 5, 1941*]

THESE are days of confusion, unrest and anxiety. These are days of hatred, bloodshed, and destruction of every human ideal. The freedoms of expression, of worship, the freedoms from fear and want are degenerating over the whole world.

We are here tonight concerned with a work which bears upon the preservation of these freedoms in America. We are concerned to build manhood which will contend against these pressures of degeneration.

The issue before the American people today depends as much on their souls as their weapons. We can build weapons in shops. We cannot build minds and souls with machine tools. This organization is devoted to building minds, bodies and souls against these malign forces.

Never before in history has there been so much conscious effort, so much definite organization to control the mind of youth—some for good and some for evil. And our country in one aspect of building for good presents a tough job. Our civilization constructed these magnificent cities. But by doing so we changed all the normal and biological environment of the human animal. Then we selected half a hundred different races to populate these cities. And we coagulated great masses of them into congested areas. And out of this mixture and this environment we try to preserve a democracy that did not have its birth or growth in any such surroundings.

But you may rightly ask what has all this to do with boys and Boys' Clubs. It is just this: there are some 18,000,000 boys growing up in our country today. We estimate that about 3,000,000 of them are crowded into the congested centers of our modern American cities. And a million of them are the first generation from parents somewhere outside the United States. We have thus increased the number of boys per acre who spend their spare time on city pavements, surrounded by brick walls. On hot days the policeman may relent and open fire hydrants to give a little fun and a little relief. Or they can hitch hike rides on busses, trolley cars, or trucks. Or they may gang up on the fruit vendor. But little of that serves to shape character.

Boys' Clubs are established primarily in these spots where America has done least for her children. There the most fruitful soil is found for the growth of crime and of subversive forces. Yet this is the citizen who, after all, is going to transmit our interests, ideals and concepts of this civilization.

It is no use to believe freedom will live unless it lives in the minds of boys. And the equally important responsibilities that freedom implies will not live unless they live in the minds of boys. That is the spiritual impulse which impels this organization. That is in essence the program of the 352 Boys' Clubs located in 197 cities. Today the physical assets of these Clubs exceed \$25,000,000. But their moral assets are far more important than this, for they are serving some 308,000 American boys.

The boys in these pavement districts are no more given to crime and delinquency than any other boys. Their trouble is that they have nothing constructive to do, no adequate place to play, close to home and in the evening. And their chief excitement quickly becomes mischief and the bright lights. Our criminologists, judges and police officers tell us that the criminals are not made overnight. They develop from early youth. Crime prevention is a youth problem. Likewise our leading crime authorities tell us that delinquency is concentrated in congested areas; that two or more boys are involved in the great majority of offenses; and that delinquency is not deliberately



planned. If you plot the percentage of juvenile delinquency for 1000 boys in any city you will find it heaviest in the congested areas except where there is a Boys' Club or some other effective agency. On the other hand, it is repeatedly pointed out that the area in which a Boys' Club is located has even less delinquency than in many silk-stocking areas.

There is an inherent gang spirit in all human animals. There is the spirit of adventure.

In the days before we coagulated into these big cities and covered the grass with cobblestones, the boy got a great release of spirits in the challenge of the animals, the growing things and ranging the landscape. We cannot restore these adventures in his world of brick and cement. We can, however, satisfy his craving for adventure and gang life in a way that will develop his character and elevate his ideals.

The mission of Boys' Clubs is to provide outlets for their gang spirit in clean and wholesome play; to teach young America the thrill of doing something constructive because they like to do it; and to show the value of friendly leadership.

A Boys' Club is not a paper organization to which you belong. It is just as much a club as a man's club. It always has its own building, gymnasium, game and meeting rooms; vocational classes; and plenty of shower baths. It is the boys' own Club where he goes from choice. There is no distinction as to race or creed. Here he learns sportsmanship and that means self-control and fair play; he gets a vocational direction from the work shops. And the Club pulls out his hidden talents in art, music, craftsmanship or mechanical skill. He is fascinated by the possibilities found in the shop with its materials, equipment and leadership. He experiences the thrill and pride that come from satisfying the creative urge which is so strong in every boy.

The leaders in this movement are here attending this closing occasion of the 35th annual convention of the Boys' Clubs of America. Through the unswerving devotion of these men, multiplied by many thousands of other workers throughout the

country, these ideas and ideals are being implanted. And they are giving these boys new joys of life along with it.

As evidence of the public's support to this movement we have just successfully completed a five-year expansion program. It has stimulated a great interest throughout the nation. We can say with pardonable pride that the Boys' Club is stronger today than ever before. Yet we are now only reaching about 10 per cent of 3,000,000 boys who need the opportunities of a Boys' Club.

It is with the purpose of still more vigorous expansion that we are now setting up a "Committee of 100" leading citizens in the 100 largest cities of the United States. Through them we hope to interest a nationwide audience of 100,000 selected citizens who, when informed and convinced as to the merit of this work, will dedicate themselves to this effort.

And one last thought. In the final analysis the only kind of society that counts is one which holds that in the poorest born and the least privileged boy there is the material of greatness. The congested areas of our cities are not kind to boys. They do not naturally develop his talents, his personality, his honor and his virtue. And the boy asks little in life. He has marvelous powers of adaptation. He goes blithely on his way, a smile on his face, intent on his big concerns – survival, achievement and play. What he needs is to have a door open where he can pursue his great adventures in moral and physical safety.

# Commencement Exercises of Haverford College

HAVERFORD, PENNSYLVANIA

[*June 7, 1941*]

IT IS a great pleasure at last to be able to accept an invitation to come to Haverford. And for two reasons. It was founded and has been sustained by the faith in which I was reared. And when I was yearning to go to college my stern Quaker managers insisted that my spiritual welfare would be unsafe in a nonsectarian institution. They therefore secured for me a scholarship in this college and an alternate one at Earlham. But my ambitions then were in sciences and engineering and Haverford, at that time, was not strong in that branch. That deficiency has long since been overcome and Haverford now turns out its quota of first quality men in those branches.

## THE NEED FOR IMMEDIATE EXPANSION OF RESEARCH

I wish to take this occasion to urge again the immediate expansion of our research facilities in pure and applied science, and the more systematic application of what we already know in these fields. That is at all times the highway to increased efficiency and increased productivity. And this action is the more urgent today because through it we can contribute to alleviate the hardships of our American people both during and after this war.

However, as Huxley insists, let me first define my terms. For the practical purposes of this discussion, pure science research

search means the search for fundamental natural law. That is the search for truth. That is a good exercise any time.

Applied science research is the application of such discoveries to practical use. That is invention. Pure science is thus the raw material of applied science.

For this discussion national industrial efficiency means producing more goods and services per capita.

I do not want you to think that I am building a rigid wall between pure and applied science. Their purposes and borders are much blended. I might mention another distinction between them. There are no big money rewards to the pure scientists. Sometimes they get an obituary notice on the fourth page inside.

I am not one who believes that the whole of civilization is founded upon scientific discovery and the inventions. I could complain of a thousand economic and social ills that have come from the industrial revolution, including the increased capacity for mass murder. But because of this war I can also tell you that unless we quickly have more of this same discovery and invention and a more efficient application of what we already know our standard of living and even our civilization will degenerate.

First—Whatever the outcome of these present wars, there is one thing certain—we shall have to divert a large segment of national energy to armament for years to come. That at once decreases the output of articles for public consumption. Unless we can by some parallel action increase our production of consumption goods, it means an immediate reduction in our standard of living. And there is nothing that can so contribute to make up that deficiency as new discovery in pure science and new inventions. From that source we can get more laborsaving devices, and better methods which increase production. We can get new materials to substitute for those we have to take from the people for munitions. Nor do we need to depend wholly upon new discovery and new invention to increase our national productivity. We can organize to better apply what we already know—and that can produce immediate results.

Second—There is another and immediate purpose of enlarged

research. The airplane has revolutionized warfare. It has made the aggressor far more powerful. It has made small nations helpless to defend their liberties. It has made the butchering of women and children a part of war. The world has not yet found the defensive answer. The airplane was born from the science of physics. The answer might come from there. And it imperatively demands research and more research—and at once. For if that answer could come and come quickly it would turn the whole fate of the world.

Third—whatever the outcome of this war one more thing is certain—this whole world and our own country will be greatly impoverished and smothered with debt. There is only one certain road to rapid recuperation. That is to increase the technological power of the nation.

It is increased productivity at lower costs that the nation will need. In the past we have always reaped such advances from important discovery, invention and organized application.

There is, of course, the commonly proposed idea that we could increase production and alleviate scarcity in goods by longer working hours. But it is far better that we accomplish this by more scientific discoveries, new labor saving devices, new methods, or the more vigorous organization and use of what we already know.

I do not need to be told all the old arguments that invention puts men out of jobs. That ghost is as old as when Eli Whitney invented the cotton gin. That ghost should have been laid when it saw the effect of the gas engine. For every man in the livery stable yesterday there are twenty in garages today.

Nor is there justification for that other truculent ghost which wails about more pressure upon individual workers. It only means that we work our machines and heads harder.

#### HOW MUCH DO WE EXPEND UPON IT?

Our pure science research is dependent largely upon our universities and a few specially endowed institutions. Their research work is decreasing rather than increasing. The reduced

interest return on the endowments of our institutions is driving them to cut into research rather than teaching. I doubt that even without curtailment their total resources for pure science research amount to \$20,000,000 a year. Thus we allow pure science a national expense account of about 5 per cent of what we allow for cosmetics.

We make a better showing in applied science. Governmental and industrial research, including agriculture, is supplied with probably \$200,000,000 a year. That is not equal to our cosmetics allowance by a good deal.

#### THE PROCESS OF DISCOVERY IN PURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE

And now under the pressure of preparedness as we need more new methods, more new inventions, more new laborsaving devices, and more new materials, let me explore the processes by which we get them.

I have said elsewhere that there was a time when invention came from the starving genius in the garret. We got the steam engine that way. These gifts now come from long years of patient experiment in great laboratories. Like the growth of plants cell by cell, of fact upon fact, some day there comes forth the blossom of discovery, the illuminating hypothesis or the great generalization. And finally it fruits into a multitude of inventions. Moreover, poverty does not essentially clarify thought. Nor does it provide laboratory equipment. Bread and water diet has been discarded by the mother of invention.

I can easily illustrate the movement of pure science from discovery to invention. Our electrical industries today are the result of search into pure science. They are the result of a half-century of step-by-step advance in the realms of pure physics and mathematics. It is from these realms that Faraday extracted the transformation of mechanical energy into electricity through induction. It is an old story that Gladstone was induced to visit Faraday's physics laboratory to see this new scientific contraption. When Gladstone, a practical man, inquired whether it would be of any use to mankind, Faraday

opined, "I think some day you will be able to tax it." But it was long years afterward that Edison, Thompson, Siemens and the other engineers translated Faraday's discovery into power and light. And today it moans and groans with taxation. But it pays the taxes.

And taxes are not the major achievement of electricity. Rivers of sweat have been saved from the backs of men. Watt and Faraday did more to reduce the 84 hour week to a 44 hour week and to give more good jobs to men than all the laws and all the organizations which have been embattled in this cause.

Infinite drudgery has been lifted from the hands of women. The electric light alone has relieved the human race from the curse of always cleaning oil lamps, scrubbing up candle drips, and everlastingly carrying one or the other of them about.

And its benefits are not all economic. They lift the spirit. It adds cheer to life—enables us to postpone our spectacles for a few years longer. It has made reading in bed infinitely more comfortable. By merely pushing a button we have introduced the element of surprise in dealing with burglars. The goblins that lived in dark corners and under the bed have now been driven to the outdoors. The doctors now peer into the recesses of our insides. Our electric light enables our cities and towns to clothe themselves in gaiety by night, no matter how sad their appearance may be by day. It has lengthened the hours of our active lives and enabled us to read the type in the telephone book. It has become the friend of man and child.

But now to return to my illustration of the progress of skilled research in electrical physics. From Faraday we could move on to Maxwell's formulation of the electrical wave theory by pure mathematics. Hertz confirmed Maxwell in experiment and proved the radiation of waves through the air. It was the engineers Marconi and DeForest who transformed these discoveries of pure physics into the radio communication. Out of that we get jazz by night and war scares by day. Between them it diverts our minds from other woes.

## THE POSSIBILITIES OF THE FUTURE

And now somebody will say that all this is in the past. What of the future? Are there any great fields to explore from which such benefits can spring again? The answer is that never in the whole history of fundamental science have there been so many vistas opened before us as right now. Discovery and invention expand in geometrical progression. Inventive minds play upon every new invention and breed a dozen more.

Much of our progress comes from the invention of new instruments – that is, new tools for research. They are born from long hypothesis and prior experiment. Out of the discoveries in atomic structure and radiation have come new tools, new instruments, which open still wider avenues for research.

By use of these laboratory tools or instruments comes a multitude of discoveries and inventions. Every time we get something new, we have some addition to human progress. And in the very recent past our scientists have evolved a number of these instruments, the possibilities of which stretch our imagination to the breaking point.

The harnessing of the cathode ray through the cathode tube was the key to television. And a great industry has been born. From that application the cathode tube was further developed to the astonishing new electron microscope. Today we have photographs of red blood corpuscles as large as dish pans. We are actually able to photograph some molecules. A dime could be enlarged to a mile in diameter if we possessed a big enough film.

And from all this we shall know more of how to limit the conduct of bacteria and increase the energies of men. We shall know far more about cellular structure and the make-up of molecules which will improve our industrial processes. The field of discovery with this instrument has hardly been entered. There are only two or three of these microscopes in use. Shortly there will be scores of these in the hands of our scientists – provided some one furnishes the money to build and operate them.



And there are the cyclotron and the mass spectrograph, and their opening of the whole vistas of atomic structure. Actual atomic power here has been experimentally produced.

All these instruments are revolutionary. All advances in laboratory instruments are not so sensational. Minor ones happen every day which contribute to progress. The spectroscope was for years just a tool for the astronomer. Today it has been transformed into an instrument for accurate metallurgical analysis to control our steel furnaces, and thus the methods of industry improve.

The invention of the steam engine did not appear in the headlines of a world then engaged in the Napoleonic Wars. Yet it saved the world from much of the impoverishment of those wars. History may yet record that the headlines of today should have been devoted to the inventions around the electron rather than war news.

#### AGAIN IT NEEDS MONEY

And now I come again to the question of men and money for these explorations. I believe every physical scientist in this country today could name new paths, new fields, that wait for the money to mobilize men and equipment. Many of their results may be sterile but somewhere something comes – an improved instrument, a new path opens and in the end an increase in the standard of living.

Some one will say that these great discoveries of fundamental law cannot be forced – that we must wait for them. I do not contend you can go out and buy such a genius and have him produce every morning. But I do say that he cannot perform without equipment and support.

#### PUSHING THE APPLICATION OF THE SCIENCE WE ALREADY KNOW

Nor do we have to wait for pure science research to give birth to new laws, new instruments, new methods, new power,

and new labor saving devices. In many directions we sorely need support for research in the application of pure science discoveries we already know.

One of the greatest of our problems right now is to develop more industrial raw materials which our farmers can produce in substitution for their overproduction of food. I doubt whether we are spending five millions a year looking for them. And we are compelled to subsidize the farmer with a billion a year and to regiment him besides until we find some such solution as this.

And in the realm of industry there are further vast possibilities in synthetic fibers, rubber, in the plastics, or new sources and methods of making and use of cellulose and a score of other things. There is the field of metallurgical treatment of low-grade ores. If we developed such methods we could free ourselves from depending upon imports of chrome and manganese. We need substitutes for materials needed for defense. I doubt that actually three millions a year are being spent in such research laboratories.

#### ELIMINATION OF WASTE

Nor to improve our national efficiency do we have to wait for even these better applications of science.

Under the pressures of emergency we can increase national efficiency through the elimination of existing industrial waste of motion and materials. That requires that we remove every sort of restriction both by capital and labor which impedes or penalizes the use of better methods and better machines or the working of these machines full time.

At once some one will rise up and say that these are fine generalities, that they lack an exact and particular action which will bring results right now while we are in the middle of this preparation for defense. If you will go back to the last war and examine the methods which we then adopted for the elimination of waste, the simplification of methods, the substitution of materials for continuous operation, you will find an immediate and enormous field already pioneered. If the armed forces

need to take 20 per cent of our shoes by such devices we can at once increase the output of our existing factories and thus save a cramp in our supply of shoes.

#### SOME OTHER ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES

We shall spend twenty billion a year on armament. We shall pile most of it up in national debt. If we would invest 1 per cent of this in an insurance policy called research and elimination of waste, we might save some of the bankruptcy when these wars die.

It is possible that the aggressive superiority of the airplane in war may be checked. And that becomes vital to the freedom of nations and to stop the massacre of women and children.

And it is not beyond human imagination that the quiet, unobtrusive scientist and engineer in their laboratories might make all nations self-contained in raw materials and their production of goods. And what a holocaust that would be for international quarrels and international thinking—and for much of the causes of war.

#### SOME SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES

And that brings me to another phase. We have been told with monotonous repetition by the collectivists and left-wingers that our frontiers are gone. They say our industrial plant is built. They claim there is no safety valve for human energies. They assure us that we have come to an age of humdrum problems of under consumption, overproduction, and the division of the existing pot. They say that new opportunity for youth has shrunk.

That is not so. There was never in history a more glorious frontier for youth than today. Adventure and opportunity beckon in every avenue of science. They beckon from the great profession of men trained to research. They beckon from its thousands of applications. From it spring tens of thousands of new services and industries. In them human courage, character, and ability have an outlet that never came even with the two gun

frontiers. Just as the new villages followed the stockades of the frontier, so do new cities follow new mastery of technology and power.

And let those who lament the loss of frontier life not forget the adventures along every mile of highway and even with the traffic cop. That all emanated from the discovery of the combustion engine.

#### SOME SPIRITUAL CONSEQUENCES

But research can bring far more than defense from aggression, or the opening of new frontiers, discoveries, adventures, inventions, labor saving devices, more power or increased standards of living. There also lies in these fields a contribution to the moral and spiritual welfare of mankind. Here is the lifting of men's minds beyond the depressing incidents of the day. Here lies the unfolding of beauty, the ever widening of the boundaries of knowledge. Here is the "inculcation of veracity of thought" in a world sodden with intellectual dishonesty. Here is the harmonizing of the individual to the pattern of his environment. Here is the confirmation of a Supreme Guidance in the universe far above man himself.

And today we need more of these things to help save and build a great nation.

# Address at the Symposium of The Fiftieth Anniversary of Stanford University

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

[*June 19, 1941*]

THERE has been held here a symposium upon the "University and the future of America." This is a discussion worthy of the celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of any great University. That subject has been here dealt with by national leaders in Education, in History, in the Law, in Science, in Economics, Sociology, and Government and in Philosophy. Within these discussions run not alone a remarkable contribution to the future of University service but beyond that a remarkable exposition of the forces now in the making of the world at large. Indeed there could be no adequate discussion of "the University and the future of America" without consideration of the future of the world itself.

And this symposium comes at no ordinary time. For there is a recognition by all these eminent men of changes in the forms of life and living that hang today in great portent over the whole of civilization.

Originally I was asked to summarize this symposium. I begged off that task because I could not do justice to it. I felt a certain amount of humility and inadequacy. Then as a result of that rebellion I was put down for a subject "to be announced." I do not have a subject. There isn't any even yet. In my present preoccupations with questions of war and peace and of

Starving and dying millions of people, I move in an immediate field apart from the necessary atmosphere of long view and objective discussions.

I could of course talk at length upon the achievements of Stanford over this last fifty years. I could speak of the great leadership of its three Presidents, Doctors Jordan, Branner, and Wilbur, as my connection with the University has been over all of its history. As I was one of the first students here I could talk upon the great teachers who have left their imprint upon thousands of Americans who have gone from these halls. I could talk upon the contribution of the University to science, to literature, to humanity and to government. I could even discuss the achievements of Stanford men and women in every part of the world and in every walk of life. Yet others will do that better than I can.

Searching for a short subject I reread these remarkable papers of this Symposium all over again today. I got not one subject but a thousand. But the trouble is they know more about their subjects and can say more about them than I could ever hope to. Your speakers have ventured on prophecy but little. It is much easier to debate with a prophet than an expert. These eminent men have indicated the nature of the many forces in motion, in the nation and the world. Some are good and some evil. And I might add that these impending changes which are already abroad would be difficult enough for humanity to compass constructively in peace, but in the midst of a destructive world war they become doubly difficult.

I suspect that these great addresses are in reality the voices of the University world directed at the layman. So I thought I would employ myself for a few moments with a few words from a layman to the University world. To lead the forces discussed here to the good of this nation the Universities must take a large part and especially in this crisis. They now have certain outstanding responsibilities beyond their major purpose of the training of our youth.

The outstanding question in all this confusion is intellectual liberty.

First: The whole growth of University life, its whole contribution to civilization, thrives only in the air of freedom of mind and of spirit. Without that stimulant to creative thought, without that privilege to adventure into doubt, and without freedom from repression and terror, all expansion in ideas must shrink, the critical function must wither, and all but the dry ashes of education are gone. The first obligation of our Universities to the future of America is therefore to fight impairments of intellectual and spiritual liberty. With the infection of war psychosis breaking out over our own country, the fight is already here.

Second: The Universities must be the insistent guardians of truth and of intellectual honesty. In this world, sodden with propaganda and demagoguery, the Universities are our one great hope. I know the philosophic view that truth is only proximate; that people differ on what constitutes truth. But despite even hairsplitting there are enough standards of truth at any one period in the world's history to lead men and women away from error. Moreover, the last war and the events which have followed have demonstrated that free minds and free spirits cannot thrive if the people are to be corrupted with even half-truth. The roads to dictatorship and totalitarianism are bordered with wreckage of truth. And I may add that the road to foreign wars is lighted with the propaganda which in itself is half lies and quarter truths. The future of America depends upon our people reaching their own conclusions unclouded by this poison. And our Universities could clear that miasmic fog greatly.

Third: The widening of the boundaries of knowledge must come largely from our Universities. It is here where knowledge can be expanded for knowledge's sake. It is here where men are not driven to produce and buy and sell and to earn. It is here where human experience and history must be constantly redistilled for the problems of each generation. It is here where research in pure sciences must largely be carried on. It is here where constantly added knowledge, cell by cell, fact upon fact, can bring forth the blossoms of discovery, of illuminating

hypothesis; of fundamental law and the great generalizations. They are the raw materials of invention, of new method, of increasing human security and comfort. Indeed that service is needed.

Fourth: Obviously the basis of all education is instruction in accumulated knowledge and in human experience. This is the place where the past is connected to the present. In times of great change humanity seems often determined to discard all the lessons from the long upward toil of mankind. In its miseries and its searching for some easy way out, it demands something arbitrarily new. The very slogans of our times are evidence of it. We hear hourly of the "New Day," the "New Freedom," the "New Education," the "New Era," the "New Deal" and the "New Order." Sometimes I could wish desperately for a substitute for that word "new." It has come to connote a break with all knowledge and experience and to do it violently. If the word "progressive" or "advancing" could be substituted for it I should have more hope for usefulness of slogans. That would connote a building upon the past of human experience. It would connote forward movement; it would connote stability instead of violence. I could get up many enthusiasms for slogans of the "progressive day," the "advancing freedom" and the "progressive order." When the sun rises in the morning we hail it as the new day. We cheer at the passing of the night. But it is a false analogy in the march of civilization. Our chores for the next day are assigned the day before. Our abilities to perform them were formulated not even the day before but centuries and even in geologic time before. If it were a day without the link of yesterday and indeed the link of the last million years it would be chaos. Even chaos might not be new. In any event, whatever the use of words may be, the function of the University is to stand for orderly progress, for evolution, not for the revolution of violence.

Fifth: The Universities must hold up certain standards of ethics and the great domain of human values. They must constantly reformulate them to meet the changing evils which rise



with a changing world. Their clear voice of right and wrong and justice must sound out above the clamor of conflict and confusion in times of crisis. The Universities can be centers from which fear and hate generated of these conflicts and confusions can be allayed. They can be the centers from which compassion upon the suffering may be demanded. They can be the place from which the immoralities of arrogance in officials can be reprimanded. The Universities can uphold the dignity of the individual man and woman as the whole basis of human progress.

Sixth: The Universities give guidance to constructive forces in time of crisis. They can check destructive forces. Among these forces are issues of peace and war. I am not going to discuss pacifism or militarism. Nations must defend themselves from military conquest. But war is the greatest destroyer of civilization. The Universities should sit in judgment upon those who claim the need of war. With their knowledge of history, their knowledge of the causes of war, they can expose the aggressor; they can expose provocative action, they can hold up truth against propaganda; they can allay fear; they can call to a people to stop, look and listen. They can apply the weights of objectivity and experience to the arguments of the fanatic and the foolish. They can and must oppose that submergence of freedom of speech and press which has already come upon this country with the madness of war psychosis.

All these six functions which bear upon the future of America may yet require a heroic stand on the part of our Universities. With two-thirds of humanity in desperate war; with the remainder arming to the teeth; with vast problems imposed upon us by our own discoveries in science; with the recognition of a greater obligation of man to his neighbor, the world is indeed of troubled mind, a world of conflict and of confusion.

There have been confusions and periods of change before now. Civilization has survived these confusions and even grown out of them greater in soul, in freedom, and in safety. But how? Because some men and some institutions have stood fast. They stood not because they knew the solution to all these confusions and changes, not because they had even the power

to find solutions. They held to certain positive principles of life, of morals, and of spiritual values. They stood firm and they held the lights of civilization until the furies passed.

There have been Universities which held these lamps aloft in darkness before now. They held them dimly throughout the entire middle Ages. They will be needed in the days to come. They are needed right now. And there have been Universities which have failed and gone into eclipse, as those in the Central Empires.

After all, the constructive progress of civilization is not founded on power of men over matter. It is founded upon the advance of truth, of knowledge, of beauty and of obligation to fellow men and these are the fields of the free spirits and they are the fields of our Universities.

There is one phase of these addresses which I wish to emphasize a little further. That is free men and free women. In the changes with which the world is faced, many of our speakers have properly forecast the increases of governmental domination in the life of the people. It means more limitations on personal liberty or some limitations at least. That is inevitable even in the democracies in the face of the problems we must meet. It is inevitable from the growing complexity of national life. It will come faster under the necessities of preparedness. And government may submerge all liberty in case of war. Then it is the Universities which must raise again the lamp of freedom.

To me, there is one test of all these proposals of further governmental encroachments into the daily lives of men: "Does this or that act increase or protect or does it limit or destroy intellectual or spiritual freedom? Does it make for the dignity of men?" The whole progress of mankind depends upon that chart. It is the only convoy of American civilization. It is indeed the problem that faces the whole world at this minute.

Two or three hundred years ago the world began again after centuries of the middle Ages to shake off the bonds upon free minds and free spirits. Our nation was born under this star. We might call it the resurrection of personal liberty. From this

very release of mind and spirit sprang our great scientific discoveries and their application in invention and machines and methods of production. And thus we built up what is sometimes called the industrial revolution. But out of this very industrial revolution and all its growth of productivity and wealth we created a thousand limitations again of personal liberty, and changes in national life. Every scientific discovery, every new invention, produced new possibilities of privilege as well as progress.

And then began a conflict which we sought to solve. Indeed freedom is the most difficult of all philosophies to realize in government because the very freedom which vitalizes the soil of progress sprouts also the weeds of selfishness and sordid ambition and untruth. The most easily available instrument to turn to for the protection of freedom is government and we use it too freely. For over seventy years we have been ceaselessly legislating, ceaselessly trying by trial and error to find solution to this conflict. Too often the real test of intellectual freedom and intellectual integrity has not been searchingly applied to these doings.

And now across these complexities of our own comes war in the world. And intellectual and spiritual freedoms are even in greater jeopardy. There is another phase of this symposium which interested me profoundly, perhaps of less importance but still of great weight. That was the constant urge for a better synthesis of the facts and experiences of these many specialties in knowledge and the presentation of their probable combined consequences. That would be important to public guidance and high statesmanship. It would help if the law, sociology, economics and history could get together and define where the enlargement of government begins to crowd on the freedom of mind and spirit. That would be very helpful. I have some worry over what the politicians might do with a synthesis, but we could let that pass. I have wished that the economists and the sociologists and the governmentalists generally would sit down with the biologists. In the long run, society will be built upon the sums of human behavior. And that behavior has

deeper roots than wishful thinking and exhortation. I gathered from one of our eminent speakers that those chromosomes which transmit the behavior of geologic ages ought to haunt the thinking of the social and governmental doctors. This human animal has certain inheritances that cannot by evolution or cultivation be wholly shaken off. From these chromosomes he gets certain pretty fixed instincts and determinates. For instance, he is an acquisitive animal. Just like the squirrel, from his chromosomes, man will put up nuts for the winter. If we want to motivate him to steady effort he must be allowed to keep some nuts. He also gets a love of power with his chromosomes. And among his chromosomes seem to be some which yearn for some mystical basis of organization which would yield him the highest values of the spirit and at the same time pay his food bills.

Man is apparently also born with a chromosome that urges him to organize—to organize the gang or the tribe or the nation to gain power by his own elevation or power for his group by which he will be the beneficiary. If we want to implement his mental energies we probably have to allow this chromosome some opportunities for exercise. There is an inborn limit to what exertion he will make solely for the collective good. And it is upon this chromosome that some of the current solutions for our world complexities are going to be wrecked.

Generally these chromosomes seem to form a heavy nucleus of behavior around which there revolve some electrons of altruism. The job of the University seems to me to be to excite these electrons.

But again I wander into the troubles of our daily life and away from the purpose you have heard during these addresses. To me the sum of these great addresses is hope. It is hope founded upon evidence of constructive minds. They are minds reaching into the past and projecting into the future for solutions to our perplexing problems and the problems of all humanity. And that hope warrants a faith in the University and the future of America.

# Dedication of the Hoover Library on War, Revolution and Peace

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

[*June 20, 1941*]

THE initial inspiration of this Library was Andrew D. White. It was while reading his works one day when crossing the North Sea in 1914 that I was greatly impressed by his complaint that there was so little of the contemporaneous literature and documentation of great events ever preserved.

However, this Library is not so much my work as it is the work of thousands of devoted people. There are the scores of men and women in many nations who at my request collected materials during the whole of the World War. There is the host of young professors who were released by General Pershing from the Army to storm Europe under the direction of Professor Adams during the Armistice. There are the officials of forty governments who co-operated in an extraordinary way in furnishing materials. There are the indefatigable labors of the Directors of the Library. There is the staff that has over these years prepared and classified these millions of items.

There are the individual donors of hundreds of thousands of important records. There are the donors of the endowment, and of many sums for purchases and research. There is the architect, Arthur Brown, who has created here a great contribution to American architecture. And there are the hundreds of donors who contributed to this building. There is the liberal contribution of the Stanford Trustees. If I were to name all of

these generous people, it would take hours. Of all this Doctor Wilbur, Doctor Lutz and Mr. Rickard will speak to you. But I must express the special obligation to my American and Belgian colleagues in the Commission for Relief for their unending contributions and service.

But as the result of these combined efforts there has been built here the most important collection in the world today upon the last war, and its aftermaths of revolutions, of destructive and constructive forces, and the spells of peace that have followed it. Here are not alone published books. They are easy to obtain. But here are the fugitive documents which quickly disappear. Here are the inner records of governments, of minutes of war councils and war departments, records of peace negotiations, economic and social organizations over all the nations who have been involved in war. Here are records of every social movement from Communism through Fascism, Nazism and the democracies. And here are the only records of the great intervention of America which saved the lives of hundreds of millions in Belgium and from the aftermath of the Great Famine and Pestilence which swept over Europe after the last war. Here are the records of the efforts to make and preserve peace.

These millions of items have one great distinction—that large parts are not preserved elsewhere. And the collection is not ended yet, for, by funds furnished by generous donors, and gifts from those countries, collection is in progress in every part of the warring world today. And no doubt wars, revolutions, famine and peace will long continue.

I suppose some one will wonder why all this trouble and expense to preserve these records. They embrace the campaigns of armies, the negotiations of statesmen. They tell the great drama of superlative sacrifice, of glory, of victory, of death, of sorrow, of frustration and defeat. If we assume that humanity is going to abandon the lessons of its own experience, the whole of this collection is useless, except to the casual visitor. But sometimes the voice of experience does call out to stop, look and listen. And sometimes peoples respond to that call.

As an instance of its possibilities, in an alcove of this library is a collection which shrieks to be heard today. That is the tens of thousands of pieces of propaganda in the last war. It was in the last war that war propaganda first became major strategy of war. It was used by every government in endeavor to keep some nations out of war, and to get others involved in war. War propaganda is a highly developed species of untruth and part truth and distorted truth. As war sanctifies murder, so it sanctifies the lesser immoralities of lies. Here lies the proof which comes with retrospect that propaganda moves by tainting of facts, suppressing the facts, by synthetic facts, as well as perversion of facts. Here is the proof of organized promotion of hate, fear and dissension. These files are the silent challenge to the intellectual honesty of all governments when they go to war. We are today flooded again by the belligerent governments with these attempts in the same terms to mislead and becloud American thinking.

And there are the records of the world's effort to make peace. Here are the proofs of the highest idealism. And here are the records of selfishness and the lowest trickery. Here can be found the record of the ideas and forces which made for failure of the last peace and the ideas and forces which might have made its success. Out of these files the world can get great warning of what not to do and what to do when it next assembles around the peace table. True, there must be brought to that table a concept of new human relations, a concept that substitutes peace for war. But if the world is to have long peace, that concept must find its origins in human experience and its inspiration in human idealism.

And here are the documents which record the suffering, the self-denial, the devotion, and the heroic deeds of men. Surely from these records there can be help to mankind in its confusions and perplexities, and its yearnings for peace.

The purpose of this institution is to promote peace. Its records stand as a challenge to those who promote war. They should attract those who search for peace.

I therefore dedicate this building to these purposes.

*PART IV*

**POLITICAL ISSUES**



# Coalition Government

*Letter to Senator Charles W. Tobey*  
*[May 21, 1940]*

My dear Senator:

I HAVE your inquiry as to my views on the position the Republican Party should take on the adjournment of partisanship and coalition government.

The first question is: What is meant by the adjournment of partisanship or politics? There ought to be an adjournment of cheap political tricks, carping criticism, smearing personal defamation not only today but always.

If by "adjournment of partisanship" or "coalition government" is meant the adjournment of party action in the United States, then a most serious question is raised. Virile organization of political parties has a vital function in sustaining the processes of free government. It is only by such organization that the people can express themselves on public questions, can propose alternative action, can debate public issues, can protect minorities, and check inroads on free press and free speech. It could only be suspended if self-government had been abandoned.

The election of 1940 has not been suspended. In that election we are confronted with solution of our problems of unemployment, of agriculture, of debt, and of even deeper problems of the whole governmental, social, and economic structure of our nation. They are larger issues than at any time in seventy years. And at the 1940 election these fundamental issues will have to be decided. They will have to be formulated. They will have to be hammered out on the anvil of debate. The only verdict upon them is by the ballot.

Even in foreign policies there is the necessity of debate and action by the people. Fortunately, there is no fundamental division today upon the major policy of keeping the United States out of European and Asiatic wars, and to maintain an adequate military preparedness to defend the Western Hemisphere against all comers. The leaders of both political parties have supported these policies. Our people will differ in opinion as to the best methods of keeping out of war. If there is to be no debate upon foreign policies when there is difference of opinion, then we have again lost free government.

All these functions cannot be adjourned unless free government is adjourned.

The question arises: In what sort of emergency should the processes of free government be "adjourned"? The only possible warrantable emergency that imagination could picture is if we go to war. We are not at war. Nobody is attacking us. Nobody even threatens to attack us. Nobody even talks of attacking us. We do not need to go to war. Certainly a war in Europe does not suspend the processes of democracy in the United States.

#### COALITION GOVERNMENT

The suggestion of coalition government deserves still further comment. I presume it is suggested as a peacetime action to make a suspension of party action more concrete. If it did what is implied, that is to suspend party action, it would mean one party government. It would be the start of totalitarian government. It would mean the suspension of all democratic processes.

Even in war it is of doubtful application unless we throw up our hands to dictatorship. That whole idea is imported from the occasional practice of European democracies in times when the life of the nation is in jeopardy. In the European parliamentary form of democracy the Cabinet is simply a committee of the majority members of the legislative body. Every member of this Committee or Cabinet has a joint responsibility in its recommendations for legislation. The Premier is merely the mouthpiece of the Cabinet. Coalition abroad, therefore, by inclusion

of elected leaders of the minority party, carries their authority of the legislative arm into the determination of policies.

The structure of our government makes the responsibility of the President and the legislative body entirely independent, and for good reasons. Our Cabinet, in fact, is only a body of operating vice presidents, in charge of administrative departments, and meets for purposes of coordinating administrative action. It has no power over the President. It has no power to originate presidential policies. It is sometimes an advisory body, depending on the President. An American Coalition Cabinet would have no effective part in formulating presidential policies even in war, unless the President would bind himself to abide by the joint and collective vote of the Cabinet. That he would not do.

Also, if a Coalition Cabinet were formed under our structure of government, the Republican members could not and would not even represent the Republican members of Congress. They have their own responsibilities. If the purpose is to adjourn independent action in the Congress it would fail. If it succeeded, it would be a disaster to free government.

Nor could such Cabinet members represent the Republican Party at large for the simple reason that there is no way to elect them.

If, to obtain greater skill in the Cabinet or greater confidence for his Administration, the President desires to select Republicans for those posts, there is not the slightest objection. If he desires to obtain advice from Republicans, likewise there can be no objection. If he desires to explore what unity could be obtained upon special questions that also is good. But these individuals would give this advice and sit in those positions solely for their skill and merit. They would not be acting for their party.

The Republican Party and the Democratic Party as well must carry on. That is a fundamental necessity to free government in the United States unless we yield to dictatorship.

Certainly while we are at peace the Republican Party should

lend its support to our opponents if they adhere to keeping this nation out of war and of preparing adequate defense for our country. And in our domestic questions it has a real duty to maintain free debate, constructive opposition, the presentation of alternative domestic policies, and to perform its responsibilities in the election of 1940. That cannot be adjourned. As a matter of fact, those functions were not adjourned even in the Civil War. They were not adjourned during the Great War. To propose such actions in times of peace is a proposal to adjourn free government in the United States.

Yours faithfully,  
HERBERT HOOVER

# Republican National Convention

PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

[June 25, 1940]

LADIES and Gentlemen of the Republican National Convention:

We are here faced with the task of saving America for free men. Two-thirds of the world has become the stamping ground of militant despotisms. Almost everywhere in the Old World the light of liberty for which men have struggled and died has gone into a long night. Men and nations have lost their moral and spiritual moorings. Even in America our system of liberty has been weakened. We are divided in mind and fearful. And confusion in liberal nations is made worse by the spread of incompetence in government. The whole world is in confusion.

The world has survived confusion before. And men have grown in soul and safety. But how? Because some organizations of men have stood solid. They stood not because they knew the solutions to all these confusions, not even because they have the power to find solution. They stood firm and they held the light of civilization—until the furies passed, because they held to certain positive principles of life, of morals, of spiritual values.

In a time of confusion and crisis the action of a Republican Convention 80 years ago saved this nation for free men. And free men of two generations built it into unparalleled greatness.

Upon this party again rests the responsibility for the freedom and prosperity of men for the next two generations. The Republican Party again accepts that responsibility here and now.

Our Party is not concerned here with petty or factional issues or minor criticisms.

This crisis in America is not to be obscured by any events abroad. We have witnessed a steady sapping of our system of liberty and the mismanagement of government for the last seven years. During all this time we have had 10 million chronically unemployed, 18 million of our fellow Americans have been continuously on relief. Agriculture has been held afloat by government subsidies. Unending deficits and huge increases in debt threaten the financial stability of the government. Our industry and business are hesitant and are afraid. In this decade, we have actually decreased in national income and national wealth for the first time in 150 years. America has gone backward. The human consequence is that one-third of our people are frozen to poverty.

This condition is not an inheritance from the inevitable world depression which followed the last World War. It is the result of incompetence in government. We were on the way to recovery in 1932. Every other democracy had recovered from that depression long before the outbreak of this war.

Now, economically weakened for the past seven years, we are faced with mismanaged national defense.

And this new world war is no sudden blow. It comes from the destruction of systems of liberty in the Old World. Since the last World War over a billion human beings in Europe and Asia have been shaken by revolutions. The insidious poisons of men's minds from this cauldron sweep over us.

And now with this war one liberty loving country after another has been submerged. Our indignation, our sympathies, and our fears are desperately involved in their heroic struggles for freedom.

Whatever the outcome of this world cataclysm, whatever the solution of our domestic crisis, the pattern of this world will not again be the same. Dictatorships, totalitarian economics, and militarism will long continue over a large part of the earth. New economic and political forces will be loosened upon the world.

## OUR TASKS

To be prepared, we must at once undertake seven stern tasks.

First. We must restore and revitalize liberty in America.

Second. We must restore and rebuild morals in government.

Third. We must restore decent life and living to one-third of our farmers and workers, who have been chronically submerged by the New Deal.

Fourth. We must restore competence to government.

Fifth. We must prepare this nation to defend the Western Hemisphere.

Sixth. We must develop and maintain foreign policies that keep us out of these wars unless we are attacked. We should facilitate all nations fighting for their freedom in procuring materials and munitions, but subject to definite limitations which keep us out of war.

Seventh. We must recall our people from the flabbiness of the New Deal. We must re-establish stamina, character and ideals. We must regenerate hope and confidence in America.

## WEAKENING THE STRUCTURE OF LIBERTY

Let us first examine the weakening of the structure of liberty in the United States. That is but part of a far larger war in the world today than a war of tanks and airplanes. It is even more dangerous to America. This is a war of hostile ideas, philosophies and systems of government. There are no neutrals in that war. That is where we have to fight.

We have to fight not only fifth columns and insidious poisons of men's minds, but we have to fight those failures of government which drive democracies upon the rocks.

The battle for liberty has been about lost in the Old World. But right ideas never die. Nevertheless from this seething cauldron of revolutions and wars of ideas there are many lessons for us.

Let me recite a little history.

For more than a century and a half before the War of 1914 the whole continent of Europe up to the Russian border had been struggling upward toward liberty. These people in 20 races had attained a large degree of free government—free speech, free worship, orderly justice and free enterprise. After that war, liberty and peace seemed assured to the world.

And then in less than 20 years hundreds of millions of these people surrendered freedom for bondage under totalitarian government. This abandonment of liberty has been the most gigantic revolution in history.

Two years ago I was the invited guest of some twelve European countries. That gave to me a unique opportunity to inquire into some things that might help the American people.

I wanted to know more of what ideas and pressures had plunged these nations into dictatorships.

There will flash into your minds that it was Communism, Fascism, or Nazism. That is not what I refer to. They were the effect. I was seeking the cause. Liberty had been weakened long before the dictators rose under those banners. There was a long poignant drama before the last act in this gigantic tragedy of civilization.

There were many disintegrating forces. But also in every single case before the rise of dictatorships there had been a period dominated by economic planners. Each of these nations had an era under starry-eyed men who believed that they could plan and force the economic life of the people. They believed that was the way to correct abuse or to meet emergencies in systems of free enterprise. They exalted the state as the solvent of all economic problems.

These men thought they were liberals. But they also thought they could have economic dictatorship by bureaucracy and at the same time preserve free speech, orderly justice and free government. They can be called the totalitarian "liberals." They were the spiritual fathers of the New Deal.

These men were not Communists or Fascists. But they mixed these ideas into free systems. It is true that Communists and



Fascists were round about. They formed popular fronts and gave the applause.

These so-called liberals shifted the relation of government to free enterprise from that of umpire to controller. Directly or indirectly they politically controlled credit, prices, and production of industry, farmer and labor. They devalued, pump primed, and inflated. They controlled private business by government competition, by regulation and by taxes. They met every failure with demands for more and more power of control. And they employed that hand maiden of power, named "Gimme a Billion, Quick."

These leaders ignored the fact that the driving power of free economic life is the initiative and enterprise of men.

When it was too late they discovered that every time they stretched the arm of government into private enterprise, except to correct abuse, then somehow somewhere men's minds and judgments became confused. At once men became hesitant and fearful. Initiative slackened, production in industry slowed down.

Then came chronic unemployment and frantic government spending in effort to support the unemployed. Government debts mounted. And finally government credit was undermined. Out of the miseries of their people there grew pressure groups—business, labor, farmers, demanding relief or special privilege. Class hate poisoned co-operation.

Does this sound unfamiliar to you?

It was all these confusions which rang down the curtain upon liberty. Frustrated and despairing, these hundreds of millions of people voluntarily voted the powers of government to the man on horseback as the only way out. They did it in the hope of preserving themselves from want and poverty. They did it in hope of preserving their national independence.

And that blight of totalitarian "liberalism" even spread to Great Britain in 1929. But that liberty loving people overthrew it in 1931. The British fully recovered prosperity in 1934. The blight swept over France in 1936 under Premier Blum and the French attempted to escape collapse by voting his

government out in 1938. But their morale and their productive life were so injured that they are paying in blood, in tears and defeat.

Need I carry this analogy further?

This is a battle which Americans better not lose.

#### OUR TOTALITARIAN LIBERALS

We have now had seven years of experience with our own totalitarian "liberals." Battling against all the natural forces of recovery they succeeded in stabilizing depression.

What is more, in forcing their economic measures upon us they have given even deeper wounds to Liberty. Their headlines in history would be: Vast Powers to President; Vast Extension of Bureaucracy; Supreme Court Decides Against New Deal; Attack on Supreme Court; Court Loaded with Totalitarian Liberals; Congress Surrenders Power of Purse by Blank Checks to President; Will of Legislators Weakened by Patronage and Political Pie; Attacks on Business; Stirring Class Hate;

Pressure Groups Stimulated; Men's Rights Disregarded by Boards and Investigations; Resentment at Free Opposition, Attempt to Discredit Free Press.

Certainly the New Deal has not been allergic to power. And now fed fat on power they demand a third term for Mr. Roosevelt. That is not a mere violation of tradition. It is a violation of a fundamental restraint on power in this Republic.

But we Republicans would welcome Mr. Roosevelt as a candidate. For this battle must be fought out under the guns of debate. And that debate will be done best with the man who is responsible for it.

#### RESTORATION OF AMERICAN LIVING

One of our Republican tasks is to restore security of living and hope to those 40,000,000 Americans – farmers and workers – who are today plunged into insecurity or destitution. Restoration of jobs to 10,000,000 unemployed is the first step to lift

this mass of poverty. It is the first step to relief of farmers. It is the first step to balancing our budget. It is the first step to preparedness.

Unemployment is not a chronic disease of a free system. It is a disease of governmental interference with that system. These jobs can be restored alone by the restoration of the vitality of free enterprise.

Let me say at once I am not interested in free enterprise because it is a property system. I am interested in it because intellectual and spiritual liberty can be sustained only by economic liberty. They are indissolubly bound in a common fate. I am interested in free enterprise because it is the one dynamic force by which we can restore productive jobs to our people.

It was dynamic individual enterprise which raised the country from insignificance to greatness. It was not government that put these prairies under the plow. It was not government that flung these railways across a continent. It was not government that built these great factories or cities. It was not government that brought forth these great inventions. It was not governments that build these millions of churches, or added this wealth of music, art and literature.

Is this nation to be a great national workshop or a vast eleemosynary institution? We cannot have two-thirds workers and one-third dependents.

It is easy to prove that the people are fearful of the New Deal. The evidence of their fears and loss of confidence is when they postpone the building of homes. It shows when they fail to improve and construct factories to produce the new goods to which science and invention beckon our energies. Let me give you just one figure.

The New Deal points with pride to its housing schemes. In the seven years before the New Deal, and with no subsidies a free America built 3,400,000 new family units of housing. A part of those years were depression years. During the whole New Deal with all its subsidies, America has built 1,700,000 new units. They no doubt have some more "on order."

There can be a free economy in America which releases the

productive energies of men. Or there can be a dictated economy. These cannot be mixed. A free economy means sweat, turmoil, and competition—hard at times if you choose. It means ever new wrongs that must be righted, but it means also resistless growth and resistless progress.

The restoration of confidence does not require exploitation or monopoly. A free people can no more tolerate private economic power without checks and balances than we can tolerate political power without balances and checks. But in effecting great reforms there is a dividing line. Upon the right of this line is cure of abuse and solution of marginal problems. On the left of it are dictation and tyranny and discouragement of production. We must now reform the reforms.

A confident, alert, alive and free people can quickly repair losses, repay debts and bury mistakes.

In the meantime while we are getting our economic machine back to work we must care for those who suffer. It was a Republican administration in 1930 that first announced we cannot allow Americans to go hungry and cold from no fault of their own. We organized and prevented it. It was a Republican Administration which first started relief for farmers.

But wholesale relief cannot go on for ever. No government can carry this deficit indefinitely. We must restore these people to self-support before the money fails. These people want to work and to produce. The nation needs their work. They want their self-respect restored through productive jobs.

That can come only through a change of administration.

#### MORALS IN GOVERNMENT

And that brings me to restoration of morals in government. Does any one in the United States doubt that the New Deal has built up the most gigantic political machine to control the vote ever known in this country?

What of the abundantly proved misuse of relief for politics? What of this shady substitution of political patronage for the merit system?

What of this vicious building of city machines through handing them gigantic Federal funds to expend?

What of the use of taxpayers' money for partisan propaganda?

The whole business stank to an extent that the Jeffersonian Democrats joined with Republicans in Congress in passing new laws trying to stop this political corruption.

The effect of the new law on the New Deal has probably been to increase the use of the telephone instead of the typewriter.

Today there are three or four hundred thousand New Deal political officeholders who are the officers over an army of ten million voters who receive government benefits. A modern explanation of this New Deal method would be that elections have been taken into protective custody.

There is no time tonight to go into the whole field of intellectual and financial morals of the New Deal. They will be amplified in this campaign.

At the end of this debate we ought to have an election, not an auction.

Is all this Liberalism? Liberals fought these things for centuries.

Does not the citizen lose faith in moral standards when he sees such government dealings?

There can be no double standard of morals in a republic. For ideals must be served with clean hands.

#### COMPETENCE IN GOVERNMENT

Let us for a moment explore the question of competence in government, as distinguished from philosophy and morals.

There can be monstrosities in broad policies of government beyond those that merely cost money. They can jeopardize the Republic. I may mention a few samples. You will have others.

#### COMPETENT MEN

My first comment is that competence in government is not alone laws and policies. It is the capable administration of

them. That means the quality and experience of the men and women doing the job. Many a good objective has gone wrong up that alley.

For fifty years the American people have fought to dig out the spoils system. Our people built a great dyke of competence through non-political selection by merit. At one time 80 per cent of Federal servants were employed that way. Today one-half of its officials have never passed a merit examination. That is, however, a minor part of the subject. I cannot discuss its major aspects because I do not wish to deal in personalities.

#### FISCAL POLICIES

My second example of the consequences of incompetence in government relates to continued deficits and mounting national debt in peace time. It is a dull subject. And like any chronic disease we "sort of get used to it." Deficits, debts, inflations, and their spawn of managed currency have been the curse of the earth ever since the last war. They are inscribed on the tombstones of every fallen democracy.

We are still alive and therefore I make two mild suggestions. These deficits are partly the natural results of pressures that arise from stabilized depression.

Therefore I suggest that we release national energies that make productive jobs.

Thereby we would restore the national income from the present 70 billions to the 100 billions it ought to be today. Thereby the revenues of the government would increase automatically. Thereby the billions of dollars for relief would decrease automatically.

These deficits are partly due to men who, no matter what they say, show no comprehension that the money which they spend comes from the sweat of people who toil and produce. Now the ordinary peace time expenses of the government have increased from about four billions under Republicans to nine billions under the Abundant Life. My other suggestion is that somehow, somewhere we might pare a little off the abundance

without hurting anybody but office holders. But these men cannot stop spending. It is in their blood. And it is part of the New Economics.

Our national debt is now long past the danger sign and its speed is increasing. It already weakens our national defense.

Mr. Roosevelt gaily dismisses his fantastic national debt by the idea that Americans do not owe it, because we owe it to Americans. That idea is one source of the intellectual depression today.

You and your grocer are both Americans. You might ask your grocer if he would not concede the same idea. The fact is this debt represents the self-denial of those who have toiled and saved. They have a large part of their savings in that debt. Their 125 million insurance policies, and their 30 million savings and bank accounts are in it. Our children will have to pay it. And they will pay it with toil and bitterness toward our generation. They will be working to pay for the follies of the New Deal instead of their own living.

And in another direction these deficits and debts are becoming the explosives which will destroy the whole of our social reforms. During these eight years the New Deal has given hourly advertising to their advances in the social field. There have been advances. We sorely needed them. We always will need them. Republicans build them over years. We have no quarrel with the principle of protection for labor, the farmers, the old and the destitute. Our quarrel is with method and incompetence in administration. But the torpedo prepared for these services is that the nation is not allowed to produce enough goods and wealth to foot the bill. They cannot be long paid by the magic of borrowed money. Unless the whole direction of this government is changed, these humanitarian measures will go into the New Deal embroidered wastebasket called bankruptcy.

#### CURRENCY

My third sample of the higher incompetence is the purchase of three-quarters of the whole world's gold supply. We bought

it by giving foreigners our commodities and our investments. We have buried 19 billions mostly in a hole at Fort Knox.

The foreigners got our property at depression prices. We paid a high price for this metal.

You have often been reminded of the legend of King Midas. Today that legend bears more careful examination. Midas also had the starry-eyed notion that he could benefit the Kingdom if he had the power to turn his commodities into gold. The Gods gave him the power. And when he finished he had a great pile of gold but no commodities. Then he assembled another commission for advice. The God Bacchus advised him to jump in a certain river. The legend says he came out with donkey's ears.

Even Midas did not undertake to operate on silver. He left that to the New Deal.

Unless we quickly restore the vitality of this pile of dead gold, this nation will face a loss of the whole 19 billion of it. We should start by putting it in circulation at home. We should start putting it in circulation abroad by swapping it for useful metals which we do not ourselves produce. We would far better have many years' stock of manganese, nickel, tungsten and tin than the so-called precious metals. These we may need for national defense.

#### PREPAREDNESS

There is other major incompetence in government which I could well discuss. There are Agriculture and Relief. But tonight my last example is national defense. For this incompetence strikes at our national safety.

Mr. Roosevelt recently broadcast an alibi that preparedness had been neglected by Republican administrations.

In the six years of peaceful world outlook before the New Deal we had spent about 680 million a year on our military services. As a matter of fact Mr. Roosevelt considered we were spending too much on it. He supported the Democratic platform in 1932 which implied that – and other things. And in 1934 he drastically reduced our defense to 550 million, lopping off 20 millions from the air corps alone. And that year he reduced



the number of commissioned naval graduates by one-half.

The interlude in conduct would seem to weaken the alibi.

Nazism in Germany and our New Deal both rose to power in 1933. During these dangerous years our Republicans in Congress supported repeated increases in defense appropriations until they reached 1400 million a year. In these six years the New Deal has spent 6.2 billions.

What have we got for that enormous sum?

After all that expenditure we are told we are wholly unprepared to defend ourselves.

Our military leaders say to the Congress, we are not organized for modern war; we do not have more than 75,000 fully equipped men.

Despite the growing menace in the air, and the expenditure of 350 millions of dollars on the air force in the last six years, General Arnold says not half a dozen of our army planes are modern.

If we spend another 6.2 billions and get no more actual defense than from the last 6.2 billions nobody will be afraid of us.

Yet the lives of our children, the fate of our nation, and the future of our civilization are at stake. We cannot risk failure. This is another battle which America better not lose. If we are to achieve preparedness we must have a change in our national administration.

#### AND WHAT OF OUR FOREIGN RELATIONS?

The first line of our national defense is clear, realistic and sober foreign policies directed to secure respect, goodwill and peace.

To realize that ideal, during the whole twelve years of Republican Administration after the last Armistice we strove to keep the face of civilization turned toward goodwill and peace. Americans saved Europe and Russia from collapse in famine. Americans led the advance on methods of settlement of international controversy by peaceful means. We led the world to reduce naval arms and lifted billions from the backs of all whom

toil. We led in constructive proposals for Land Disarmament. We set a moral standard in the world by refusal to recognize the murderous regime in Russia. We refused to issue a Communist license to undermine our institutions. We had organized a world conference to stabilize currencies and by removing trade barriers to give the world a chance. That Conference was scuttled by Mr. Roosevelt. That killed the last hope of world co-operation.

#### THIS WAR

The immense task now is to shape our foreign policies to protect us from the conflagration in Europe and Asia.

There is no such thing as our isolation from wars which envelop two-thirds of all the people in the world. The Monroe Doctrine alone is the negation of that. There is no such thing as economic isolation. Those shocks jam through the doors of our farmers and our workers every hour. There is no such thing as moral isolation. These violations of treaties and agreements raise dangers to the reign of law everywhere. There is no such thing as intellectual and spiritual isolation. Emotions come through the air in every telegraphed and printed word.

From all this there are shifting dangers in which the nation should have common council that we may have national unity. In a few days this convention will have chosen our national leader. The President will be able to secure from him the views of our Party upon those transcendent questions.

Conference and agreement are the roads to a solid front to the world.

Today a thousand tragedies to mankind crash one after another. One heroic people after another have been submerged. Czechoslovakia, Poland, Finland, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and now France, who cradled our liberties. But the spirits of great races do not die. They will rise again.

We resent these aggressions. The brutality of it arouses our indignation. Their sufferings cry out to the sympathy of every decent man and woman.

But here and now America must summon reason to control

emotion. The greatest quality of men in danger, second only to courage, is cool deliberate action. That is equally the necessity in a nation. And idealism as never before must keep its feet on the ground of realism.

The first policy of calm realism is not to exaggerate our immediate dangers. Every whale that spouts is not a submarine. The 3000 miles of ocean is still a protection. The air forces, tanks and armies of Europe are useless to attack us unless they establish bases in the Western Hemisphere. To do that they must first pass our Navy. It can stop anything in sight now. In any event this ocean and our magnificent Navy give time for sober preparation. But we have no time to waste.

Second, we must be armed so that no foreign nation will entertain the dangerous thought of starting over these 3000 miles of ocean. We must be so prepared that we can rely solely upon our own right arm.

We need a navy powerful as never before. Rather than a vast accumulation of arms, we must have an industry tuned up to make war machines faster and better than any nation on earth. We need trained personnel of key men in reserve. We have the resources, the genius, and the industry to make us impregnable.

But preparedness is not only making armies and navies. It must be supported by a sound national finance, national economy and a restored productivity of our people.

And before we can have preparedness we must have competent organization in Washington.

New Deal politics will never "make tyranny tremble." I suppose we might frighten tyrants by appointing another board to advise the advisory commission of the Council of National Defense.

The third of realistic policies bears upon supplies of materials and munitions to those nations who are fighting for their freedom. My belief is that we should facilitate them in every way subject to two limitations. First that it involves no action which takes us to war and second that as liberty lives by law we must act within the law.

## PEACE OR WAR

Today many of our citizens consciously or unconsciously are considering peace or war with the totalitarian governments.

The most vital realism in all our relations with the world today requires that we keep out of these wars unless the Western Hemisphere is attacked. It is a solemn determination. One price of war is the lives of our sons and the poverty of our grandchildren. But we are here also considering the fate of our nation and the fate of liberty in the world.

It is nonsense that we cannot defend freedom here even if the Old World fails. Our ancestors, with sparse population and resources, for the first fifty years of this Republic sustained liberty here when most of the world was ruled by despots. We can do it again if we have to. And the spirits of American boys buried in Flanders twenty-two years ago rise before us today to warn us that we can make war but we cannot assure liberty in the Old World.

The hope of mankind and the hope of civilization is that democracy survives on this continent. Those who advocate war should never forget one thing. The first necessity of any great war is to set up dictatorship. France and England were compelled to do so. But with our already weakened structure of liberty and the fabulous national debt we shall have, and the mania for power of the New Deal, we should be generations in restoring free men in America. We should be sacrificing the last sanctuary of liberty in the world in the belief that we are defending liberty.

Those who feel we should intervene in this war should take note of other realistic reasons why we should keep out. If we join, we shall in our own unpreparedness require two or three years to make ourselves effective. That will be too late. In the meantime we should require the whole energies of American industry to arm ourselves. For us to declare war would do the Allies more harm than good.

The final realism is that if we are to keep cool and not stimulate war there must be an end to provocative speech by our officials. Expressions of indignation or regret do not require insults. The first responsibility of the President of the United States is to abate war, not to stimulate it. It is not the province of the President of the United States to create hate. Irresponsible talk in explosive times may bring danger. And we need remember that the day will come when we might be of service to humanity in dealing with these same men for peace.

And there is an infinite service that America can bring to the world. After this struggle we shall see hate sitting at the peace table. We might with our moral force and council abate its dread consequences. I know the famine; disease and suffering that are yet to come with this war. With our economic strength and our compassion we can save millions of lives, give aid to reconstruction. We might inspire tolerance and hope again to the world.

#### AND AFTER THE WAR WHAT THEN?

After this war our foreign trade will meet an impoverished Europe, reduced in its standards of living and above all armed with totalitarian directed exports and imports. All that points in three directions. American workers and farmers will require more protection than ever from imports. We need to mobilize counter action on exports. We need to develop self-sufficiency in our own industrial production. Under these impacts the Hull treaties will go to the heaven of forgotten issues.

I have said whatever the outcome of this war, whatever the solution of our domestic crisis; the form of this world will not be the same. We must meet great change. And we will meet with moral and spiritual degeneration in the world.

In time these world storms will blow themselves out. Perhaps it will be a long time. But the spirit of Luther, Goethe, Schiller, of Mazzini and Garibaldi still live. And here upon our soil the temple of liberty must stand, that men may be inspired to return to its worship.

## THE REGENERATION OF AMERICA

Finally, the greatest task of all deals with the intangibles of national life. It is to stiffen the stamina and the morals of our people. It is to unify their ideals and lift their spirits.

Truly we have been following the suicide road for liberty that led to disaster in Europe. But let me give you a word of encouragement. Those countries were economically lean from the last war. We still have economic fat on our national bones. Those countries were weaker in their fidelities to liberty. We are tougher in our fidelities.

Our ability to meet these storms and these changes will abide in the qualities of our people.

There is in every nation some quality distilled from its racial life. Those are the *mores* of the race. Ours is a belief in God, a belief in the dignity of the common man. Ours is a spirit of independence, a vigorous assertion of self-reliance, of devotion to duty. Ours is a high sense of co-operation in time of stress. We have always fought tyranny in any form. We have not in the past been deterred by difficulty or defeated by disaster. We have sought new frontiers, new obstacles to surmount. We have been resilient, courageous, fearless and unconquerable. The New Deal has contributed to sap our stamina and make us soft.

In quest of security we have retreated from liberty. In quest of reform we have abandoned justice and stirred class hate. In quest of economic power they have impoverished the people. In quest of relief we have injured self-reliance. In quest of an easy way out we have lessened the vision of America.

The road of regeneration is burdensome and hard. It is straight and simple. It is a road paved with work and with sacrifice and consecration to the indefinable spirit that is America.

Centuries ago, alone under the stars, contrasting his own insignificance with the immensity of God's universe, there sprang to the lips of the Psalmist the question "What is man, that Thou art mindful of him? And the son of man that Thou visit him?"

Was man created a little lower than the angels, a being for which the abundance of life consists of justice, liberty and opportunity? Does he possess the right from the Creator to plan his own life, to dare his own adventure, to earn his own reward so long as he does no harm to his fellows? Or must he submerge his life, his liberties, and his independent personality in an omnipotent government?

If man is merely one of the herds, running with the pack, Stalin is right, Hitler is right, and God help us for our follies and our greed, the New Deal is right.

But if man is an inviolable human soul, possessed of dignity, endowed with unalienable rights, America is right. And this is a war that Americans dare not lose.

Republicans! You go into battle for the greatest cause entrusted to the government of mankind.

With steadfastness to these ideals, you can put this house in order. You can defend this nation. You can demonstrate that self-governing, free people can solve the problems imposed by the industrial revolution. You can restore employment and agriculture, and end their sufferings. You can wipe out coercion and corruption. You can make this a classless country devoted to equal opportunity for all. You can build up humane measures of security, of increasing standards of living for all of the people. You can remove their fears. You can inspire their devotion to American ideals. You can, and you will, hold alight to a confused world the lamp of liberty.

Republicans! Are you prepared to fight?

# The Third Term

COLUMBUS, OHIO

[*October 24, 1940*]

TONIGHT I shall speak on the Third Term Issue. Next Thursday night from Lincoln, Nebraska, I shall speak upon our Foreign Relations.

This Republic has since the beginning held this tradition that there should be no Third Term for Presidents. That is not just a tradition, like a silk hat for funerals. It has been an unwritten provision in our Constitution. It represents the resolute determination of every generation of Americans that there shall be no such soil for the growth of personal power in this Republic. Other speakers have emphasized its historic backgrounds. I propose to deal with this question in its relation to the forces in motion right now in this year 1940.

Nor do I need to spend time on the question of indispensability of any one man in a representative Republic. If we have arrived at that dearth of ability the Republic is already gone.

In the last twenty years representative government has been abandoned or destroyed in two-thirds of the world by the rise of personal power.

I do not suggest that Mr. Roosevelt aspires to be a dictator. It is however an understatement to say that he has build personal power to a dangerous point in this Republic. Moreover, there are forces and men around him who are implacably pushing further and further in that direction. The exact reason that this tradition has been a living force over all these years is to meet just such a situation as this. The reasons why that rampart of freedom should be maintained are far higher than partisanship



They reach to the foundations of free men and women.

#### POWER POLITICS

But before I explore further let me say something about power in men and in government itself.

In Europe they constantly use the word power in a connotation that was at one time strange to many Americans.

They refer to power over people as if it were an implement, or a property, the possession of which is handed and pushed about among men or groups, or parties. They speak of men grasping for power. They talk of giving the power to this man or that.

They speak of it as a sort of game. It is a game of chicanery. It is not a game of open covenants openly arrived at. The word leadership is always their public disguise.

Those who play with power the world over contend they are working for the public good. This grasping for power is universally based on manipulating the public mind with emotional appeals to fear, to greed, and to hate.

And the rise of every dictator in Europe has been through step by step yielding of powers to the leader by the legislative body in the name of emergency.

And now the word power has come into America. We at one time thought that the power belonged in the people. We thought public officials were the servants of the people who never parted with the power. Now we talk much about the power of the President.

Is there any single person in America who is so ignorant that he does not know the gigantic growth of the personal power of the President during this last seven years?

#### THE GROWTH OF POWER IN THE PRESIDENCY

I can perhaps speak of this growth of power and its dangerous use in the hands of bureaucracy from more experience than most people.

We have no time here to catalogue the extraordinary powers that have been yielded by the Congress to the President. They number in scores. In economic powers alone they shape up into so-called Planned Economy. Therein we have been steadily building presidential control or dictation of taxation, governmental expenditures, money, credit, foreign exchange, banking, industrial production and distribution, prices, wages, hours, what the farmer can plant and reap, and who shall or shall not receive governmental relief. Regulation of business intended to prevent the abuses of minorities has been transformed into dictating the conduct of business by good men. These powers include the government in business in competition with the citizen. All this points toward an American breed of totalitarianism. And there are extraordinary powers outside the economic field.

At no time has one of these powers been voluntarily surrendered back to the people or the Congress.

In some of these cases the right of the individual even to appeal to the courts has been limited. And now Mr. Roosevelt opposes the Logan-Walter Bill, which simply restores the right of the citizen to the protection of the Courts.

Finally, Mr. Roosevelt himself states: "We have built up new instruments of public power"—please note the use of that word "powers"—which he says could "provide shackles for the liberties of the people." He is right. The liberties of the people have been shackled.

All this in seven years represents a greater peacetime expansion of power in the office of President than has taken place in all the previous 160 years. And within the past few months we see that inevitable destiny of power fed officials. That is the assumption of power to override the law.

The third term tradition is a direct check upon this personal power. In the face of this perilous increase of personal power, is this any time for America to surrender forever this vital check upon power?

WEAKNESS OF POWER IN THE CONGRESS  
AND THE SUPREME COURT

In all the centuries of the struggle to establish liberty under the rule of law, humanity has built stone by stone these safeguards against personal power. Every school child knows, or should know that the reason why this Republic of free men has nourished longer than any republic in modern history is because power was divided among the three branches as check and balance each upon the other.

This rise of personal power of the President over the last seven years has been accomplished by the disastrous weakening of the legislative and judicial branches.

The sinister word "must" still rings in our ears. Legislative action has been repeatedly jammed through without debate or consideration. Nobody will deny that the majority of the Congress has been reduced to a rubber stamp for the Executive. They don't deny it themselves.

The control of executive expenditures by the Legislative arm has been the battle of the people against dictatorial grasp since Edward I. That is the very root of the people's power. Men died over centuries to secure it. And yet time after time in the last seven years we have seen that power surrendered to the President through gigantic unchecked lump appropriations. We have seen exposure after exposure of Congressional beguilement by the pork barrel and its intimidation by threat of loss of patronage.

If we examine the fate of wrecked republics through the world we find the first symptoms in the weakening of the legislative arm. Subservience in legislative halls is the spot where liberty commits suicide.

And how about weakening of the judicial arm? The majority members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, both Republicans and Democrats, who voted against Mr. Roosevelt's proposal to pack the Supreme Court said among other things:

It would subjugate the courts to the will ... of the President and thereby destroy the independence of the Judiciary ... It points the

way to evasion of the Constitution . . . Violates every sacred tradition of American democracy. . . make this government one of men rather than one of law . . .

Does not that scathing denunciation breathe with the odor of grasp for personal power?

The indignation which swept the country at that attempt to pack the Court was an inspiring moment in popular government. For here the people demonstrated an understanding of one of the most profound yet subtle safeguards of human liberty – the independence of judges.

You may think the President's power dive on the Supreme Court failed. It did not. We have seen the Court weakened steadily with complaisant appointments. Who will say that the Court now is as great a check upon the personal power of the President as it has always been in the past?

Do we restore the protections of free men when we abandon the third term check on the rise of personal power?

#### WHAT HAS BEEN ACCOMPLISHED?

All these powers have been obtained on the ground of emergency. That emergency was said to be poverty, unemployment and a prostrate agriculture.

I may suggest that after seven years the problems of poverty, of unemployment and of agriculture have not been solved. True we have a munitions boom built on borrowed money. It is no economic rebuilding of the nation.

We can quickly prove that real recovery has not come. After seven years we have 10 million unemployed; we have 18 million people on government relief, we have several million farmers barely keeping above water by government subsidy; we have business living in a fictitious fever of military contracts, but underneath free enterprise is paralyzed with fear of these very powers; we have a deficit without hope of balance; we have increased the public debt by 25 billion; we have a country disunited and divided by class hate.

Is it not time that these gigantic powers be reviewed lest perchance this growth of power has been either futile or actually defeating its purpose?

Will that desperately needed review of these powers be made by surrender of the third-term check?

#### POWER POLITICS

Behind all these direct actions has been another and an even more sinister build-up of personal power in this Republic.

One characteristic of totalitarian government is that there is only one political party. The Nazi Party rules Germany, the Communist Party rules Russia, the Fascist Party rules Italy. And no one else is allowed to chirp. Herein the head of totalitarian government differs somewhat from the old-fashioned one-man dictator. He is a leader who compels his followers to follow.

The European leader has different departments for urging unanimity on his followers. They have a department of political machines made of office holders. These office holders control the loaves and fishes for everybody. They have a department of intimidation, with its final home a concentration camp. They have a purge department for those who object. They have a department of self-glorification. They have a department of hate. They have a department of emergencies. The leader must always be finding a new emergency when the old one wears out—like riding a bicycle he must keep going. The leader also holds to the doctrine of indispensability.

These European dictators also have a department of international power politics. And the grimmest fact of all is that each one of these totalitarians eventually has ended in war.

I do not suggest that the New Deal has copied these totalitarian tactics. It is probably only the coincidence of action among all those who build up personal power.

The New Deal has also developed a department of machine politics. They have mobilized about 1,000,000 federal and state officials who are allied with the New Deal party. And

these office holders are the power over the great shower of manna which must or may be rained on one-third of our unfortunate homes through relief or subsidies or government contracts.

And here let me inject an example of smearing – or worse. Last night Mr. Roosevelt said:

Back in 1932 these leaders were willing to let workers starve if they could not get a job.

He also said:

I consider it a public duty to denounce falsifications and state the facts.

So do I – and right now. The report of Mr. Roosevelt's own officials in the *Congressional Record* shows that when he took over the Administration there were over eighteen million people receiving systematic organized relief. They were being cared for. There is not one person in all the records of the nation recorded as having died of hunger or cold. That relief was organized during my administration and it was organized under non-political, non-corrupt local committees. What Mr. Roosevelt did was to destroy these non-political and non-corrupt organizations of the destitute and to centralize it in a Federal Bureaucracy, thereby making a gigantic political machine of it. And after seven years of abundant life and prosperity there are still eighteen million people on relief. The United States Senate rings with denunciation and proof of the misuse of relief.

Even some Democratic Senators revolted, and with Republican aid passed the Hatch Act in an effort to stop its misuse. But after all, that Act does not really control the individual officers in the political machine. To prove violation, you must catch more evidence than merely a hint passed out of the corner of some official's mouth or the activities of his wife.

And do I need recall the gigantic city machines built up and reinforced by Federal expenditures?

The New Deal party has also established an intimidation department. We do not have physical concentration camps but

the New Deal has erected a large number of intellectual concentration camps. You will recall one devoted to Corporations and other third-degree sweating of thousands of dollars for New Deal campaign books. You will recall the intimidations of the Labor Board. However the most widely established intellectual concentration camp is the one to which opponents are condemned through the highly developed art of smearing. And do I need recall that the New Deal has built power upon hate? Without semblances of trial men have been condemned to the intellectual jail as of "reactionary," "Nazi," "men opposed to national welfare."

In this building of power the New Deal party also has a self-glorification department. I need only point out the 1400 ex-newspapermen who are now in every bureau and department of government and whose job it is to propagate their special bureau or department by continuous print or on the air. That they work hard at it is evidenced by the fact that although the Government's franked mail, if it had to pay postage, averaged about \$9,000,000 per annum for the twelve years before the New Deal, it has now increased to over \$35,000,000, or about 600 per cent.

#### PURGE

I mentioned that the leader of these totalitarian parties in Europe has a gentle habit of purging any opponents who may arise in his own party. The New Deal established that department also. It is true that some indignation arose in the Democratic Party over this department. When the senatorial purge was on they used harder words than urbanity permits to me.

*The Atlanta Constitution* said: "He would turn the United States Senate into a gathering of Charley McCarthys with himself as Edgar Bergen."

*Charlotte (Va.) Observer*: "... A new Napoleon. . . . Crucifixion of the inherent liberties of the people."

*Norfolk (Va.) Dispatch*: "... a personal ambition for unquestioned power. . . ."

*Baltimore Sun*: "... an act of executive arrogance. . . ."

*Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle:* ". . . we must forget political independence as a thing dead and reconcile ourselves to complete dictation from the Chief Executive."

*New Orleans States:* "What right has Mr. Roosevelt to dictate to the people . . . how they shall vote?"

*Nashville (Tenn.) Banner:* ". . . the power drunk Chief Executive. . ."

*Lynchburg (Va.) Advance,* owned by Senator Glass, says:

"Are the people of the forty-eight states to select their representatives in Congress or is the President of the United States to perform that duty for them and thereby become a national dictator?"

If I understand these words they are intended to connote despotic tendencies.

#### FREE ELECTIONS

A few days ago Mr. Roosevelt sought to dismiss all this by the statement that "No dictator ever dared to run the gauntlet of a really free election." That is not the answer. The answer is that there can be no free election with such a political machine as the New Deal has created. Does any man believe that even today 10,000,000 households are not tied to this party by other forces than pure reason?

Do you want to give another four years of building up of a single undefeatable party? After four years more, then what? Does not the surrender of the third term tradition lead to a political machine which can elect to a fourth term or even a life term?

#### THE MORAL PROCESSES USED TO GAIN AND HOLD POWER

There is another method of building personal power in this Republic. It is an old enough phenomenon in democracies but never before has it been developed into so efficient a system.

Self-government is based on moral and spiritual concepts. The government must in itself represent the highest ideals of a people. If it fails it destroys the foundation of free government



Honesty is one of these concepts. There are three kinds of dishonesty in this world. There is money dishonesty. There is political dishonesty. There is intellectual dishonesty. The last is a term of politeness.

It was intellectual dishonesty that Lincoln referred to when he said you cannot fool all the people all the time. But it can be made into a system that will fool them long enough to bring them to disaster.

Now I can perhaps make myself clear by a few examples.

We had a good example last night. Mr. Roosevelt sought to defend his Administration by making a comparison between two economic periods. On one hand he picked out as the low point a world wide economic depression which was the inevitable aftermath of the World War. And on the other hand he took the high point of the present artificial munitions boom that is being created by gigantic spending of borrowed money. And he omitted some essential facts. He omitted to mention that the whole world was on the way to recovery before he was elected and that all democratic countries went straight on to recovery without a New Deal. Only we were set back. What was our first setback? That was when Mr. Roosevelt in violation of his solemn promise gave evidence he was going to tinker with currency and himself created a panic of bank depositors. Thus he made a new low point.

Now he chooses his own self-created low point as a basis for his comparisons. That is a variety of intellectual dishonesty usually referred to as statistical dishonesty. And this example is the worse as it has been publicly exploded a thousand times.

#### THE METHOD OF ATTACK ON THE SUPREME COURT

Another sample of grab for power by misrepresentation is indicated in the reasons given for packing the Supreme Court. I do not refer to the merits but to the reasons given for this action.

Again politeness by Republicans toward the President of the

United States limits their use of hard words. I have, however, some expressions from those who supported Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. Walter Lippmann's expressions include "trick," "lack of good faith," "lawless legality," "use of the letter to violate the spirit," "degrading," "misleading," "injures the moral foundations of the Republic."

The Democratic *New York Times* uses the words "political sharp practice."

The Democratic *Baltimore Sun* says "devious," "deceptive," "intent to deceive."

Some Democratic Senators used all the other synonyms— "unmoral reasons," "camouflage," "hypocrisy," etc. I could continue indefinitely these exclamations of pain from Democratic supporters. It would seem that at least they intend to connote undue personal power.

#### PSEUDOLIBERALISM

Another intellectual dishonesty that has been put over the country is that the New Deal represents Liberalism. Mr. Roosevelt scarcely ever makes an address that he does not refer to "we liberals." He summons all liberals to join him. Earl Browder and Harry Bridges were joiners for a long time. But you cannot be or make a liberal by just shouting "liberal" and denouncing everybody else as "reactionary." Even in these days the test of the Greatest Leader of humanity still holds. "By their fruits ye shall know them. Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?"

The thorns are a sort of totalitarian liberalism with a benevolent gadget. Those are the people who believe they can preserve civil liberty and do away with economic liberty. The thistles are intellectual dishonesty.

True Liberalism seeks all legitimate freedom in the confident belief that without such freedom the pursuit of all other blessings is in vain. The whole spirit of liberalism is to free men. It is not to set bounds to it by increasing the domination either of bureaucrats or economic groups.

By way of bureaucrats the New Deal has pinned 124 new bureaus and 500,000 more officials on the American people. Through the NRA and several other acts they tried to pin more economic tyranny upon us than exists even in Italy, where the model came from.

One of the great triumphs of true Liberalism was the independence of the Judiciary. Some appointments to the Supreme Court are about as liberal as Charles the First and Hanging Judge Jeffreys.

Another one of the triumphs of true Liberalism was the independence of the legislative arm. This yes yes manipulation of Congress has a counterpart in that great liberal George III.

Mr. Roosevelt one time repeated a well-known saying that increasing government debt was the rock upon which liberal governments are wrecked. He was talking about five billion then. When it becomes thirty billions it is not a rock, it is an investment and is Liberalism.

The real birth of the Liberal party in England came from the reform of the rotten borough elections. Hague, Kelly, and others sit in the high places at the New Deal.

I have already pointed out Mr. Roosevelt's own admission, "We have built up new instruments of power," which he admits "could prove shackles for the liberty of the people." Is that Liberalism?

The only definition of liberal they have adhered to is one in the dictionary which implies copious spending. But that dictionary definition implies spending one's own money.

I could collect some hard words on this pseudo liberalism from Democrats who were deserted by the New Deal but I shall not take your time. Anyway they are the same words as those applied to the Supreme Court transaction.

#### OTHER INTELLECTUAL DISHONESTIES

And the overall piece of intellectual dishonesty is the effort to cover up all this building up of personal power and the drift to National Socialism by ceaseless denunciation of everybody and sundry as Nazis and Fascists.

I could go on with example after example of this particular method of building personal power in the Republic, but there is not time tonight.

Money dishonesty is less destructive to democracy than intellectual dishonesty. We can put people in jail for money dishonesty. But intellectual and political dishonesty poisons the minds of the people. It degenerates every standard of truth. We cannot put people in jail for it. We have the laborious job of putting them out of public office.

Do you not think we should hold to the third term tradition as a check on the building up of this kind of power over the minds of the people?

#### THE DRAFT OF MR. ROOSEVELT FOR A THIRD TERM

Within the last 90 days we have seen the supreme demonstration of all this varied method of building personal power. You recollect the spontaneity of the third term nomination by the last New Deal Convention. It demonstrated an unparalleled grasp for personal power in the Republic. It demonstrated that a political machine has been built for personal power. It demonstrated the high art of fooling the people. Here again the urbanity of debate leads me to leave the descriptive words to Mr. Roosevelt's onetime supporters. Surely when they exclaim in great pain they are likely to be both truthful and violent. As I have said, they are by their nature more used to hard words than Republicans.

But before I come to their remarks let us recall again the scene at that convention in Chicago. Beginning last March, a number of states held Democratic primaries for President. The Jeffersonian Democrats wanted an open convention openly arrived at. If Mr. Roosevelt had not wanted a third term he could have withdrawn his name from those primaries with a ten word telegram and had an open convention. He did not. Then a member of Mr. Roosevelt's cabinet went early to Chicago. He was Mr. Roosevelt's most intimate friend. He lived actually

in the White House. I don't suppose they ever discussed the third term. And Mr. Hopkins sat in smoke filled rooms, urging leaders, telephoning the White House hourly. Madame Secretary Perkins describes the scene of the convention as having the air of a prayer meeting. I rejoice to know that these officeholders were engaged in prayer. It was especially gratifying to see Mrs. Perkins, Mr. Hopkins, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Kelly and Mr. Hague all sitting together on the stage engaged in prayer. You will recollect that down in the cellar of the Convention Hall a gentleman who held the office of Superintendent of Sewers in the Kelly-Nash machine hooked in on the loud-speaker system. His job was to yell spontaneously at all times that this state or that demanded Roosevelt. Some of the state delegates were obviously surprised at the news. Once in a while he slipped in a yell that "Mayor Kelly wants Roosevelt." Here he was on truthful ground. A press dispatch observed that this deathless voice from the sewers would echo down the corridors of time. Mr. Hopkins must have been surprised by this voice of the people. Anyway they said Mr. Roosevelt was drafted.

#### WHAT DO DEMOCRATS SAY?

Now let us see what Mr. Roosevelt's former supporters say about this transaction.

Raymond Clapper, a most earnest New Dealer, present at the Convention, quotes Mr. Roosevelt's message to the Convention that he "has never had and has not today any desire or purpose to continue in office or to be a candidate," etc. Mr. Clapper continues, "I simply do not believe that. ... I don't believe that statement is the truth. Up to that message I had faith in Mr. Roosevelt. I have so no longer." He moans that "something has gone out of public life."

My own view is that something came into it eight years ago.

I must not take your time with a multitude of other quotations I have collected. But among the journalists who supported Mr. Roosevelt in previous elections I find such expressions

as "machine politics," "a job holders' job," "debasement of party organization," "synthetic," "power draft," "spurious call," "fraud," "hypocrisy," "trend to dictatorship," "imperils the nation's free institutions and menaces democracy," "same argument equally good for life term," "they want power at the price of democracy." All of which shows that we Republicans understate the case.

After that exhibit of grasp for personal power do you want to abandon the one check upon it?

#### CONCLUSION

To sum up – it is not only a tradition against a third term about which we are concerned. We are concerned with a vital check upon the rise of personal power in the Republic. There has been a gigantic and insidious building up of personal power of the President during these two terms. The President himself admits these powers provide shackles upon liberty which may be dangerous. Many of these extraordinary powers have been obtained under claims of emergencies which proved not to exist or to have expired. Despite many promises, there has been no return of these dangerous powers or the unused powers, or those which proved futile or for which emergencies have passed. In building up these powers the independence of the Supreme Court, the Congress and the local government has been degraded. Methods of intellectual dishonesty have been used in creating this personal power. A political machine has been built which places all free election in jeopardy. An economic system is being created which drifts steadily away from free men and free enterprise down the suicide road of National Socialism. Under assumptions of personal power we are steadily drifting toward war. And one result of the use of these powers has been to stifle the restoration of productive employment, and a prosperous agriculture, and to involve the peace of the American people.

And may I add a personal word to my countrymen? During these last 25 years I have been an intimate witness to these

forces in nations which endanger the lives, the security and the freedom of those who cannot protect themselves – the great mass of ordinary people. I have had to deal with these destructive floods in many nations. I have seen the dikes which protect the rights and security of men become soft and have seen crevasses break through the protective levies, pouring disaster and revolution before them. The homes, the savings, the jobs of workers, the farmers, all become engulfed in the flood of destitution and poverty. The ideals of nations and peoples are carried away. I do not say these things will finally overwhelm America. I believe that somewhere somehow the floods which bring these horrors will be stopped. But if they are to be stopped it must be by holding the dikes strong. Our dikes are weaker and softer today than ever before in our history. Now is the time to strengthen, not to weaken, these embankments. You can give that needed strength only by holding strong to this unwritten provision in our constitution against the rise of personal power in our Republic.

We are almost the last stand in this world today of representative government under which only limited powers rest in any man's hand. If we are to make sure that kind of government is not to perish we must do it here and now by the election of Wendell Willkie.

## The Major Issues

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

[*November 1, 1940*]

I AM PROUD of the graciousness of your welcome. I am especially proud to be presented to this meeting by Mrs. Mattel on behalf of Pro America. The devotion of this great national women's organization and the other women's organizations of the country to the support of Mr. Willkie is without parallel in our national elections. It is indeed evidence of the seriousness of the crisis in which we are involved. We are nearly to the end of the campaign.

I do wish the New Dealers would get up a new speech for the use of their barnstormers in this campaign. Their speeches have a standardized form. Maybe they all go back to the same ghost.

They always start with copious tears as to the state of the country in 1933. They naturally omit that the country was in a temporary depression, the price of our last war through the inevitable financial collapse of Europe. And they carefully omit that the country was on the way to recovery before the election of 1932 and the new low point they themselves created in a panic of bank depositors. That was the result of the disclosure of Mr. Roosevelt's intention to tinker with the currency in violation of his promise only two months old. Then they quote statistics from their self-created low point as to how good and happy we have got since. Without that self-created low point they would not even be able to get these speeches started.

Then we come to that section where the New Deal has the monopoly of humanity and liberalism. They set up glorious



social and human objectives with which we all agree. Then they answer our charge that they are not driving toward their claimed high objective, but over a precipice. The answer is to denounce the opposition as persons opposed to all human rights and having no belief in Heaven itself. They sorrowfully announce we are "reactionary," that we are the tools of Satan or of Wall Street. From that premise we are the enemy of all mankind.

Then they have an economic section of the speech devoted to the glories of making one blade of grass grow where two grew before. Or on how much better it is to be on the WPA than a wage slave in industry at twice the wages.

Then we come to fiscal policies and the glorious investment value of the deficit. Here they indicate that there is murder of women and children in the hearts of all those who suggest that the money has in part gone to the politicians and to get votes rather than for human compassion.

Then there is the section devoted to foreign relations by which everybody else is a Nazi, an appeaser or a Fifth Columnist and that they themselves have had preparedness on order for a long time but kept it confidential.

And if you wait long enough you come to the peroration. It consists of many words but of one idea. That idea is that there is but one man in the United States who is indispensable. They affirm that he was spontaneously drafted for a Third Term by a Convention in prayer.

Now that we have heard this a thousand times will they please put somebody up to debate the way out of our national confusion?

How are we going to stop this steady drift to National Socialism within our own borders and substitute an economy based on faith—not upon fear?

How are we to stop the growth of dangerous personal power in this Republic by abandoning forever the great unwritten law against a third term?

How are we going to restore the dynamic forces in our country that will put 9,000,000 unemployed to productive jobs,

build up a market for agriculture, and enable us to carry the burdens of armament?

How are we going to avoid inflation and bankruptcy with this continued spending and thereby the destruction of every social service?

How do they propose to organize this country so that it does not continue to stutter over preparedness?

How are we going to stop this continued drift toward war?

There are a lot of other questions we might discuss, such as what are we going to do with 20 billions of sterile gold? Or how are we going to stop the poison to agriculture in these reciprocal tariffs? Or protect America from competition with impoverished Europe? Or how are we going to restore morals in government?

As the standard New Deal speech naturally does not touch upon these subjects I will try to help out by dealing with some of them. And I shall review only the transcendent issues before us. Never in 80 years has this nation faced such momentous decisions.

#### THE NEW DEAL PHILOSOPHY

One transcendent issue today is to preserve the freedom of men and women in America. For upon that rests the chance of America to solve all these other problems. We are on the road that has led a dozen nations into totalitarian government. And National Socialism is not even rule by the state; it is rule by one man in the name of the state.

Just eight years ago in closing the presidential campaign of 1932, I said:

"This campaign is more than a contest between two men. It is more than a contest between two parties. It is a contest between two philosophies of government."

I stated that the proposed New Deal was not a change which comes from constant reform of the American system of life. I stated that we must have strong reforms in business and greater security in life to the great mass of our people. I insisted that the New Deal principles would in the end build up dangerous

personal power, that this philosophy would lead to the regimentation of men. I spoke of the stifling of free enterprise, free labor and the defeat of recovery. I insisted that this was the road to the defeat of Liberalism and Liberty. I pointed out that the kind of men advising Mr. Roosevelt were men publicly advocating European philosophies of government. I spoke of the destruction of the spiritual energies of our people. I urged that what the nation needed was not abandonment of our system of liberty but its regeneration.

I was urged not to deliver that speech. I was told it could not happen here. I was told I was crying in the wilderness of unbelief. I did not expect it would be believed by the majority of our people. I knew also that I was about to go into the wilderness anyway. And I have been delivering it ever since. During these seven years that warning has proved an understatement. Millions of people have now come to understand that it is the governmental philosophy of a people that makes the jobs, the prosperity, and the moral strength of the nation.

Tonight you will forgive my satisfaction that at last this has been realized as the issue of America. Mr. Willkie has taken up that torch. He stated:

"The fundamental issue of this campaign is the preservation of democracy. If we are to save democracy we must save the roots of democracy. We must save the philosophy. That is the battle of America."

I am aware that these questions of liberty and freedom of men can be dismissed as abstractions. I am told they are beyond the grasp of the people. In about 1776 the American people fought and died for exactly that abstraction. And they understood what they were dying for.

#### NEW DEAL DRIFT TOWARD NATIONAL SOCIALISM

The New Deal started with three economic ideas. First, the whole American system was a wreck and wrong and must be made over. Second, new frontiers of enterprise were gone and the job was to divide the existing pot. Third, the Federal Government

should be exalted to control of economic life. They adopted ideas of "planned economy," or "economic planning," from Europe.

You will find all of these economic ideas somewhere along the Berlin-Rome-Moscow axis. And to force these ideas on America you have seen attempts to control our Courts, to control our Congress, to control our elections, to control our public opinion with mass propaganda and slogans, and finally to demand a third term. All that at least has a pronounced odor of totalitarian government.

You cannot mix these ideas into a society of free men and women.

Are men free when there is political manipulation of currency, credit, wages, prices and production? Does free enterprise consist of the government in business in competition with the citizen? Are men made free by changing regulations to prevent abuses by a minority of bad men into dictation to good men as to conduct of their business? Are farmers free men when it is dictated to them what they can sow and reap?

They have driven our economy on fear, not upon faith, upon tied men, not free men.

To catch the cockroaches in the cellars of the temple of free enterprise, they are tearing out the foundations of the temple.

Certainly the New Deal System produces profound mysteries.

There is the mystery of how you can produce less and still have more. There is the mystery of how you can raise the costs of production and thus prices and how the people will then buy more. There is the mystery of buying all the loose gold and silver in the world, then burying it in the ground at Fort Knox and West Point. That sounds like the old method of curing rheumatism by carrying a potato in the pocket.

There is the mystery of letting down our tariff on farm products. The foreign farmer sells beef to us, so another foreigner will have more money to buy our surplus beef. The foreigner was grateful and complimented us highly on our good neighbor policy.

This Tower of Babel, called Confused Economy, certainly never reached to Heaven. But like the people of Babel, the speech of men is confused and their energies scattered.

The end result was to fix depression as a chronic way of American life. This munitions boom may obscure it momentarily. But the consequences are inevitable. It is only by a change in national direction that there lies the moral as well as the economic regeneration of America.

Mr. Willkie has been bravely crusading from one end of this country to the other, demanding a change of national direction back to free men. That issue would be enough for one campaign, but there are others.

#### THE THIRD TERM

I spoke at length last week on the third term. I shall not repeat that argument again. But Mr. Roosevelt in his various addresses this past week persists in trying to divert the third term issues to a fight of the 1932 campaign over again. All right. I am glad to have him raise that matter. I have a better right than any one in this country to ask him a few questions about that campaign. And it has an important bearing on Mr. Roosevelt's claims for an election to a third term. But that bearing does not lead us quite in the direction he intends.

Would Mr. Roosevelt have been elected in 1932 if he had frankly stated that he would spend and spend until he had increased the cost of government by 150 per cent, and would have raised the national debt to over 50 billion?

Would he have been elected if he had not denied my specific charge in that campaign that he would repudiate government obligations and tinker with the currency or if he had admitted he would devalue the dollar?

Would he have been elected if he had not replied in answer to my charges with a specific promise that he would not attempt to subjugate the Supreme Court?

Would he have been elected if he had stated an intention to reduce the Congress to pusillanimity?

Would he have been elected if he had promised to build up our modest 560,000 civil employees to a 1,100,000, by creation of new boards, bureaus and bureaucrats?

Would he have been elected if he had frankly stated that he intended to build up the most gigantic political machine in American history?

Do you think he would have been elected had the American people been promised the hard way – the only way – to recovery instead of white rabbits from a hat?

Would he have been elected if he had frankly admitted our charges that he intended to build up personal power in this republic until in his own words it shackled our liberties?

Would he have been elected if he had not denied the charges that he would transform American life with a mixture of National Socialism?

Would he have been elected if he had proposed to abandon the whole Republican program of constructive peace to engage in foreign power politics and thereby build up not only distrust and hate for America but a gigantic military pressure alliance on us and thereby bring us steadily toward war?

Do you remember what Mr. Roosevelt actually said in 1932 and actually promised about all of these things and about many others?

Are the promises of 1940 to be given any more credibility? For instance, to keep us out of war?

I will not refer to the despicable smearing of that campaign which is again today being directed against Mr. Willkie.

Can even Mr. Roosevelt or any of his political adherents contend that the campaign of 1932 was honestly won?

And there are other things about 1932 in Mr. Roosevelt's speeches during the last few days that bear upon his indispensability to the American people. These questions lie in the field of intellectual dishonesty. I stated the other night that this was a form of politeness. I will give you a few samples just to illustrate. The other night Mr. Roosevelt implied with sorrow that the price of corn was 10 cents a bushel and that wheat was 20 cents a bushel under the Republican administration. He

referred to other prices which in traveling I am not able to check. But in September 1932, before the slump caused through fear of Mr. Roosevelt's election, the price of wheat was 60 cents a bushel at Chicago, so he was only 300 per cent wrong about that. Corn was 34 1/2 cents, so that he was only 345 per cent wrong about that.

Mr. Roosevelt in these speeches is still making excuses for himself for failures in preparedness by claims of the weakness of national defense under Republicans. I could point out that Republicans helped to keep the face of the world toward peace, that America was not hated or distrusted and did not have an enemy in the world; that we had saved billions from the backs of those who toil by our international agreements limiting the size of the navies; that our navy was equal to the greatest other navy in the world. I could remind you that military strength is relative to other nations and that our relative strength effectively protected our country. But let that pass. We will examine Mr. Roosevelt's own actions and his own figures.

In the 1932 campaign, Mr. Roosevelt promised to reduce expenditures on defense by 25 per cent. At least he implied that. And when he came into office he did perform a part of that one promise, for in the year 1934 he reduced the Republican preparedness program by \$100,000,000, including 50 per cent reduction of the army airplane construction. He certainly moved that "weakness" in preparedness forward into his own administration. He certainly weakened it.

In 1933 there were 135,000 officers and men in the regular army. In 1935 – although Hitler had come into power two years before – at the same time as Mr. Roosevelt – the army was still 135,000 officers and men. So that weak point moves forward away from the Republicans.

In 1939 when this World War started the army had been increased only 50,000 to 185,000. And six months ago the Chief of Staff went before the Senate Committee and said that he had only 75,000 men fully equipped for modern war. It would appear that this weak point is becoming distressingly far away from the Republican administration.

Mr. Roosevelt has built up the navy, but not as much as his speech the other night would imply. He said in that speech that he had increased the navy from 193 "commissioned" ships to 337 "commissioned" ships. That implied an 80 per cent increase in the navy. The weasel word is "commissioned." The obscurity is the size of the ships that have been commissioned.

We Republicans had a host of destroyers and other small ships tied to the wharf in order to save their operating expenses but they could have been "commissioned" any day that war turned up. Parts of them are in the fifty destroyers that are so valuable to the British. The strength of a navy is the fighting ships. In 1933 we had fourteen battleships in the water. We have fourteen today. In 1933 we had three aircraft carriers and one nearly completed. Today we have five in the water. In 1933 we had seven large cruisers largely advanced in construction – he is able to "commission" them.

The Statistical Abstract published by Mr. Roosevelt's administration shows that we had available fighting ships to a total of about 1,100,000 tons when he took office as against about 1,350,000 tons today. And we had 90,000 tons more in actual construction. You will notice that is an increase of fighting ships in the water of about 25 per cent. That is not 80 per cent.

In Mr. Roosevelt's lively crusade for bigger and better production of falsifications, he quotes me as complaining of his military expenditures in the following words: "We shall be spending \$900,000,000 more than any other nation on earth." That is about 20 per cent right. I said \$200,000,000. And that was the fact, when it was said in 1938. But he does not interpret my complaint quite right. I am guilty of complaining frequently that we are not getting our money's worth. That is obvious from the testimony of the Chief of Staff before the Senate Committee. And my further complaint is that we are spending blindly without a defined foreign policy to defend. It is a different thing to build up an expeditionary force to go to Europe or Asia from that required for the defense of the Western Hemisphere. And that has not been defined yet – at least not publicly.



I have brought out this discussion for only one reason. I want to suggest to you that "indispensability" qualifications should include intellectual honesty. And I want to suggest to you that it should include a record as to fidelity to promises.

It is with some apology that I interrupt a discussion upon the fate of a nation to mention that part of Mr. Roosevelt's recent address in which he implied that I had talked of two chickens in a pot—I never said that. So that he can cease his anxiety over the weight of this in the future of the world.

Mr. Roosevelt also referred to my remark in 1932 about grass growing in the streets and the fields. I did say that. In his address, however, he omitted the context. I said it would happen if Mr. Roosevelt imposed the tariff reductions he was promising in that campaign. He did not keep that promise either. In fact he has actually increased some tariff items. He has reduced some others enough to set grass growing in the fields of the West that ought to be growing sugar beets and other crops. Also he has had the W.P.A. busy cutting down the grass. But we will let that pass. It is small stuff for discussion by a President of the United States when a world is on fire and when a nation is in chaos.

I will return to our discussion of that part of this great crisis relating to his arrogant demand for a third term. Incidentally, Mr. Ickes promises there will be no fourth term.

I listened the other night to an elaborate explanation of how times have changed since Jefferson's famous statement on the third term. The chief excuse was that Hitler was now around. Does it occur to you that Napoleon was around about in Jefferson's time—and was creating just as much trouble? Jefferson did not believe that a dictator in Europe necessitated one in the U. S.

But let me give emphasis to the fight we are making for a free election.

According to the Department of Labor there are about 4,500,000 persons on the Federal payroll through all its agencies. You add to this other millions receiving subsidies and contracts. This is the American form of the Praetorian Guard of

Ancient Rome. That political band had exactly similar habits in making elections foolproof. It was also active in the decline and fall of the morals of the Roman Empire. The New Deal has, however, improved the Roman practice. The millions of their political employees are the officers of an army of wives and cousins and aunts. And in addition there are the allied armies of Hague, Flynn, Kelly and Nash.

Lest this should appear to be biased from me, let me quote from Democratic sources. One Senator says: "Those who believe that out in the counties and in the cities and in the precincts this instrumentality [relief] which we have set up is not being used for political purposes are more credulous than I am." Another Democratic Senator describing conditions in certain Democratic primaries says: "These facts should arouse the conscience of the country. They imperil the right of the people to a free and unpolluted ballot."

Do you think that in another four years you would have a chance to defeat such a presidential power for himself or his successor?

Mr. Willkie by character and temperament is no seeker for personal power. His dominant hope is public service.

#### SPENDING

One of the other great issues of this campaign relates to the 300 per cent increase in our taxes, the huge deficits, the immense debt, the buying of most of the gold and silver in the world and thereby making it daily less valuable. These policies have only one end. That is inflation, devaluation and finally bankruptcy. And at this point not only are the people impoverished but all the social services build up over the last fifty years would have to go into the waste heap.

Mr. Willkie's is not the kind of mentality that promotes such policies. His constant insistence is to get this economic machine functioning, to produce, to give jobs, to make a market for farm products in full stomachs instead of half full stomachs, build up national income, and create the production out of which taxes can

be paid and deficits overcome. And above all, to open the windows of hope to American youth.

This alone would be sufficient issue for one campaign.

#### FOREIGN EXPERIENCE IN OUR ISSUES

For the consequences of all these policies we do not need to look alone to our own New Deal failure.

The world today is a vast laboratory of such experiments and we can see how they came out in the end. We can shortly examine three of them—Great Britain, which has no New Deal, and France and Germany, each of which had one.

#### BRITISH EXPERIENCE

Great Britain has the same economic system of free enterprise that we have. They have fewer natural resources. They are five times more dependent upon the vicissitudes of foreign trade than we are. They were subject to the same worldwide depression in 1929 to 1932 as we were.

The whole world began to recover in the spring of 1932 as the result of sane policies of a Republican administration at home and in co-operation with other nations abroad. But we adopted the New Deal six months after the tide of recovery had turned. The British would have none of it. What was the result?

In 1934, one year later, the British had recovered their employment to the 1929 level. We were still 15 per cent below it. In 1937 the British more than recovered. We lagged along 18 per cent behind them. In 1929 the British national income stood at 19 billion dollars. Our income was 80 billion dollars. In 1934, the British were back again to 100 per cent at 19 billion dollars. Our income was 50 billion dollars, or 47 per cent behind. In 1937, theirs was 24 billion dollars or up 25 per cent above pre-depression. Ours never got back. In 1939, we were still behind pre-depression. The major difference between the two countries was a New Deal and no New Deal.

We can further expand these comparisons. If we eliminate the totalitarian countries and the French, who adopted our New Deal with similar disastrous results, we find that of fourteen democratic nations with economic systems like ours, all fourteen had fully recovered to the 1929 level by 1937 except the United States. In fact, ten of them were from 6 per cent to over 40 per cent above the 1929 level, while we were 15 per cent below. Again they had no New Deal. We had one.

I might mention that the other night Mr. Roosevelt gave some comparisons of the present munitions boom with the boom of 1929. But to make it look right he had to use a new index number lately invented by the New Deal. If he had used the old index numbers, it would have told a different story. But, of course, we must have a new deal in the multiplication table to prove the New Deal.

#### FRENCH EXPERIENCE

In the year 1936 Leon Blum became Premier of France. He was the leader of the amalgamated left-wingers. Their mission was to save France by making it over. They also had a fine resolve, even if they had to tear out the foundations, to drive all the cockroaches out of the cellars of the temple. Their economic theory was to divide up the existing pot instead of putting more into it. To help along they fed the people with speeches stimulating class hatred.

At once Mr. Blum went on a spree of laws to correct every evil and to do evil to everybody he did not like. Seventy laws— the *must* sort—were rushed through Parliament in two months. These laws were the same that have been imposed on us. They set up the same economic dictation in the name of regulation and reform, the same controls of money, credit, prices, wages, and production. They were busy dividing a shrinking national wealth instead of producing wealth. They built up class hate. It resulted in the same huge deficit and swelled the national debt. It was truly a parable of the foolish Utopians. They neglected home defense,

Business crept into the storm cellar, unemployment increased.

And Blum stared Hitler in the face just across the fence and ignored every warning. The output of military planes dropped to about 100 a month. The Germans were making 1000 a month.

Mr. Roosevelt and the totalitarian "liberals" in the United States purred with satisfaction. It was a splendid confirmation of the New Deal. The New Deal creed was spreading over the earth. It was announced that Mr. Blum was to come to the United States and be given a great reception.

France is a compact country. Its economic life is simpler than ours. It has less fat on its bones than we have. It reacts much quicker to every economic force. Under its New Deal the vitality of France sank steadily. It became a very sick nation. Stalin and the French Communists supported Blum hopefully. Hitler no doubt looked on sardonically. Finally Blum fell. The two years of his successor before the present war were too short a time to rebuild the moral, economic and military strength of the nation. And France crumpled up at the spot where twenty years before she made the most heroic stand of history.

We today are a sick nation. How sick we do not know. Fortunately we shall not be likely to receive a blow on our sickbed as did France. Hitler is 3000 ocean miles away instead of across the fence. We still have a chance to recover and build defense. But we need to change doctors.

#### GERMAN EXPERIENCE

After the last war the Germans established a Republic. In the course of time they met with all the war aftermaths of economic difficulty. They also had economic planners. In their Republic there arose starry-eyed men who believed they could plan and force the economic life of the people better than the people themselves. They mixed into a system of free enterprise all the acts of our New Dealers long before the New Deal was born. These men thought they were liberals. They thought

you could do all these things to a people and preserve civil liberty. They ignored the fact that the driving power of free men was initiative and enterprise. They too produced the same consequences as always in unemployment and stagnation. They had other troubles from without their borders but this was the worst. But their destiny was different. Frustrated and confused, their people voluntarily voted the whole power of government to Hitler. They did it in the hope of preserving themselves from want and poverty. They did it in the hopes of national defense. And they awoke to a military despotism with an economic system based wholly on force. Their civil liberties were drowned in a sea of brutality, and war was their destiny. We can make sure we do not travel that suicide road.

#### PEACE OR WAR

The fourth dominant issue in this campaign is peace or war. Last night at Lincoln I developed the extreme dangers toward which this administration was leading us. I do not need to impress them further upon your minds on this occasion. Serious as they are they are being used to blackout the domestic failures of this administration.

Indeed most of our thinking is about Europe. We need to think about the United States part of the time. The Republic cannot be destroyed by attacks from abroad. It can be destroyed from degeneration within. We must have a change in direction not alone upon peace and war but upon the whole basis of our national life.

#### CONCLUSION

I can speak from some knowledge as to the sort of man America today needs in the White House. I have experienced the winds which blow through its halls. I have enjoyed the friendship of five Presidents. I have for a quarter of a century known intimately the flow of pressures, of emotions, of demands that press upon Presidents from every quarter of our country and abroad.

The first requisites of a President of the United States are intellectual honesty and sincerity. Those Mr. Willkie possesses. The second requirement is intelligence. That Mr. Willkie has abundantly. The third requirement is executive ability. That includes the ability to choose honest and able men. Mr. Willkie has demonstrated that in his life work.

Beyond these qualities there is something more that America needs in the White House right now.

The world is in mad confusion. It has survived these confusions before. And the life of peoples has grown greater spiritually and in living. But how? Because some men stood solid. They stood not because they knew the solution to all these confusions, not even because they had the power in themselves to find solution. They stood because they held to certain principles.

America needs a man who is truly devoted to the American Dream. That is a nation of free men—a nation of peace. It is the attitude of a President to the great principles of America that counts. If he truly believes in free men then a thousand of today's confusions find solution. If he truly believes in peace then peace will not be lost except by wanton attack upon us. If he truly believes in the dynamic future of America he will bring it back to production, to prosperity. He will heal the confusions of insecurity and poverty with plenty.

# Index

- Abbeville, 31  
Abuses, 172, 194, 208, 209, 212, 244; European, 169; of minorities, 226  
Adams, Ephraim D., 196  
Adventure, 26, 176, 186  
Africa, 15, 80, 122, 136  
Aggression, 16, 36, 40, 41, 42, 82, 109, 111, 187, 218; economic, 15, 59; eighteenth century, 96; wars of, 108  
Aggressive arms, 37, 38  
Aggressor nations, 5, 106, 180, 192; World War, 107  
Agreements, food, *see* Food relief; international, *see* International agreements  
Agriculture, 19, 47, 165, 170, 201, 223, 2a8, 242; and defense, 10, 12, 16; industrial uses, 181, 185; and New Deal, 34, 206, 216, 238, 242; surpluses, 18, 153; war, 18, 60, 70, 110, 134, 147; *see also* Farmers  
Agriculture, Department of, 134, 158  
Air-attack, abolition of, 37; on America, 4, 44, 45, 91, 92, 105; European war, 31, 32, 49, 74, 80, 81, 83, 130, 180; on shipping, 81, 89, 91, 141; on warships, 91, 92  
Airbases, 4, 45, 78  
Aircorps, American, 50, 216, 217; Chief of, 6  
Air defense, 46, 80, 81, 180, 186  
Airplanes, American, 6, 8, 36, 44, 45, 82, 83, 99, 247, 248; British, 83, 84, 89, 104; German, 45, 78, 80; French, 84  
Airpower, 80, 92, 131; and seapower, 87, 90, 92  
Albert, King of Belgians, 28  
Albert Canal, 29  
Allies, European, 5, 220; Belgian campaign, 29-33; munitions orders, 6; World War, 72, 109, 124  
Altruism, 127, 195  
America, capacities of, 11, 13, 86, 219; and Communism, 38, 94, 95; contrast with Europe, 108, 171, 172; defined, 53, 222; enemies of, 36, 43, 247; future of, 172, 190, 195, 225, 255; goodwill to, 36, 154, 159, 160, 217; humanity, 53; postwar, 62, 95, 178, 180; and propaganda, 190, 198; racial stocks of, 52, 103, 132, 145, 154, 176; and Russian recognition, 39, 94, 104; and Socialism, 110; and totalitarianism, 59, 96; *see also* Army, American; Navy, American; New Deal; Roosevelt  
America, Revolutionary, 96, 243  
America and European War, attack-threat, 202; by Germany, 4, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 51, 80, 88, 91, 92, 105, 219; by Japan, 79, 81, 89, 90, 91, 92, 100; Napoleonic, 112; American boys in, 42, 75, 79, 82, 93, 95, 101, 103, 106, 110, 111, 113, 173, 220; entry into, 16, 35, 40, 41, 49, 61, 63, 64, 66, 75, 76, 77, 78, 81, 82, 83, 84, 89, 93, 95, 97, 98, 99, 101, 103, 106, 107, 114, 145, 202, 219, 220; drift to, 49, 51, 87, 88, 106, 202, 238, 242, 246; European hope of, 41, 43; promises against, 61, 77, 88, 202; reluctance to, 41, 50, 88, 202; urging to, 43, 47, 48, 50, 66, 87, 88, 101, 114, 221; *see also* Army and Navy; Britain, aid to; Defense; Preparedness; War, European  
America, South, *see* South America  
*American Mercury*, 165 ff.  
American responsibility, for freedom, 101, 102, 111, 113; for world peace, 75, 98, 102, 110, 113, 221; for relief, 121, 125, 131, 145, 151, 153, 154, 156, 160, 221; *see also* Food-relief  
American System, 194, 242, 243  
American War Council, 9  
Ames, Fisher, 112  
Antwerp, 29, 30  
Appeasers, 42, 56, 241; of Russia, 40  
Ardennes, 29  
Armament, 16, 18, 19, 179; cost of, 186, 242; *see also* Defense; Munitions  
Armies, mechanized, 5  
Armistice, 45, 72, 109  
Arms limitation, 6, 7, 71, 217, 247; Geneva Conference on, 37, 38; naval, 6-7, 218, 247; *see also* Disarmament  
Army, American, 6, 8, 45, 46, 86, 99, 105, 247; Chief of Staff on, 6, 247, 248; equipment of, 8, 9, 10, 12, 64, 83, 219; expeditionary force, 78, 79, 80, 82, 92, 248; Britain on, 84, 99; Roosevelt on, 77, 88, 202  
Army and Navy, American, 7, 10, 50; expenditures on, 5, 7, 8, 11, 216, 217,



- 247, 248; planes for, 9; pre-war, 36; *see also* Aircorps
- Arnold, General, 217
- Arsenal, 88; America as, 100
- Art, 52, 54, 108, 211
- Asia, 49, 51, 114, 202, 206, 218, 348; and power politics, 41, 43
- Atlantic, 44, 47, 91, 105, 219; shooting war in, 100; Statement, 106
- Atomic structure, 183, 184
- Australia, 45
- Axis, 36, 78, 81, 91, 92, 101; *see also* Food relief; Germany; Italy; Japan
- Balkan States, 118, 135, 142, 143
- Ballot, 201
- Bank deposits, 57
- Bank panic, 38, 233
- Bankruptcy, 74, 85, 242, 250
- Barter, 17, 18, 25
- Baruch, Bernard, 10
- Bases, enemy, 4, 13, 45, 47, 219
- Battle of Belgium, 29-33
- Battle of England, 124
- Beauty, 26, 187, 193
- Belgian Educational Foundation, 33
- Belgian Pavilion, World's Fair, 3
- Belgians, 3, 28, 33, 122; in America, 120, 125, 145
- Belgium, American Minister to, 140; army of, 27-33; cabinet, 27, 32; campaign, 27-33; conquest of, 38, 95, 218; fugitive government, 33, 143, 158, 159; neutrality, 28; and totalitarian liberalism, 171; *see also* Food-relief, Belgium
- Berlin-Rome-Moscow axis, 244
- Bessarabia, 40, 134
- Biologists, 194-195
- Bismarck*, 90
- Blitzkrieg, 38
- Blockade, 81, 84, 92, 106, 128, 130, 147; of Germany, 80; *see also* Food Relief; European War; World War
- Blocs, 168
- Bloom, Sol, 63
- Blum, Premier Leon, 13, 171, 209, 252, 253
- Boards, government, 172; for defense, 10, 11, 12, 46, 57, 100, 219
- Bombing, *see* Air-attack
- Boom, of 1929, 252; munitions, 228, 233, 245
- Boundaries, racial, 108
- Boys' Clubs, 174-7
- Branner, John Caspar, 189
- Breadstuffs, *see* Food-relief
- Bridges, Harry, 234
- Britain, 9, 44, 56, 75, 119, 128, 209; aid to, 50, 57, 61, 63, 64, 66, 74, 78, 79, 82, 83, 84, 88, 89, 90, 100, 101, 105, 113, 154; air attack, 81; army, 27-32; Battle of Crete, 90; Belgian neutrality, 28; defense by, 16, 45, 47, 90, 93, 104, 124, 157; employment, 171, 251; evacuation, 32; and Finland, 136; food for, 80, 83, 90, 92, 141, 148, 154; *see also* Food-relief; freedom of the seas, 106; invasion of, 45, 80, 84, 92, 112; and Japan, 90; labor of, 90, 171; Liberal Party, 235; manpower, 84; Minister of Economic Warfare, 134; Munich Pact, 42; Napoleonic, 112; Parliament, 63; peace-making, 71, 109; re-arming of, 7; and recovery, 251; and *Robin Moor*, 97; and Russia, 93; and totalitarian liberalism, 171, 209; trade, foreign, 251; *see also* America and war entry; Food-relief; War, European
- British blockade, *see* Food-relief; European War; World War
- British Navy, 5, 83, 84, 89, 90, 113, 141; American ships for, 89, 113; capture of, 45, 47, 80, 92
- British Prime Minister, 37, 140, 149
- Browder, Earl, 234
- Brown, Arthur, 196
- Brussels, 124, 139
- Budget, balanced, 211
- Building, 211
- Bulgaria, 135
- Bullitt, William, 47, 48
- Bureaucracy, 10, 12, 170, 210, 230, 234, 235, 246; economic, 208; post-war, 73, propaganda, 231
- Business, 70, 226, 228, 242; defense, 10, 70; European, 169, 209, 252, 253; New Deal, 12, 13, 172, 206, 244
- Cabinet, Roosevelt, 43, 47, 87; coalition, 203; at Democratic convention, 237; war talk by, 87
- Cabinets, European coalition, 202
- Cassars, rise of, 171
- Campaign books, New Deal, 231
- Campaign, Presidential, of 1932, 242, 245, 246, 247, 249; of 1940, 14, 34, 35, 213, 240; issues of, 205, 250; peace-promises, 50, 61, 77, 202
- Canada, 45, 47
- Capital, 17, 58; restrictions by, 22, 59, 185
- Cathode ray, 183
- Catholics, 122
- Censorship, 125, 132; *see* Freedom of press
- Chamber of Commerce, 171, 172
- Channel, English, 31, 45, 80, 92, 104
- Charles I, 235

- Chicago, address at, 87 ff., 103 ff., 147 ff.;  
convention at, 236
- Children, American, 215, 217, 220
- Children, European, 119, 122; and famine, 61, 132,  
139, 141, 148, 154, 155, 156; and malnutrition,  
127, 138; and relief, 140, 151, 157, 158, 159,  
160; in total war, 68, 110, 117, 121, 122, 126,  
127, 130, 180; *see also* Food-relief
- Children's Crusade, 95
- China, 15, 44, 57, 101
- Chivalry, in war, 68
- Christianity, 41, 131, 145; *see also* Religion
- Chromosomes, 195
- Churchill, Winston, 27, 106, 109
- Churches, 171, 211; *see also* Religion
- Clapper, Raymond, 237
- Cities, and boys, 174, 176; and war-food, 117, 122,  
137; political machines, 230
- Civil service, 213, 214
- Civil War, 204
- Civilians, 31, 72, 81, 92; in modern war, 60, 68,  
69, 130, 132, 133, 141, 148; relief for, 117, 133;  
*see also* Children; Women; Food-relief
- Civilization, 61, 147, 179, 188, 191, 192;  
American, 53, 174, 193, 217; European, 108;  
future of, 102, 193, 205, 220; revolt against, 52,  
59
- Classes, European, 96, 108, 173, 252
- Class-hate, 94, 209, 210, 222, 223, 228
- Clinics, 111
- Coalition, 10, 171, 201, 203, 203
- Collectivists, 186
- Collier's*, 48, 122, 132 ff.
- Columbus, Ohio, address at, 224 ff.
- Commander-in-Chief, Allies, 30; Belgian, 27, 33;  
Hoover as, 77
- Commerce, Department of, 22, 178
- Commission for Relief in Belgium (CRB), *see*  
Food-relief, World War
- Committee on Food for the Small Democracies, *see*  
Food-relief; Small Democracies
- Committee, Congressional, on Foreign Affairs, 64;  
Judiciary Committee, 227; on Military Affairs,  
247, 248
- Committee of 100, for Boys' Clubs, 177
- Communism, 93, 94, 168; Hoover opinion, 104;  
and labor, 57, 95; records of, 197; rise of, 41,  
208; Russian, 38, 95, 134, 229; war for, 93, 114
- Communists, European, 41, 208; as Fifth column,  
40, 94; French, 253; Spanish, 166
- Compassion, 53, 74, 126, 131, 145, 155, 192; at  
peace-table, 76
- Competition, 18, 22, 23, 58, 59, 212
- Concentration camp, 229; New Deal, 230, 231
- Confidence, American, 13, 207, 211, 212
- Confusion, 172, 192, 209, 255; world, 169, 205,  
255
- Congress, 6, 112; controlled, 63, 210, 226, 227,  
235, 238, 245; and Lease-Lend Bill, 63, 64;  
purge of, 232; on relief, 213; rubber stamp, 227;  
war-declaration by, 51, 56, 64, 66, 71, 85, 87,  
88, 101, 103, 106, 110, 114
- Congressional appropriations, 227; defense, 5, 7, 8,  
11, 216, 217, 247, 248
- Congressional Committees, 39, 40, 64, 94
- Congressmen, New Deal, 47; Republican, 40, 203,  
213, 217
- Constitution, 210, 224, 228; on war, 79, 85, 87, 88
- Consumption, 22, 59, 179
- Contraband, 97, 105, 106
- Convention, New Deal, *see* Democratic National  
Convention
- Convoys, 64, 78, 82, 83, 89
- Co-operation, 11, 23, 39, 46, 120, 222
- Corn-price, 246, 247
- Cornell, President of, 196
- Corruption, government, *see* Government morals
- Cosmetics, 21
- Costs, production, 21, 32, 59, 180, 244
- Cotton, 20
- Coulter, John Lee, 157
- Council of National Defense, 219
- Courts, 171, 226, 227, 244; free, 169, 228, 235; *see*  
*also* Supreme Court
- Covenants, open, 42, 225
- Credit, control of, 170, 171, 209, 226, 244, 252;  
government, 17, 58, 168, 209
- Crete, Battle of, 90
- Crime, 175
- Criticism, 34, 69, 171, 190, 201; *see also*  
Opposition
- Cruisers, American, 248; *see also* Navy, American  
Crusade, 69, 95
- Cudahy, Ambassador John, 117
- Culture, European, 108
- Currency, managed, 58, 214, 244; postwar, 17;  
stabilized, 37, 218; tinkering with, 233, 240, 245
- Cyclotron, 184
- Czechoslovakia, 42, 218
- Dairy products, *see* Food-relief
- Daladier, Premier, 171
- Debate, 65, 75, 133, 227; Republican duty of, 204,  
210, 213; on war, 56, 79, 88, 103
- Debt, American, compared, 57; New

- New Deal, 12, 34, 171, 201, 206, 215, 228, 245, 250; postwar, 110, 186; Roosevelt on, 235; World War, 99, 111, 165
- Defeatism, 53, 172, 186
- Defense, economic, *see* Economic defense
- Defense, national, air-power in, 8, 9, 91; Hoover program for, 12, 40, 50, 101, 113; and industry, 7, 8, 10, 11, 46, 57, 60, 63, 70, 98, 219, 220; and invention, 185, 187; minerals for, 216; Munitions Board, 12; need of, 6, 35, 40, 46, 50, 53, 67, 100, 101, 113, 192, 207, 219, 253; production for, 4, 6, 9, 10, 13, 16, 19, 46, 47, 82, 83, 89, 90, 105, 219; relativity of, 36, 38, 247; World War production, 10, 11; Republican duty, 204, 207; Republican record, 6, 7, 8, 9, 36, 216, 217, 247, 248; and strikes, 95; *see also* Britain, aid to; Preparedness
- Defense-expenditures: American, New Deal, 5, 7, 8, 11, 217, 247, 248; Republican, 8, 216, 217, 247, 248; European, 7, 10, 41, 173
- Defense-organization, 4, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 46, 57, 99, 100, 219; Hoover experience, 9, 77; one-man-head, 10, 12; World War, 9, 10, 11, 60, 63
- Deficit, American, 165, 170, 206, 214, 228, 241, 250; for relief, 212
- DeForest, Lee, 183
- Delinquency, 175
- Demagogues, 169, 190
- Democracies, fall of, 207, 314; free speech, 69; and liberty, 193; records of, 197; in war, 41, 60, 71, 114; aid to, 66, 67, 113, 207, 219; coalition, 202; post-war, 73, 95, 165; recovery in, 206, 233, 252; and Russia, in; western, 153, 154; *see also* Britain, aid to
- Democracies, small European, 96, 120, 123, 144, 154; invasion of, 40, 95, 131; unemployed, 159; World War position, 142; *see* Food-relief, small democracies
- Democracy, 59, 75, 76, 170, 175, 220; American responsibility for, 126, 128; imposed, 72, 93; overthrow of, 94, 166, 167; post-war, 49, 57; Roosevelt on, 106; Spanish, 166; in war, 23, 48, 50, 63, 70, 71, 79, 202; Willkie on, 243; world safe for, 69, 107
- Democratic ideals, and food-relief, 145, 154, 157, 161; in small democracies, 122, 145; processes, 60
- Democratic National Convention, 1940, 236, 237, 241; *see also* Campaign, presidential, 1940
- Democratic Party, 203, 231; Congressmen, 47; platform, 1932, 216; primaries, 236, 250; Secretaries of State, 38; Senators, 47, 227, 230, 231, 234, 250; *see also* New Deal
- Democrats, 40, 98, 235; Jeffersonian, 213
- Denmark, 95, 135, 136, 218
- Depression, American, 210, 211, 214, 215, 240, 245; Roosevelt on, 38 ff., 233; British, 251; post-war, 36, 130; world, 206; *see also* Recovery
- Des Moines, 4
- Despotism, 93, 96, 205, 254
- Destroyers, American, 248; *see also* Navy, American
- Devaluation, New Deal, 170, 171, 245, 250; European, 17, 168; *see also* Currency
- Dictation, economic, *see* Economic dictation
- Dictator, 65, 229, 242; President as, 224, 226, 232, 244
- Dictators, 23, 38, 44, 45, 56, 57; and economic system, 23, 170; quarantining of, 41; rise of, 99, 166, 167, 208, 225
- Dictatorship, 171, 190, 227; American, 16, 85, 88, 100, 101, 171; and parties, 202, 203; in war, 49, 60, 98, 220; *see also* European dictatorships
- Dies Committee, 39, 94
- Dinant, 30
- Disarmament, enemy, 49, 106; world, 16, 74; *see also* Arms limitation
- Disease, European war, 117, 120, 125, 132, 148; and Germans, 127, 144 malnutrition, 127, 138, 139, 154 post-war, 221; in Poland, 142; and science, 26
- Dishonesty, intellectual, *see* Intellectual honesty
- Dutch, *see* Holland
- Earlham College, 178
- East Indies, 15
- Eben Emael, 30
- Economic, aftermaths, 73; defense, 14, 15, 16, 20, 25, 58, 59, 97; dictation 60, 99, 170, 208, 212, 213, 226, 252; isolation, 218; mixtures, 171, 172; peace, 74; power, 172, 212, 222; powers, presidential, 226; war-organization, 50, 57, 219
- Economic Conference, World, 37, 218
- Economic future, Hoover program for, 58
- Economics, 194; European, 166;

- French, 253; German, 96, 253; New Deal, 5, 171, 210, 215, 238, 241, 244; post-war, 56, 61, 75; totalitarian, 59, 60, 169, 170, 172, 206
- Economy, American, 12, 16, 36, 96, 98, 201; of faith, 244; of fear, 244; free, 15, 110, 114, 209, 211, 212, 234; future, 13, 14 ff., 36, 88
- Education, 188, 191; European, 166; leaders in, 121
- Edward I, 227
- Efficiency, industrial, 13, 20, 21, 22, 58, 59, 179; national, 23, 46, 178, 185
- Election, Presidential, of 1932, 37, 172, 240; of 1940, 121, 201, 204; *see also* Campaign, Presidential
- Elections, American, 240, 244, 249; and political machine, 232, 238; and relief, 213, 249, 250; British, 235; European, 138
- Electricity, 181, 182, 183, 184
- Emergency, 202; New Deal, 238, 238; totalitarian, 225, 229
- Emotions, war, 47, 56, 66, 69, 87
- Employers, 22; and employees, 57
- Employment, 13, 173, 181, 182, 210, 211, 223, 238; British, 171, 251; post-war, 75, 98; *see also* Unemployment
- Endowments, 21, 85, 99, 181; of Hoover Library, 196
- Enemies, American, *see* America, enemies of
- Enemy countries, 72; *see also* Disarmament, enemy; Germany
- Engineer, 186; engineering, 22, 178; engines, 180, 181, 184, 187
- England, *see* Britain
- Enterprise, free, 110, 169, 170, 171, 208, 209, 211, 238; British, 171, 251; European, 166; German, 253; New Deal, 228, 243, 344; *see also* Initiative and enterprise
- Estonia, 40, 94, 95, 134
- Ethics, 191; *see also* Morals
- Europe, 105, 169, 254; American contrast, 108, 171, 172; and American ideals, 72, 75, 88, 97, 110, 113; business, 168, 169, 209, 252, 253; civilization of, 108; classes in, 96, 108, 173, 252; coalition in, 202; competition from, *see* Trade; credit, 17, 168; debt, 17, 60, 168, 170, 180, 209, 214, 220, 252; defense expenditures, 7, 10, 41, 173; economics of, 166; education, 166; elections, 138; exhaustion, 92, 104; farmers of, 117, 122, 134, 168, 224 financial collapse, 240; food supply, *see* Food-relief; freedom in, 109, 110, 153, 166, 169, 208; German-occupied, 80, 91, 104, 122; hate in, 43, 67, 100, 108, 225, 229; heritage from, 52, 108; Hoover visit to, 40, 41, 166, 208; inflation, 17, 108, 168; labor, 144, 168, 169; leaders, 167, 169; legislatures, 168, 225; liberals, 208, 209; liberty, *see* Liberty, European; philosophies, *see* Ideologies; planned economy, 8, 20, 88, 244; population, 108, 136; postwar, 15, 17, 18, 97, 107, 108, 109, 165, 169, 217, 221; power-politics, 42, 43, 225, 229; production, 10, 120, 168; propaganda, 225; poverty, 168, 209, 239; races of, 54, 74, 107, 108; rearming of, 5, 7, 41; recovery, 36, 37, 233, 257; revolutions in, 206; standards of living in, 108, 135, 168, 223; *see* Food-relief; unemployment, 18, 83, 88, 159, 168, 170; war-causes, 108, 109; war-relief, *see* Relief, food; *see also* American and European war; Communism; Democracies; Fascism; Food-relief; Names of countries; Peace; Totalitarianism; War, European; World War
- Europe, Central, 127
- European dictatorships, American analogy, 171; duration of, 206; Hoover on, 153; Napoleonic, 59; periodic, 111; post-war, 15, 61
- Evacuation, Belgian, 32; British, 32, 33
- Evolution, 191
- Expeditionary force, American, *see* Army, American
- Experience, 74, 191, 192; voice of, 107, 110, 111
- Exploitation, 212; territorial, 108
- Exports and imports, *see* Food-relief; Trade
- Factories, 211
- Faith, economy of, 241
- Falconer, J. I., 157
- Famine, 61, 74, 127, 130, 138, 154, 197 effect of, 155; Hoover experience in 155; Horseman of, 131; modern, 147 post-war, 18, 72, 147, 217, 221; World War, 130, 148, 197; *see also* Food-relief; Starvation
- Far East, 15; *see also* China; Japan
- Faraday, Michael, 181
- Farmers, 137, 139; American, and food-relief, 153; industrial raw materials, 185; and New Deal, 207, 209, 226, 228, 244; post-war, 73, 85; pressure groups of, 209; price rise, 58; and Republicans, 207, 210, 211, 212; in war, 71, 218; European, 117, 122, 134, 168, 244; *see also* Agriculture
- Farm-organizations, 171
- Farm trade, 58, 215, 221, 244, 250

- Fascism, 59, 169; American demobilization, 75; cause of, 208; economics of, 60, 169; finances of, 71; NRA as, 172; post-war, 73; records of, 197; in war, 60, 71
- Fascists, 41, 229; European, 208, 209, 235; Spanish, 166
- Fear, 106, 192, 211, 225; economic, 170, 241, 244; European, 108, 109
- Federal government, *see* Government; New Deal
- "Fellow-travellers," 39
- Fertilizers, 134
- Feudalism, 41, 172
- Fifth Column, 35, 48, 49, 207, 241; Communist, 40, 94; Jeffersonian, 112
- Finland, 17, 40, 94, 121, 122, 134, 143, 218; American help to, 95; credits to, 153; food supplies, 136, 138, 142, 150; starvation in, 132; and totalitarian liberalism, 171; Finns, American, 125, 145
- Fisheries, 134, 147
- Flanders, 33, 220
- Fleet, British, *see* British navy
- Food Administration, 129, 139
- Food, effect of war, 117, 133, 134, 137, 147; post-war, 61; war strategy, 124, 140, 141, 147, 148, 158
- Food, European, 104, 133-7, 148, 151; production of, 134, 135, 137; rationing of, 133, 135, 136, 148; starvation, 121, 129, 132, 134, 137, 138, 148; *see also* Food-relief; Food supplies
- Food-relief, Hoover experience in, 129, 130, 133, 139, 155
- Food-relief: European War
- America, extent of aid, 119, 120, 121, 125, 126, 153, 159; government relation, 129; Hull on, 158; misinformation on, 117; poll on, 125; responsibility for, 121, 125, 131, 145, 151, 153, 154, 156, 160, 221
  - Britain, blockade, 117, 118, 123, 128, 132, 134, 138, 141, 143, 148, 151, 157; relaxation asked, 118, 124, 148, 151, 158; relaxed for French, 158, 160; for Spain, 128; *see also* Food-relief: World War; food agreement asked, 118, 119, 124, 143, 148, 150, 151, 158; food agreement refused, 123, 124, 156, 157, 158, 159; military effect on, 151, 152, 153, 160; self-interest in, 144; statement of British Embassy, 156; of British Minister of Economic Warfare, 134
  - France, 117, 121, 125, 136, 150, 158; Red Cross feeding, 160
  - Germany, blockade on food, 138; contribution To feeding, 142, 143, 158, 159; food-Agreement asked, 118, 119, 124, 143, 148, 150; food-plan accepted, 118, 148, 158, 159; relief-food taken by, 126, 143, 144, 151, 159, 160; requisitioning by, 124, 136, 144, 148; responsibility for feeding, 118, 123, 133, 148, 157; self-interest in relief, 143, 159, 160
- Food-relief: Small democracies
- appeal from, 119, 121, 125, 142, 143; from Hoover, 117, 121, 124, 142; from National Committee, 148, 160
  - food-imports, 117-120, 122, 124, 133-138, 142-144, 148, 151, 159
  - food need, 3, 61, 117-129, 131-139, 141-145, 147-161; famine in, 80, 117, 120, 124, 125, 132, 148, 153
  - food sources, American, 125, 126, 138, 141; Balkans, 135, 142; Germans, 142, 159; Russia, 118, 122, 134, 142, 143; South America, 38, 153
  - Hoover Food Plan, 118, 119, 124, 125, 126, 129, 142-3, 148, 150; Belgian experiment, 151-2, 158-9; payment for, 118, 119, 123, 129, 143, 151, 153 Pershing and Pratt on, 152-3, 160; relief-stocks, 127, 128, 144, 152, 159; safeguards for, 118, 124, 125, 126, 143, 144, 148, 151, 159
  - National Committee on Food for, 148, 149, 150, 152, 156, 160; experts committee, 157-8
- Food-relief: World War
- Allied blockade, 123, 139, 140, 141, 152, 160; post-war, 72
  - Belgian-French, 118, 120, 123-4, 126, 130, 133, 139-143, 147, 149, 152, 154-5, 158, 197; cost of, 123, 124, 140; CRB (Commission for Relief in Belgium), 123, 139, 140, 197
  - British support of, 123, 124, 140, 149; Prime Minister on, 140, 149
  - France, Northern, 123, 139, 140, 141, 149; French contribution, 140
  - Germany and, 123, 124, 139, 140, 141
  - Poland, 142
  - Post-war, 72, 130, 133, 154, 197, 217
- Food-ships, 118, 120, 121, 128, 129, 141, 143, 153, 159
- Food-stuffs, breads, 134-239; 150, 151, 158, 159; dairy-products, 138, 147, 157; fats, 136-139, 141, 147, 157, 158 feed, 117, 134, 136-138, 147, 158; meats, 136, 138, 139, 147, 151, 157; milk, 137, 138
- Food Supplies: European War
- America, 126, 153; Balkans, 135; Belgians, 136, 137, 138, 142, 144,

- 149, 150, 157; rationing in, 150, 157; starvation in, 28, 61, 132; Bessarabia, 134; Britain, 80, 83, 90, 92, 141, 148, 154; rationing, 148, 150; Bulgaria, 135; Denmark, 135, 136; Estonia, 134; Finland, 134, 136, 138, 142, 150; France, 117, 121, 136, 150; Germany, 80, 92, 123, 134, 135, 141, 142, 144, 148, 150, 152, 157, 159; rationing in, 148, 150; Greece, 57, 135; Holland, 137, 138, 142, 149, 150; Hungary, 135; Italy, 135, 141, 142; Jugoslavia, 135; Latvia, 134; Lithuania, 134; Norway, 119, 132, 136, 137, 138, 142, 144, 150; Poland, 122, 132, 136, 137, 138, 142, 144; East, 134; famine in, 142; Portugal, 135; Rumania, 135; Russia, 118, 122, 133, 134, 142, 143; South America, 153; Spain, 135; Sweden, 135; Switzerland, 135
- Forefathers, American, 108  
 Foreign Affairs, Committee on, 63  
 Foreign exchange, 37, 226  
 Foreign policies, 4; American, 35, 36, 207, 217, 246; *see also* Roosevelt; campaign agreement, 203; debate for, 202; and domestic failure, 48; Hoover program for, 50, 101, 105, 112; Republican, 207, 217, 246; *see also* America and European War; War, European  
 Foreign relations, *see* Foreign policies; Roosevelt, foreign policies  
 Foreign trade, British, 251; *see also* Trade  
 Fort Knox, 216, 244  
 Forts, Belgian, 30  
 "Four Freedoms," 88, 93, 100, 101, 107, 174; Roosevelt on, 106; and Russia, 93, 95  
 "Fourteen Points," 107, 109  
 Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, 131  
 Fourth term, 249  
 France, 100, 218, 220; agriculture, 136; airplanes, 252; and Belgian campaign, 27-32; children of, 158; collapse of, 38, 47, 82, 94, 210, 252; Communists, 253; food-supplies of 117, 121, 136, 150; and Hitler, 95, 109; and Munich Pact, 42; New Deal in, 13, 171, 251, 252; Occupied, 160; peace-making, 71, 109; parliament, 252; Premier's statement, 27; re-arming of, 7; unemployed, 83; war-government, 9  
 France, Northern, World War relief of, 124, 139, 140, 141, 149  
 Franking privilege, 231  
 Free assembly, 166  
 Free courts, *see* Courts, free  
 Free economy, *see* Economy, free  
 Free government, 202, 203, 204, 208, 232  
 Free men, 23, 220, 228, 254, 255; Hoover on, 153  
 Free nations, 16, 18  
 Free speech, 61, 106, 110, 169; and free press, 52, 69, 75, 169, 210; European, 166, 208; parties, 201; universities, 192  
 Free systems, 24, 103, 113, 211, 244; European, 169; and foreign trade, 18, 24  
 Free worship, *see* Religion  
 Freedom, 53, 220; of boys, 175; imposition of, 88, 110, 113; issue of (1776), 243; (1860), 205; (1940), 242; in liberalism, 169, 234; of mind and spirit, 190, 193, 194; and parties, 201; and peace, 67; philosophy of, 194; post-war, 60, 153; Schiller on, 54; small democracies' defense, 28, 148; World War for, 106; *see also* Liberty; Liberalism  
 Freedom, American, 75, 114, 224; ideal of, 109; loss of, 35, 110, 113; and war, 98, 101, 107  
 "Freedom, New," 191  
 Freedom, responsibility for, America's, 102; Republican, 205; universities', 193  
 Freedom of the seas, 97, 105, 106  
 Friends' Service Committee, 160  
 Frontiers, 23, 183, 186, 187  
 Gamelin, General, 30  
 Garibaldi, 221  
 Gasoline, 40  
 Geneva Conference, 37, 38  
 George III, 235  
 Germany  
 European War; blockade by, 81, 123, 138, 141; and America, 79, 85, 91; *see also* America, attack on; Belgian campaign, 28-33; British fleet, 45, 47, 92; defeat of, 95, 97, 100; food consumption, 127, 144, 159; food supplies, 80, 134, 135, 141, 148, 150, 152, 157; invasion of, 49, 80, 92, 97, 104; navy, 7, 45; post-war plans, 15; production of planes, 252; of ships, 44; Russian War, 87, 104; submarines, 78, 89, 141; *see also* Food-relief; Hitler; Nazis  
 Pre-war; arms limitation, 7, 38; Hoover report on, 41; liberty in, 54; Munich Pact, 42; Nazi rise, 317, 229; New Deal in, 251, 253, 254; rearming, 7; Republic of, 7, 253; unemployed in, 88; Universities, 193; *see also* Nazi-ism

- World War; 9, 45, 69, 109, 134; post-war feeding, 72, 141, 151
- Ghost, New Deal, 240
- Gladstone, William E., 181
- Glass, Senator Carter, 232
- Goethe, 221
- Gold, 17, 55, 216, 242; and silver, 244, 250; world supply, 215, 216
- Good-neighbor policy, 244
- Goodwill, to America, 36, 154, 159, 160, 217
- Government, American concept of, 109; and American development, 211; borrowing, 57; coalition, 10, 171, 201, 203; competition, 17, 58, 71, 73, 85, 98, 170, 172, 209; dictation, 25, 171, 172, 193, 211; and inflation, 99; liberal, 235; local, 238; morals in, 207, 212, 213, 242; representative, 60, 224, 239; research, 181; restrictions by, 22, 59, 194, 209; war-organization of, 9, 11, 12, 13, 82; *see also* Debt, national; Defense; New Deal; Preparedness
- Government Departments, 89
- Government philosophy, 153, 243; European, 242; war of, 207; *see also* Ideologies
- Great Britain, *see* Britain
- Greece, 57, 135; Ancient, 169
- Groups, economic, 234; pressure, 168, 171, 195, 209, 210, 234
- Hague, Frank, 235, 237, 250
- Hague Conventions, 64
- Harvard University, 112
- Hatch Act, 213, 230; *see also* Elections, relief in
- Hate, American, 46, 53, 231; class hate, 94, 209, 210, 222, 223, 228; for Hitler, 104; and Roosevelt, 43, 221
- Hate, European, 42, 67, 100, 108, 225, 229; at peace-table, 71, 72, 85, 88, 102, 109; in war, 69, 72, 141
- Haverford, Pennsylvania, address at, 178 ff.
- Haverford College, 178
- Heredity, 195
- Hertz, Heinrich, 183
- Hitler, Adolf, 323, 249, 253; attack on America, 48, 80, 88; attack on Britain, 45, 80, 81, 92, 104; attack on Western Hemisphere, 47, 91, 105; and Axis, 43; brutality of, 95; Churchill on, 109; collapse of, 96, 105, 113; conquests of, 91, 95, 100; defeat of, 95, 97, 100; hate for, 104; invasion of, 80; and Japan, 90, 100; and Poland, 94; post-war plans, 15; rise of, 7, 109, 247, 254; and Russia, 43, 87, 94, 104
- Hobson, Asher, 157
- Holland, 30, 117, 118, 122, 126, 143, 171, 218; conquest of, 38, 95; food supplies of, 119, 120, 132, 136, 137, 138, 142, 144, 149, 150; Dutch in America, 125, 145; *see also* Food-relief
- Home-building, 211
- Honesty, intellectual, *see* Intellectual honesty
- Hoover, on American spirit, 53, 222; Belgian friendship, 28; on British aid, 63, 78, 154; on British victory, 45; on campaign, 1932, 242, 245; on Communism, 104; *see* Totalitarianism; on debate-need, 56; on defense need, 41, 100, 192; defense record of, 6, 7, 8, 9, 36, 216, 217, 248; on dictatorships, 153; disarmament, 37; and Economic Conference, 37, 218; on European revival, 54; European visit of, 40, 41, 166, 167, 208; on free enterprise, 211; on German responsibility, 133, 148; industrial waste study, 23; on liberty, 153, 211; misquoted, 248, 249; on Nazi-ism, 104; on New Deal defense spending, 248; New Deal prophecy, 242; nonpartisanship of, 55, 57, 78, 121; and NRA, 172; on peace, 5, 106; on negotiated peace, 70; on power-politics, 41, 42; on Presidency, 254; on reforms, 242; relief concerns of, 189; *see also* Food-relief; and Russian recognition, 38, 93; on security, 342; smearing of, 103; student days, 178, 189; on tariff, 249; on totalitarianism, 41, 78, 95, 104, 153; on alliance with totalitarians, 104; future of totalitarianism, 15, 25, 97; and unemployment relief, 212, 230; on war, 130, 131; on war entry, 63, 75, 103; *see also* America and war entry; on World War entry, 68, 107; war services of, 107, 133, 166; war stand of, 50, 68
- Hoover experience, in defense organization, 9, 77; in famine, 155; in foreign relations, 34, 239; as President, 254; in food-relief, 129, 130, 133, 139-40, 149, 155, 158; in war, 9, 67, 107, 130, 133, 166
- Hoover Library dedication, 196 ff.
- Hoover program, for defense, 8, 12, 40, 50, 99, 101; for munitions, 5, 8, 12, 40, 217; for economic defense, 20-25, 58-9, 178-80, 185; for food-relief, *see* Food-relief Plan; for foreign relations, 35, 50, 101, 112 ff.; for gold, 216;

- for Republican Party, 207; for Universities, 190-3
- Hopkins, Harry, 236, 237
- Hospitals, 85
- House of Commons, 27
- House of Representatives, 63, 94; *see also* Congress
- Housing program, 211
- Hull, Secretary Cordell, 158, 221
- Human behavior, 195
- Humanitarianism, payment for, 215 Humanity, 192, 193; American, 53; food-relief, 127, 154, 155, 161; and Stanford University, 189
- Humor, sense of, 53
- Hungary, 135
- Huxley, Thomas, 179
- Ickes, Harold, 249
- Ideals, for boys, 177; democratic, 93, 154, 161; in foreign policies, 219; world, 149
- Ideals, American, 53, 76, 111, 113, 213, 222, 223; and food relief, 155, 160; and New Deal, 207, 232
- Ideologies, 121, 127, 131; defeat of, 95; economic, 23; and food relief, 154, 155; revolutionary, 59; totalitarian, 15, 41, 88
- Ideology, American, 35; wars of, 49, 69, 93, 95, 100, 101
- Imperialism, 67, 96, 108
- Income, national, 22, 165, 214, 250; British contrast, 7, 251; decrease in, 206; pre-war, 57
- Independence Hall, 47, 48
- Indispensable man, 34, 224, 229, 241, 246, 249
- Individual, coercion of, 96; dignity of, 192, 193, 223; rights of, 226
- Industrial efficiency, *see* Efficiency
- Industrial obsolescence, 13
- Industrial Revolution, 26, 61, 194
- Industrialists, 12, 165
- Industry, 12, 13, 26, 173, 184, 209; Belgian, 3; and defense, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 46, 57, 60, 63, 70, 98, 219, 221; European, 168; new, 21, 23, 186; and research, 23, 26, 181; post-war, 85
- Inflation, 17, 57, 62, 99, 170, 214, 242, 250; credit, 171; European, 17, 108, 168; war, 17, 57, 71, 99, 110
- Influenza, 127, 138
- Initiative and enterprise, 165, 170, 209; in Germany, 254; and government restrictions, 22, 59; *see also* Enterprise, free
- Insurance policies, 215
- Intellectual honesty, 190, 198, 233, 249, 255; dishonesty, 26, 187, 234, 235, 236, 246
- International agreements, 94, 217, 218, 247; Economic Conference, 37, 218; Geneva Conference, 37, 38; Hague Conventions, 64; Japan-Axis, 43; Roosevelt-Churchill, 106; Roosevelt-Stalin, 39, 43; Stalin-Hitler, 94; *see also* Arms limitation
- International cooperation, 217, 218; law, 94, 97, 219; morals, 39, 43, 88, 218
- Intervention, 113; interventionist, 105; Hoover stand, 50; Napoleonic era, 112; *see also* America, war entry
- Intolerance, 53, 75, 103; and liberty, 71; and war, 56, 60, 69
- Invasion, *see* America; Britain; Germany; Western Hemisphere
- Invention and discovery, 179, 187, 191, 194; capacity for, 173; future for, 183, 184
- Inventions, 21, 59, 180, 181, 211
- Iraq, 80
- Isolation, 113, 218; isolationist, 48; Hoover stand, 50
- Issue, American, 174, 242, 243; campaign, 1940, 201, 224, 254; in Revolution, 243; in 1860, 205; *see also* Peace
- Italy, 15, 43, 100, 141, 229, 235; and disarmament, 38; food supply of, 135, 141; Italians, 122, 142
- Japan, 7, 15, 81, 90, 95, 100, 105; attack by, 79, 89, 91, 92; and Axis, 43
- Jefferson, Thomas, 112, 249
- Jeffersonian Democrats, 236
- Jeffreys, Judge, 235
- Jews, 122
- Johns Hopkins University, 157
- Johnson Act, 64
- Jordan, David Starr, 189
- Jugoslavia, 135
- Justice, 71, 113; American, 222, 223
- Kaiser, 71
- Kelly, Mayor, 235, 237; Kelly-Nash machine, 237, 250
- Keyes, Admiral Sir Roger, 27
- Knudson, William, 38
- K. W. line, 29
- Labor, 6, 22, 211, 241; controlled, 23, 209; and defense, 10, 12, 57; and efficiency, 22; and foreign trade, 221; under New Deal, 58, 207, 243; pressure groups of, 209; protection of, 215; and Republican Party, 207, 210; restrictions by, 22, 59, 185; and taxes, 247; in war, 60, 70, 71, 98, 218



- Labor arbitration, 57  
 Labor Board, 231  
 Labor, British, 90, 171  
 Labor, European, 144, 168, 169  
 Labor, hours of, 22, 58, 59, 180, 182; post-war, 18; powers over, 226; totalitarian, 18  
 Labor laws, 64  
 Labor-leaders, and communism, 57, 95  
 Labor-saving devices, 21, 22, 179, 180, 181, 185, 187  
 Labor-strikes, 57, 95  
 Labor-unions, in dictatorships, 171  
 Laboratories, 23, 181, 183, 184, 185  
 Latvia, 40, 94, 95, 134  
 Law, 188, 194, 219, 226, 227; French, 252; government of, 228; international, 94, 97, 219; natural, 179, 184  
 Leaders, Allied, 71; educational and religious, 121, 188; European, 167, 169; liberal, 169; subversive, 169  
 Leadership, 192, 205, 225, 229; and Boys' Clubs, 175, 176; moral, 43, 121, 125; relief, 129, 131  
 League of Nations, 72, 107, 109  
 Lease-Lend Bill, 63, 64  
 Left-wingers, 168, 252  
 Legislature, 203, 227, 235; American, 171; coalition, 202; European, 168, 225; *see also* Congress  
 Leopold III, 27, 30, 31, 32  
 Liberal Party, 235  
 Liberalism, 41, 213, 234, 235; European, 169; and New Deal, 240, 243  
 "Liberals," totalitarian, 169, 208, 209, 210; British, 171, 209; European, 208; German, 253; New Deal, 172, 234, 253  
 Liberties, civil, 60, 98, 169, 170, 226, 234; limitations on, 169, 193, 194, 223  
 Liberty, 54, 112, 219, 222, 223, 227; American responsibility for, 13, 61, 76, 114, 220, 221, 223; and Communism, 25, 93; in dictatorships, 228; economic, 234; imposed, 72, 75; safeguards of, 171  
 Liberty, American, 52, 109, 172, 220; and New Deal, 48, 205, 207, 210, 226, 235, 243; post-war, 85; Republican responsibility for, 207; in Revolutionary War, 243  
 Liberty, European, 11, 61, 108, 166; collapse of, 167, 170, 172, 205, 206, 207, 209, 222, 239, 243; intellectual and spiritual, 211; pre-war, 208; in small democracies, 96; revolt against, 59; *see also* Freedom  
 Liberty Bell, 48  
 Library, Hoover, 196 ff.  
 Liege, 29, 30  
 Lierre, 29  
 Life-insurance, and inflation, 99  
 Limitation of arms, *see* Arms limitation; Disarmament  
 Lincoln, Abraham, 233  
 Lincoln, Nebraska, address at, 34 ff.  
 Lindbergh, Charles A., 5, 6  
 Lippmann, Walter, 234  
 Literature, 54, 108, 189, 211  
 Lithuania, 40, 94, 95  
 Livestock, 136, 137, 138, 147, 150  
 Lloyd George, Prime Minister, 140  
 Loans, 17, 71, 165  
 Logan-Walter Bill, 226  
 London, 4  
 Lothian, Lord, 62, 99  
 Louvain, 30, 297  
 Luther, 221  
 Lutz, Ralph Hazwell, 197  
 MacDonald, Prime Minister Ramsay, 37  
 Machiavelli, Niccolo, 48  
 Machines, 22, 40, 59, 185, 194; age, 68, 147; tools, 13, 22, 174  
 Machines, political, *see* Political machines  
 Madison, James, 112  
 Maginot Line, 30  
 Mail, franked, 231  
 Malines, 29  
 Malnutrition, 127, 138, 154; *see also* Famine  
 Man on horseback, 73, 209  
 Man-power, 134, 136, 147  
 Marconi, Guglielmo, 182  
 Maritime Commission, 89  
 Mass-feeding, 129, 139  
 Mass spectrograph, 184  
 Matsuoka, 100  
 Mattei, Mrs. Albert, 240  
 Maxwell, James, 182  
 Mazzini, Guiseppe, 221  
 McCollum, E. V., 157  
 McCormick, Chauncey, 153  
 Mediterranean, 80  
 Mercy, 53, 131  
 Merit System, 212  
 Metallurgy, 185  
 Metropolitan Opera, 52  
 Meuse River, 29, 30  
 Mezieres, 30  
 Microscope, electron, 183  
 Middle Ages, 49, 193  
 Militarism, 50, 206  
 Military expenditure, *see* Army and Navy, expenditure on  
 Military personnel, 8, 10, 347  
 Military power, 81, 90, 02, 95, 101;

- relative, 247; *see also* Air power; Sea power
- Minerals, 216
- Minister, American, to Belgium, 140
- Minorities, 108, 201, 226
- Mohammedanism, 41
- Molecules, 183
- Money, 226, 253; *see also* Currency
- Monopoly, 212
- Monroe, James, 112
- Monroe Doctrine, 218
- Moral assets, 175; problems, 61; isolation, 218; welfare, 25, 187
- Moral responsibility, American, in leadership, 43, 121, 125; in relief, 121, 124
- Morale, 92, 133, 141
- Morals, 12, 35, 36, 93, 205, 232, 242; American, 75, 98, 109, 222; government, 20, 212, 213; international, 39, 43, 88, 218; Roman, 250
- Moscow, 244
- Mothers and wives, 84
- Munich Pact, 42
- Munitions, 58, 82, 92, 144, 179, 219; Administration, 10, 11, 12; boom in, 228, 233, 252; British need, 83, 90; lease-lend, 64; organization for, 8, 11, 57; Republican policy, 207; *see also* Britain, aid to
- Music, 52, 54, 108, 211
- Mussolini, Benito, 15, 43, 100
- "Must" laws, 227
- Name calling, 113
- Namur, 29, 30
- Napoleon, 104, 112, 249; wars of, 147, 184
- Nash-Kelly machine, 250
- National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies, 152, 156, 160; *see* Food-relief
- National Electric Light Association, 172
- Nationalism, 108, 168
- Nations, small, 54, 180; *see* Food-relief; Democracies, small
- Naval limitation, 6, 7, 218, 247
- Navies, European, 5
- Navy, American, 5, 8, 44, 82, 105, 217, 219; action by, 78, 79, 103, 182; convoy, 64, 78, 82, 83, 89; and Munitions Board, 12; New Deal, 248; one-ocean, 99; warships, 6, 12, 36, 44, 64, 91, 92, 105, 106; compared, 247, 248; for Britain, 93, 113; *see also* Army and Navy
- Navy, Secretary of, 7, 8
- Nazi-ism, 59, 60, 197; collapse of, 208, 217
- Hoover opinion of, 104; *see also* Germany;
- Hitler
- Nehemiah, 53
- Neutrality Acts, 64, 106
- Neutrals, attack on, 5, 28, 29; in food-relief, 118, 119, 129, 133, 148, 151, 159; World War, 143
- "New Day," 191
- New Deal, 14, 191, 207, 208, 223; and business, 12, 13, 172, 206, 209, 226, 244, 248; concentration camps, 230, 231; contracts, 230; cost of, 245; *see also* Debt; defense, *see* Defense, national; economics of, 241, 244; and elections, 231, 235, 236, 249-50; employees, 214, 235, 246, 249; European analogies, 171, 172; and farmers, 34, 206, 216, 238, 244; fiscal record, 241, 245, 250; foreign policies, *see* Roosevelt; and gold, 17, 55, 215, 216, 242, 230; headlines of, 210; Hoover prophecy on, 242; and housing, 211; and Liberalism, 234, 240, 243; liberty under, 48, 205, 207, 210, 226, 235, 243, 244; mail, franked, 23; mismanagement of, 34, 205, 206, 213, 214, 228, 251, 254; mysteries of, 244; and NRA, 172; objectives of, 240; officials, 213, 229, 230, 235; political machine, 212, 232, 236, 246, 249; power-growth, 220, 238; *see* Personal power; price-production theory, 244; propaganda, 231, 244; purge, 231, 244; and recovery, 206, 228, 233, 240, 243, 246, 251; relief, 117, 213, 230; self-praise, 47, 240; spending, 166, 209, 213, 214, 218, 226, 227, 230, 233, 235, 242; spending, defense, 5, 7, 8, 11, 217, 247, 248; tariff record, 249; totalitarianism, 25, 66, 99, 104, 226, 229, 242, 244; and underprivileged, 12, 111, 113, 206, 207, 230; *see also* Roosevelt
- New Deal, in France, 251, 252, 253; in Germany, 251, 253, 254
- New Dealers, 229, 230; on Munich Pact, 42; speeches of, 240; and war hysteria, 32, 46, 48, 49, 50, 87
- "New Era," 191
- "New Freedom," 191
- New Haven, Connecticut, address at, 66 ff.
- "New Order," 107, 109, 191
- New World, 107
- New York City, 112; address at, 4 ff., 52 ff., 55 ff., 77 ff., 174 ff.
- Newspapers, 231, 232, 234, 237, 238; *see also* Freedom of speech and press
- Non-combatants, 122, 130; *see also* Civilians; Women and children

- North Sea, 196  
 Norway, 95, 117, 121, 122, 143, 218; food of, 119, 132, 136, 137, 138, 142, 144, 150; Norwegians in America, 125, 145  
 NRA, 172, 235
- Obsolescence, 8, 13, 22, 59, 99  
 Officials, 192, 215, 225, 226; New Deal, 213, 229, 230, 235; *see also* Government employees  
 Ohio State University, 157  
 Old age, 110, 166, 215  
 Old World, 43, 230; *see also* Europe  
 Omaha, 4  
 One-man head, 57, 99, 100; *see also* Indispensable man  
 One-ocean navy, 99  
 One-party government, 203  
 One-third underprivileged, 12, 111, 113, 206, 207, 230  
 Opportunity, 23, 26, 223  
 Opposition, 204, 210, 241; in dictatorship, 167, 171, 202, 229; to food-relief, 119, 126; to war, 88  
 Optimism, 53, 66  
 Overproduction, 186
- Pacific Ocean, 44, 81, 83, 91, 100  
 Pacifism, 48, 56, 193; Hoover stand, 50  
 Panaceas, 169  
 Panic, bank-depositors, 240; world, 37  
 Paris, 4  
 Parliament, 63, 167, 252  
 Partisanship, 121, 201, 225; Hoover as non-partisan, 55, 78, 121  
 Peace, American policy of, 50, 67, 74, 217, 238; and Communism, 4, 39, 40; and Hoover Library, 196 ff.; Hoover policies for, 37, 50; as issue, 56, 88, 101, 103, 188, 192, 219, 254; and Munich Pact, 42; and party-adjournment, 204; pre-war, 6, 7, 8, 36, 208; production for, 11; Quakers on, 5; and Republicans, 7, 246, 247; Roosevelt record on, 7, 37, 38, 40, 42, 44, 48, 51; and world changes, 15, 189  
 Peace, European war, American hope in, 74; compromise, 93, 100; Peace-table of, 66, 74, 76, 85, 101, 102, 109, 221; problems of, 69, 74, 98, 109; temporary, 16  
 Peace, permanent, 75, 98, 100, 110, 113; America's part in, 102, 221; imposed, 88, 97; Wilsonian, 106; World War aim, 107  
 Peace, World War, Conference, 1919, 98; failure of, 67, 72, 74, 107, 109, 168; hope of, 71; Hoover hope, 106; negotiated, 70; Peace-table of, 71, 73, 109, 198
- Peace machinery, world, 7, 43  
 Peace-promises, campaign, 50, 61, 77, 202  
 Peacemakers, 130  
 Pennsylvania, Society of New York, 55 ff.; University of, 14 ff.  
 Perkins, Secretary Frances, 237  
 Persecution, 69; *see also* Smearing  
 Pershing, General John, 152, 160, 196  
 Personal power, 11, 228, 229, 232, 236, 239, 241; check on, 226; Democrats on, 234; in New Deal, 229, 230, 231, 235, 243, Presidential, 63, 64, 210, 225, 226, 227, 228, 238, 246, 250; rise of, 169, 224; and third term, 234, 238; vested, 60; in war, 98  
 Peru, 24  
 Pestilence, 61, 124, 131, 132, 148; postwar, 147, 197; World War, 130; *see also* Disease  
 Philadelphia, address at, 14 ff.; 205 ff.  
 Philip II, 54  
 Phillips, Colonel, 105  
 Physics, 21  
 Planned Economy, 169, 209, 235, 244; European, 8, 20, 88, 244  
 Points, Roosevelt-Churchill, 106; Wilson, 107  
 Poison gas, 38  
 Poland, American help, 95; conquest of, 38, 94, 95, 218; credits, 153; disease in, 142; food-relief to, 117, 118, 121, 122, 132, 136, 137, 142, 143, 144, 150; World War, 142  
 Poland, Central, 122, 132, 136, 137, 138, 144; Eastern, 134  
 Political machine, 229, 230, 238; New Deal, 212, 232, 236, 246, 249; relief, 230; totalitarian, 213, 229  
 Political parties, 48, 201, 204, 229; European, 168; *see also* Coalition  
 Political patronage, 210, 212, 227  
 Politicians, 9, 10, 11, 12, 194  
 Politics, 201, 219; Hoover stand, 55; relief, 212, 230  
 Popular fronts, European, 209  
 Population, 22, 175; European, 108, 136; and food, 122  
 Pork barrel, 227  
 Portugal, 95, 135  
 Posa, Marquis of, 54  
 Poughkeepsie, address at, 121 ff.  
 Poverty, 53, 215; abolition of, 36, 67; European, 168, 209, 239; New Deal, 12, 206, 207, 210, 211, 228, 230; post-war, 58, 61, 100, 111, 113, 220  
 Power, balance of, 42, 203, 227; economic, *see* Economic power; European, 42, 43, 235; growth of, 170, 209, 229; instruments of, 226, 235; New Deal, 210, 220; political, 212, 233;

- of purse, 210; restraints on, 210; technological, 180; *see also* Personal power
- Power-politics, Hoover on, 42; international, 42, 43, 225, 229; and Munich Pact, 42; post-war, 98; Roosevelt, 41, 43, 44, 46, 95, 246
- Praetorian Guard, 249
- Pratt, Admiral William V., 152, 153, 160
- Premier, coalition, 202; French, 13, 27-28, 171, 209, 252, 253
- Preparedness, 6, 12, 14, 56, 57, 66, 77, 86, 92, 98, 110, 114, 193, 217, 242 and aid to Britain, 83; cost of, 7, 19, 57, 173, 179, 217; economic, 14 ff.; elements of, 82; and employment, 210; Hoover program for, 8, 9, 12, 40, 99; lack of, 6, 7, 44, 45, 79, 81, 99, 100, 220, 249; need of, 4, 5, 36, 46, 50, 56, 82, 85, 101, 202, 219; "on order," 241; organization for, 9; Republican record on, 6, 7, 204, 207, 216, 247; and research, 181, 185; Roosevelt reduction in, 247; and standard of living, 57; *see also* Defense, national
- Preparedness, European, 5; *see also* Rearmament
- Presidency, 11, 227; and cabinet, 203; difficulties of, 254; diplomatic courtesy, 43, 221; Hoover experience in, 34, 239, 254; and legislature, 203; qualifications for, 35; and third term, 224; and war, 88, 110, 221
- President Roosevelt, *see* Roosevelt
- Presidential campaign, *see* Campaign, Presidential; Election, Presidential
- Press, free, *see* Free speech and Free press
- Pressure groups, *see* Groups, pressure
- Prices, 24, 170, 172, 209, 226, 244, 252; corn and wheat, 246, 247; inflated, 58, 99; New Deal theory, 244; postwar, 18, 58; and production, 20, 32, 59; totalitarian, 20
- Primaries, 236, 250
- Prime Ministers, British, 37, 140, 149
- Priorities, 57, 59
- Privilege, 169, 170, 194, 209
- Pro-America, 240
- Production, 209, 212, 214, 250, 252; costs, 20, 21, 24, 59, 180, 244; for defense, *see* Defense; European, 10, 120, 168; increased, 21, 22, 58, 59, 179, 180, 194; managed, 23, 170, 172, 209, 226, 244, 252; post-war, 18, 58; and prices, 20, 22, 59
- Productivity, 169, 170, 194, 219; European, 168; and research, 178
- Progress, 15, 55, 192, 193, 211, 212; industrial, 173; and invention, 183; and universities, 191; world, 24
- Propaganda, 71, 190, 198, 236; European, 225; ideological, 60, 62, 207; New Deal, 231, 244; records of, 198; against relief, 149; and war, 56, 66, 77, 87, 190, 198
- Property, private, 17, 166, 211
- Prosperity, 12, 20, 74, 75, 243, 255
- Public interest, 23
- Public opinion, 126, 131, 149, 155, 244; polls of, 23, 125, 128
- Purge, 229, 231, 232
- Quaker faith, 5, 178
- Quarantine, of dictators, 41, 42
- Quotas, 25
- Races, in America, 52, 103, 132, 145, 154, 176; European, 54, 74, 107, 108
- Radio, 182
- Railways, 211
- Reactionaries, 172, 231, 234, 241; Jefferson as, 112
- Realism, 219
- Re-armament, European, 5, 7, 41
- Reason, 56, 72, 84, 89, 218
- Reconstruction, 113, 221
- Recovery, American, 206, 228, 233, 240, 243, 246, 251; British, 209; in democracies, 206, 233, 252; post-war, 75; world, 36, 37, 233, 251
- Red Cross, 89, 129, 139, 158, 160
- Reformation, rise of, 41
- Reforms, 212, 215, 242, 252
- Refugees, 31, 33, 52, 136
- Regeneration, 15, 222, 245
- Regimentation, 60, 98, 242
- Regulation, government, 172, 226, 244, 252
- Rehabilitation, world, 98
- Relief, unemployment, 129, 139, 165, 212, 216, 226; politics in, 213, 249, 250; relief-rolls, 12, 34, 206, 228, 230; Republican, 212, 230; spending, 7, 214
- Religion, 52, 106, 121, 155, 169; Boys' Clubs, 176; and Communism, 93, 94; in Europe, 104, 108, 122, 171, 208, 211; revolt against, 59; wars of, 49
- Reparations, 71, 98
- Republican, businessmen, 172; Congressmen, 40, 203, 213, 217; Presidents, 39; Secretaries of State, 38, 39; Senators, 227, 230
- Republican Administrations, defense record, 6, 7, 8, 9, 36, 216, 217, 247, 248; recovery in, 206, 240, 251; social reforms, 215; spending, 214, 216, 217

- Republican National Convention of 1860, 205; of 1940, 204 ff.
- Republican Party, and coalition, 201, 203; and freedom, 205; issue for, 223; and peace, 246; and preparedness, 6, 7, 8, 9, 36, 216, 217, 247, 248; program for, 204, 207, 210; relief stand, 212; on third term, 238
- Republics, 224, 227
- Repudiation, 17
- Research, historic, 196
- Research, scientific, 9, 12, 21, 23, 25, 26, 29, 178, 180, 183, 185, 190; committees of, 23; spending for, 21, 181, 184, 186
- Resources, 13, 75, 76, 108
- Revolution, American, 243
- Revolutions, 166, 167, 191, 197, 208, 209, 239; causes, 38, 57, 168; of ideas, 207; industrial, 179, 223; post-war, 73, 100, 165, 197, 210
- Reynaud, Premier Paul, 27, 28
- Rickard, Edgar, 197
- Rights, human, 93, 106, 223; *see also* Freedom; Liberty
- Robin Moor*, 87, 88, 97
- Rome, 244, 250; Ancient, 249
- Roosevelt, President Franklin, 64, 218; advisers of, 43, 47, 87, 237, 244; American ideals, 36; bank-panic, 28, 233; campaign promises, 38, 50, 61, 77, 172, 202, 245-50; class hate, 43; coalition government, 203; Communism, 39-40; currency, 240; defense organization, 46; Democratic convention, 237; primaries, 236; as dictator, 224, 226, 232, 344; Economic Conference, 37, 218; foreign policies, 34-40, 42, 43, 46 ff., 51, 95, 103, 106, 218, 224, 241, 246, 248, 253, 254; French New Deal, 253; Geneva Conference, 38; MacDonald, 37; Munich Pact, 42; purge, 232; Roosevelt-Churchill agreement, 106; Russia, 39-40, 43, 94; supporters on, 234, 236, 237, 243; smearing by, 230; and Supreme Court, 226, 227, 228; third term, 38, 210, 224 ff., 232; war, 78, 97; war-provocation by, 42, 43, 47, 51, 87, 110, 114, 221; *see also* Defense, national; New Deal; Personal power; Power-politics; Preparedness
- Roosevelt views, on air force, 8; on boom of 1929, 252; on debt, 235; on defense figures, 6, 7, 8, 46, 216; on depression, 38 ff., 233; on Dies Committee, 39; on Four Freedoms, 106; on freedom of the seas, 105; on invasion, 4; on liberals, 234; on peace, 50; on production, 57; on public power, 226, 235, 238;
- on quarantining dictators, 41; on Republican Administration, 216, 246; on *Robin Moor*, 97; on tariff, 249; on unemployment, 47
- Roosevelt-Churchill statement, 106
- Rubber stamp, 227; *see also* Congress
- Rumania, 135
- Russia, 15, 24, 104, 122, 133; aggression by, 40, 94, 134; aid to, 40, 93, 95; Communist, 38, 39, 95, 229; defense, 9, in; and Finland, 40, 94, 134; and food, 118, 122, 133, 134, 142, 143; Napoleonic, 112; and Poland, 122; post-war famine, 166, 217; rearming of, 7; in war, 91
- Russian recognition, 38, 39, 40, 43, 93, 94, 218
- Russo-German war, 87, 90, 104
- Salt Lake City, address at, 240 ff.
- Samaritan, parable of, 145
- Savings, 57, 85, 99, 215
- Scandinavia, 171
- Scapa Flow, 45
- Scarcity, 85, 180
- Schiller, Johann, 54, 221
- Schoolhouses, 111
- Science, 8, 21, 23, 26, 49, 59, 181, 186, 188, 192, 194, 211; applied, 178, 179, 181; pure, 21, 23, 178, 179, 189, 190; *see also* Research
- Scientists, 23, 52
- Sea-power, 49, 91, 93, 128; and air-power, 87, 90
- Secretaries of State, 38; on Russia, 39, 93
- Secretary of the Navy, 7, 8
- Security, 191, 222; social, 223, 242
- Self-determination, world, 106
- Self-glorification, 229, 231
- Self-government, 106, 201, 232
- Self-interest, 127
- Self-reliance, American, 222
- Self-sufficiency, 17, 18, 23, 96, 97, 186, 221
- Senate Committees, Foreign Affairs, 64; Judiciary, 227; Military, 247, 248
- Senators, Democratic, 47, 230, 231, 234, 250; Republican, 227, 230
- Sherman, General William, 72
- Shipping, sinking of, 81, 89, 90, 104, 105, 130, 141; World War, 72
- Ships, American; 44, 45, 46, 64, 80, 105, 106, 121, 126, 153; British, 27, 45, 83, 84; German, 47, 78, 105; Warships, *see* Navy
- Ships, food, 118, 120, 121, 123, 128, 139, 141, 143, 153, 159
- Shooting war, 78, 79, 88, 100, 103
- Siemens, William, 182

- Silver, 244, 250  
 Slogans, 56, 69, 191, 244  
 Slump, pre-inauguration, 247  
 Small democracies, *see* Food-relief; small democracies  
 Smallpox, 138  
 Smearing, 48, 56, 103, 169, 201, 230, 231, 235, 246  
 Soap, 122, 138  
 Social reforms, 215  
 Social service, 250  
 Socialism, 71, 75, 169, 241, 242; American, 35, 57, 110, 235, 238, 246; National, *see* Nazi-ism  
 Sociology, 188, 194  
 South Africa, 45  
 South America, 18, 105, 126, 138, 153  
 Southern Hemisphere, 90  
 Soviet Government; *see* Russia  
 Spain, 95, 128, 135, 166  
 Speculation, 168  
 Speech, free, *see* Free speech  
 Spiritual, energies, 243; growth, 255; leadership, 131, 175; liberty, 190; 205; regeneration, 15; strength, 61  
 Spoils system, 213  
 Sportsmanship, in war, 68  
 Stalin, 93, 94, 104, 223, 253; conquest of, 95, 100; and Hitler, 87, 90, 94; and Roosevelt, 39, 43; *see also* Russia  
 Standards of living, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 57, 58, 59, 165; European, 108, 135, 168, 223; post-war, 18, 221; and science, 179, 184  
 Stanford University, address at, 188 ff., 196 ff.  
 Starvation, for Britain, 84, 141; for Europe, 132, 134, 148; for Germany and Italy, 141; as war-weapon, 124, 140, 141, 148, 158; *see also* Famine  
 State of the nation (1933), 240  
 Strikes and lockouts, *see* Labor strikes  
 Submarines, 44, 81, 219; abolition of, 38; *see* Navy  
 Subsidies, government, 12, 34, 165, 169, 170, 185, 206, 228, 230, 244; housing, 211  
 Suez, 80  
 Sugar beets, 249  
 Supreme Court, 210, 235, 238; attempt on, 227, 228, 233, 245; NRA, 172  
 Sweden, 135  
 Switzerland, 135, 171  
 Tanks, 6, 36, 44, 82, 104; abolition of, 37  
 Tariff, agricultural, 244; post-war, 98; and quotas, 25; reciprocal, 242; Roosevelt promise, 249  
 Tariff Commission, 157  
 Taxation, 17, 226  
 Taxes, 12, 21, 165, 182, 209, 250; system, 22, 57; and war, 38, 71, 111  
 Teachers, 52, 189  
 Technology, 23, 187; unemployment, 21, 180  
 Television, 183  
 Territory, 35, 98, 108  
 Third term, 34, 46, 48, 210, 224, 226, 228, 229, 232, 236, 237, 238, 241, 244, 245, 249  
 Thirty Years' War, 49, 147  
 Thomson, William, 182  
 Tobey, Senator Charles W., 201  
 Totalitarianism, collapse of, 25, 96, 97; economics of, 22, 206; Hoover on, 25, 41, 78, 95, 104, 153; opposition in, 167, 171, 202, 229; post-war, 15, 16, 18; rise of, 167, 208, 242; trade of, 17, 24, 29, 165; and truth, 190; and war, 16, 19, 173, 220, 229  
 Totalitarianism, American, 25, 66, 99, 104, 226, 229, 242, 244  
 Totalitarians, "liberal"; *see* "Liberals," totalitarian  
 Tower of Babel, 245  
 Town populations, 122  
 Trade, American, 16, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 58, 59, 96, 97, 108, 216, 221  
 Trade, European, 16, 17, 18, 24, 37, 97, 106, 108, 218, 221, 251  
 Transportation, for American force, 80; for attack, 10, 12, 44, 91; for food, 139, 151, 153; World War, 159  
 Treaties, 94, 218; trade, 221, 242; *see also* International agreements  
 Treaty of Versailles, 67, 71, 72, 74, 107, 109  
 Trial by jury, 166  
 Trojan horses, 16  
 Truth, 179, 190, 193, 236  
 Turkey, 95  
 Typhus, 124, 127, 138, 139  
 Unemployed, 12, 16, 19, 23, 34, 165, 206, 210, 211  
 Unemployment, 21, 32, 59, 168, 201, 209, 212, 228; and dictatorships, 21; and foreign trade, 24; post-war, 62, 72, 85, no; relief, 145; Roosevelt on, 47; Technological, 21, 180; *see also* Europe United States, *see* America  
 Unity, national, 13, 56, 57, 64, 65, 69, 79, 82, 84, 85, 86, 88, 98, 113, 114, 218; French, 82; political, 10, 203; postwar, 61  
 Universities, 16, 21, 85, 180, 190; duties of, 189, 191, 192; European, 108, 193  
 Utopia, 82, 108  
 Veterans, 111

- Vegetable oils, 157  
 Vested interest, 60, 73, 98  
 Victory, 49, 67, 100, 101; exhaustion, 70; and permanent peace, 98; World War, 71, 141  
 Votes, relief, 213, 241; *see* Elections
- Wages, 18, 22, 23, 58, 59, 172, 236, 241, 244, 252  
 Wall Street, 241  
 Wallace, Secretary Henry, 337  
 Walloons, 33  
 Want, abolition of, 36, 67, 107, 111  
 War, and agriculture, 18, 60, 70, 110, 134, 147; and coalition cabinet, 203; causes, 41, 108, 109, 186, 254; and domestic failure, 48; emotions, 4, 47, 56, 66, 69, 87; and free men, 67, 193; holy, 93; Hoover experience of, 55, 67, 70, 133, 166; methods to end, 98; sacrifices for, 84, 131; and totalitarianism, 96, 220, 229; tyrants, 171  
 War, Assistant Secretary of, 7  
 War, European, 52, 80, 99; causes of, 108, 109, 172; change in, 87; duration of, 49, 78, 80, 81, 84, 91, 92, 93; exhaustion from, 92, 98, 100, 110, 156, 159; and invention, 172; and universities, 192; World War contrast, 68; *see also* America and European War; Food-relief; Peace  
 War, Horseman of, 131  
 War, Revolution and Peace, Hoover Library for, *see* Hoover Library  
 War, total, 68, 70, 129, 173; demobilization of, 60; dictatorship for, 98; mobilization for, 82; *see also* America and European War; Food-relief; World War  
 War Council, 77  
 War Department, 8  
 War Industries Board, 10  
 War psychosis, 48, 56, 61, 66, 87, 110, 190, 192  
 War-aftermaths, 147; coming, 61, 85, 99; Lord Lothian on, 99; World War, 60, 72, 99, 111, 147, 254  
 War-declaration, Congressional, *see* Congress  
 War-ships, *see* Navy  
 War-strategy, change in, 180; food as, 124, 140, 141, 147, 148, 158  
 War, Civil, 204; Napoleonic, 147, 184; Thirty Years', 49; *see also* War, European  
 Warsaw, 124, 139  
 Waste, 11, 21, 59, 185; study of, 23; in war, 93  
 Watt, James, 182  
 Wavre, 29, 30
- Wealth, national, 34, 194, 20; French, 252; post-war, 99  
 Weapons, aggressive, abolition of, 37, 38  
 Weapons, American, 6, 9, 82; for Britain, 46, 112; for invasion, 4; revolution in, 105; *see* Armament; Preparedness  
 West, agricultural, 249  
 West Point, 244  
 Western Hemisphere, 19, 52, 113, 207, 219, 220; attack on, 4, 5, 13, 35, 50, 91, 101, 105; defense of, 46, 82, 101, 201, 248; democracy, 50; food from, 122; and totalitarians, 96  
 Weygand, General, 31  
 Wheat, 134, 246, 247  
 White, Andrew D., 196  
 White, William Allen, 56  
 White House, 254, 255  
 Whitlock, Brand, 140  
 Whitney, Eli, 180  
 Wilbur, Ray Lyman, 189, 197  
 Willkie, Wendell, 46, 93, 239, 240, 245, 246, 250; on democracy, 243; and peace, 50, 51, 202  
 Wilson, President Woodrow, 9, 70, 72, 73; and Fourteen Points, 107, 109; Russian recognition, 38, 39, 93  
 Wisconsin University, 157  
 Women and children, attack on, 5, 143; enemy, 72; small democracies, 142, 154; starvation for, 61, 132, 138, 148, 154; in total war, 68, 127, 130, 180; *see also* Food-relief  
 Women's organizations, 240  
 World War, aftermaths of, 70, 72, 165, 172, 206; aggressor nations, 107; Allies, 72, 109, 124; American aims, 67, 69, 95, 107, 219; American relief, *see* Food-relief, World War; blockade in, 123, 139, 140, 141, 152, 160; cost of, 57, 111; debts, 17, 99, 111, 165; documentation of, 196, 197; epidemics in, 127; experience from, 10, 67, 99, 185, 190; and farmers, 58, 60, 70; hates in, 141; Hoover experience in, 9, 55, 67, 77, 107, 130; propaganda in, 56, 108; shipping, 90; starvation in, 61, 132, 140, 147, 155; war-organization, 9, 10, 11, 57, 60, 63; *see also* Peace, World War  
 World's Fair, 3  
 WPA, 241, 249
- Youth, 23, 26, 56, 66, 114; European, 168; post-war problems, 75; opportunity for, 186, 189, 251; and war, 67, 74, 82