

FURTHER ADDRESSES

UPON

THE AMERICAN ROAD

BY

Herbert Hoover

1938-1940

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

1940

COPYRIGHT, 1940, BY
EDGAR RICKARD

Printed in the United States of America
A

Contents

PART I: DOMESTIC POLICIES

MORALS IN GOVERNMENT	3
<i>[Joint Republican Organizations, Kansas City, Missouri, September 28, 1938]</i>	
UNDERMINING REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT	21
<i>[Joint Republican Organizations, Hartford, Connecticut, October 17, 1938]</i>	
THE ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF THE NEW DEAL	39
<i>[Joint Republican Organizations, Spokane, Washington, November 5, 1938]</i>	
THE REAL STATE OF THE UNION	58
<i>[Fifty-third Annual Lincoln Day Banquet of the National Republican Club, New York City, February 13, 1939]</i>	
OUR MOST IMPORTANT DOMESTIC ISSUE	69
<i>[Joint Republican Organizations, Omaha, Nebraska, February 12, 1940]</i>	

PART II: FOREIGN POLICIES

AMERICA AND THE WORLD CRISIS	83
<i>[The Forum on Current Problems, New York City, October 26, 1938]</i>	

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S NEW FOREIGN POLICIES	93
<i>[Council on Foreign Relations, Chicago, Illinois, February 1, 1939]</i>	
FOREIGN POLICIES TODAY	104
<i>[Liberty Magazine, April 15, 1939]</i>	
SHALL WE SEND OUR YOUTH TO WAR?	116
<i>[American Magazine, July 15, 1939]</i>	
A NEW PROPOSAL FOR AMERICAN ACTION	129
<i>[International Convention of Christian Endeavor Societies, Cleveland, Ohio, July 6, 1940]</i>	
WE MUST KEEP OUT	139
<i>[Saturday Evening Post, October 27, 1939]</i>	
RUSSIAN MISADVENTURE	158
<i>[Collier's, April 27, 1940]</i>	
THE NINE HORSEMEN AND AMERICA	172
<i>[Liberty Magazine, June 5, 1940]</i>	
 <i>PART III: SCIENTIFIC, RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL GROUPS</i> 	
THE IMPERATIVE NEED FOR MORAL RE-ARMAMENT	183
<i>[Annual Meeting of the York Bible Class, Toronto, Canada, November 22, 1938]</i>	
ENGINEERS AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS	192
<i>[Annual Alumni Banquet of Stevens Institute of Technology, New York City, February 2, 1939]</i>	
YOUR INHERITANCE OF LIBERTY	197
<i>[Commencement Exercises, Lincoln University, Harrogate, Tennessee, June 4, 1939]</i>	

AND WHAT IS LIBERALISM?	208
<i>[Commencement Exercises, Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana, June 12, 1939]</i>	
THE HOOVER LIBRARY ON WAR, REVOLUTION AND PEACE	215
<i>[Statement to the Trustees, August 30, 1939]</i>	
A BOY'S WORLD	219
<i>[Dedication of the Madison Square Boys' Club, New York City, April 29, 1940]</i>	
<i>PART IV: WAR RELIEF</i>	
THE SPIRIT OF POLAND	227
<i>[Pulaski Memorial Day, New York City, October 11, 1939]</i>	
RELIEF OF FINLAND	231
<i>[Madison Square Garden Mass-meeting, New York City, December 20, 1939]</i>	
EXTRACTS FROM ADDRESSES ON FINNISH RELIEF	236
<i>[December 7, 1939; February 20, 1940; March 14, 1940]</i>	
THE JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE CAMPAIGN OF 1940	241
<i>[Campaign Dinner of the Jewish Welfare Fund, Chicago, Illinois, February 11, 1940]</i>	
RELIEF FOR POLAND	246
<i>[Madison Square Garden Mass-meeting, March 12, 1940]</i>	

PART I

ADDRESSES UPON DOMESTIC POLICIES

Morals in Government

Address delivered to

Joint Republican, Organizations

KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

[September 28, 1938]

MR. ROOSEVELT has now offered the New Deal as the basis of a new political party. He summons all liberals to join him or be cast into outer darkness. I absolutely reject his interpretation of the terms Liberal and Conservative.

I propose to explore this proposed party, not by their theories or their professions, but by the test of the greatest Leader humanity has ever known, who said: "By their fruits ye shall know them."

I propose to make three addresses in this exploration. I shall, on this first occasion, deal with morals in government. At Hartford, Connecticut, I shall have something to say on the destruction of government of free men. And in the third address at Spokane, I shall have something to say as to the economic consequences.

That is represented by 11,000,000 men out of jobs, by farm prices lower in gold than ever in our history, and by the burden of debt which will blight opportunities for youth in America.

And in all cases, I shall suggest some lights for those in the outer darkness. Those lights will not be will-o'-the-wisps.

When we come to questions of immorality in government there can be no soft and respectful argument. The only emotion

appropriate to immorality is indignation. That is the time to take the gloves off. They are off.

These moral forces which affect the character and the soul of a people will control its destinies. Where they enter government they far transcend all political partisanship. The progress of mankind is in proportion to the advancement of truth and justice. Standards of truth and justice are what we usually call morals.

I have little need to define moral standards. The American people learn them at their mothers' knees. They include not only money honesty. They include telling the whole truth. They include keeping one's word. They include fidelity to public trust.

They exclude hypocrisy. They exclude creation of hate. Half-truth, hypocrisy and hate are departments in the art of demagogues. The polite phrase for all this is intellectual dishonesty.

It is moral standards in government which create sturdy self-reliance and self-respect among citizens. It is moral standards that create perceptions of what degrades the faith of a people in self-government.

During the last six years the growth of the cancerous idea that there are two standards of morals in American life has been foisted on the American people. That malignant idea is that political morals are a lower code than private morals. The apology for this double standard for government has been that the end, or to use New Deal words, "the objective," justifies the means. That is, if you can get away with it. That is the very gospel of dictatorship. That whole idea is a violation of the very foundation of Christian ethics. Wrong conduct creates moral degeneration which defeats the end. In practice it works out that government must be conducted by fooling the majority of the people all the time or buying them part of the time.

When citizens are crooked among themselves the damage falls mostly upon them. And it may affect their chances in the Life Eternal. But when government is immoral, it damages the morals of a whole people.

And let me say at once I do not claim that political morals have been perfect in this Republic under any political party. There have been sporadic incidents and there have been black spots which have been our shame. But during the past six years there has been systematic degeneration.

If the standards of honor, sincerity, and truth in public life are to differ from those we learned at our mothers' knees then this Republic is lost. It is the moral slide more even than the economic degeneration that in the last twenty years has carried nation after nation over the precipice to dictatorship.

I propose to illustrate what I mean with a few examples. In this single address I can deal only with seven or eight. If you look around you will be able to collect others.

SAMPLE I

The foremost of the New Deal Party's alphabetical morals is the G. E. A. A.—Get Elected Anyhow Anyway.

For fifty years the American people have fought the politicians to dig out the spoils system. They fought not alone to stop corruption but to stop government employees from packing elections. They built a great moral dike of non-political selection by merit. In six years we have lost forty years of the ground gained by that moral crusade.

At the end of my Administration 83 per cent of all Federal employees had been selected upon merit by the Civil Service Commission. That is the highest figure ever attained. And if a Democratic Congress had been willing it would have been 95 per cent.

During the six years of Mr. Roosevelt's Administration over 300,000 office holders have been politically appointed to the Federal government. They were without the merit requirement of the Civil Service. And that does not include some 100,000 part-time committee members. As such committee members get little pay Republicans are sometimes eligible. Politics has been the first test of merit in the 300,000. Andrew Jackson's dream of spoils rose to only four or five thousand.

The excuse that the appointment of this 300,000 outside the Civil Service was necessary in an emergency is sheer hypocrisy. Woodrow Wilson did not desert the merit system or non-political appointments during his great emergency of the War. Recently Mr. Roosevelt proposed to enlist part of this army into the merit service by executive order. New Deal executive orders are not proof of merit.

If you can find any of that Roosevelt three to four hundred thousand who are not interfering with a free ballot in this campaign, it is because their bosses have slipped up. We saw his political army turned on to purge non-conformist Democrats from the New Deal Liberal Party.

And this spoils system has other implications besides interference with a free ballot. It degrades public life. By example it pollutes every local government. Working for the government becomes a racket, not a career. Unless this patronage system is destroyed it will destroy this republic.

This New Deal army of political appointees is the American form of the Praetorian Guard of Ancient Rome. That political band had exactly similar habits in making elections foolproof. They were also active in the decline and fall of the morals of the Roman Empire. We have, however, improved the Roman practice. Our three to four hundred thousand of New Deal political employees are the officers of an army of ten million voters who receive benefits from the government.

SAMPLE II

And this brings me to Sample No. II, concerning the activity of these officers. But it will need a moment's background.

In 1930 as President I announced that as a nation we "must prevent hunger and cold to those of our people who are in honest difficulties." And I undertook the organization of their relief. I had had some years' experience elsewhere with the moral and political dangers in relief. I determined that America should not be subjected to those calamities. To prevent this we saw to it that non-partisan committees of leading citizens

were established in some 3000 communities, where relief was needed. These committees were given the full responsibility of administration. These committees were unpaid. They had no vested interest in keeping unemployment going. At the start their money support was local. As the situation deepened, first the States and finally the Federal government gave financial aid to these committees. Parallel with this, we greatly expanded useful Public Works at regular pay and full-time employment.

At this point I may wipe away a current New Deal crocodile tear. And that wells constantly out of their emotion that they were the first Administration with human sympathy or to give real relief to the distressed. They admit now that when they took over the government in 1933, our relief organization was regularly providing for over 5,400,000 distressed homes of over 21,000,000 persons. And these figures did not include Federal Public Works, or the special service to 400,000 veterans. What the New Deal in fact did was to wreck this system of local, non-partisan administration and substitute a political administration centralized in Washington. After six years the practical relief situation instead of being better is worse. The moral consequences have been degrading to the whole people.

Under local administration there was a summoning of community sympathy, a desire to help not alone with relief but with jobs and with encouragement. Today instead of being viewed as unfortunate and entitled to aid these Americans are being unjustly ridiculed as lazy parasites. But worse than even this, great numbers of self-reliant people are being inexorably molded into the hopelessness of a permanent army of relief. A hierarchy of officials is being built whose jobs depend on keeping people on relief. And American youth is being poured into this mould. It is sheer madness. A class wall of hate and fear of those on relief is growing daily.

And now, national sympathy is being defied by politics. Harry Hopkins and Aubrey Williams handle billions of your money given for relief of these distressed people. Messrs. Hopkins

and Williams have the power in this Republic to say who shall have bread and who shall not.

You will recollect the trick words by which these men this last June effectually told people on relief how to vote—or else.

Ripped of all disguises and all intellectual dishonesty, the statements of these men were a direction to these millions and their wives and relatives how to vote.

The New Deal Senatorial Committee whitewashed those trick statements as inoffensive. Messrs. Hopkins and Williams know the millions of WPA workers understand the English language even if these Senators do not.

Even if these gentlemen had never made these remarks there is scarcely one of the thousands of appointees that direct the WPA who was selected under the non-partisan Civil Service. They were selected with the approval—or something stronger—of some Democratic County Chairman, some New Deal Congressman, or some other political person. It was in fact entirely superfluous for Messrs. Hopkins and Williams to have uttered a hint. These politicians will do the hinting to those distressed people anyway. And the commanders of this detachment of the Praetorian Guard are even bolder. In the few months just prior to the 1934 Congressional election and the 1936 Presidential election, the business situation was improving. There was much less need for relief. A Congressional Committee has shown that nevertheless in those election months the number of people assisted by relief was greatly expanded. It also showed that in the same months in the off years they were greatly decreased. This was said to be a coincidence.

Again we approach an election. Again the business situation is improving and private jobs are increasing. But again more voters are being put on relief. No doubt this is also a coincidence.

If we want proof of this use of relief for pressure on the votes of distressed peoples we may turn to the recent record. The hideous morals of these actions in a free Republic were denounced by a few Democratic Senators whose morals rise

above elections. Democratic Senator Hatch proposed a law in the Senate designed to stop relief officials from using relief for vote getting purposes. The Senator said, "Those who believe that out in the counties and in the cities and in the precincts this instrumentality which we have set up is not being used for political purposes are more credulous than I am."

However, Senator Barkley, President Roosevelt's selected leader of the Senate, led the opposition to Senator Hatch's motion. The motion was defeated by President Roosevelt's rubber stamp followers in the Senate.

Would this law have been defeated if President Roosevelt had breathed one whisper of approval for it? Or better, if he had expressed one word of indignation at the action of his supporters in the Senate? Instead, Mr. Roosevelt journeyed to Kentucky to endorse the re-election of Senator Barkley.

And this sample in Kentucky could not be unknown to Mr. Roosevelt. Some months ago the Democratic Scripps-Howard papers courageously exposed the use of the WPA in Kentucky "as a grand political racket in which the taxpayer is the victim." Harry Hopkins as usual denounced the reporter as untruthful. Later on, even the Senate Committee, after investigation, had to stigmatize this stench. They said, "These facts should arouse the conscience of the country. They imperil the right of the people to a free and unpolluted ballot." I notice it was the conscience of the country that they summoned. They apparently did not think it worth while to call it to the conscience of the President.

Mr. Roosevelt has mastered the power to bestow bread and butter to millions of people or withhold it from them. He called upon the people specifically in Kentucky, in Oklahoma, Georgia, South Carolina, and Maryland to vote for his selections for the Senate. At about the same time relief wages in those territories were raised. Mr. Roosevelt threw in a few bridges and announced a new economic program for the South by government subsidy. I may not believe all this has any connection with these primaries or this election. But the question is do the relief workers believe it? Of course the people

on relief are free to vote the Republican ticket also. But do they know that?

Nor is this use of bait sectional. It envelops the whole nation. This spring when economic improvement was obvious without artificial stimulants and just before this election, this three billion dollar pump-priming program was enacted. The headlines daily flame with the assignment of some pork to every Congressional district. New Deal candidates proudly announce its arrival to their constituents. Cities and communities push in Washington to get their feet in the trough. Hundreds of them justify their manners at the Treasury by the immoral excuse that somebody else will get it. They organize a lobby to see they get it. And, worse still, government officials urge them to arrive early before the trough is empty.

Do you wonder that the whole world stands amazed at this supposedly great republic of free men? Do you wonder that every dictator in Europe uses this exhibit to prove the failure of self-government?

And there are still more ramifications of all this. Some of our local political organizations, whether Republican or Democrat, have not been perfect in the past. But we are today confronted with more disheartening growth of high-powered political machines in our cities than ever before in our history. Kansas City, Saint Louis, Jersey City, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Memphis, Chicago, and what not. It may be coincidence that these machines are supporting the New Deal. It is no coincidence that for six years the patronage and the subsidies of the New Deal have been handled by these political bosses.

We hear much Presidential urging of economic royalists to virtue. It is probably coincidence that we hear no moral urging of political royalists.

And these are but a few of the black spots. What of the stench of the primaries in Pennsylvania, New Mexico, Indiana and Tennessee? What of the indictments of high officials in Connecticut? In New York? What of the New Deal Governor of Pennsylvania who compels a legislature to suppress a Grand Jury inquiry into charges of corruption against him?

And you know and I know that moral corruption by expenditure of these huge sums of public money penetrates every county and every village. The indignant citizen used to roll up his sleeves and with his neighbors hope to clean corruption in his own town. But when it floods from Washington what hope has he to stem the tide?

Do you wonder that our own people lose faith in honesty? Do they not lose faith in democracy? Does it not disintegrate the moral standards of our people?

This gigantic expenditure of public money will make its beneficiaries drunk on the basest selfishness and it will make any group drunk with power.

That seems to be one of the attractions of this New Deal Liberal Party.

SAMPLE III

We may take up another spot where a contribution could be made to higher morals. A Republican Administration in 1925 passed a Corrupt Practices Act prohibiting corporations from contributing to political funds. That law was founded upon public morals. It seems that the New Deal considers it a reactionary measure. In a liberal spirit, something over a year ago Mr. Roosevelt personally autographed several hundred blank sheets of paper. These autographs turned up in Democratic propaganda books. These books could be produced for about 50 cents per copy. On August 12, 1937, the Congress was asked to investigate the selling of these books to corporations for \$250 apiece in Mr. Parley's name. Mr. Parley is appointed by and responsible to Mr. Roosevelt. Perhaps those corporations were collecting autographs. But Mr. Roosevelt's autograph can be bought in the bookshops for 95 per cent less than \$250. But no doubt the corporations needed autographed special editions of this book. And for the good of these corporations it was decided they needed not one autograph each but even ten or twenty. They no doubt could learn from it how to make nails or cement. Possibly it provides sedative reading between sessions with the Labor Board.

In asking for an investigation, a mass of affidavits, original letters, and photostatic copies of correspondence and other evidence was laid before the House of Representatives. These proved that Mr. Parley's agents had sold these books to wealthy corporations for party funds under thinly disguised threats and thinly disguised promises. After the incessant and lofty urging to virtue which the corporations have received this must have been a bump. It was at least a moral violation of the spirit of the Corrupt Practices Act. Mr. Roosevelt's Attorney-General said it was perfectly legal. No investigation could be had.

Later on, a list of hundreds of corporations to which these books had been sold was exposed in the press. Many of them were firms having business with the government. If Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Farley were not aware of the use of Mr. Roosevelt's signature and the methods by which it was being sold at \$250 a time, why did they not at least express indignation? Why did they not return the money?

And this immorality does not end with government officials. These are two parties to these transactions. There were some men of moral stamina who refused to buy. Their corporate morals were higher than the government's. But does this not show a breakdown, under the pressure of our government, of the moral stamina in the men who bought these books under these circumstances?

When the youth of this country see these things done, can we wonder they become cynical and scoff at all idealism?

SAMPLE IV

There is another department of current government morals. That has to do with financial honor in government business. We can select from a wide display of samples.

In the campaign of 1932 from information obviously since corroborated, I challenged Mr. Roosevelt's intention to tinker with the currency. He denied such an idea indignantly as immoral, and he assured the country that the contract (that is the obligation written on government currency and

bonds to pay in gold of present weight and fineness) was more than a contract—it was a covenant. But to make us really feel uncomfortable Mr. Roosevelt asked Senator Glass also to make a reply to my charges. The Senator's reputation for veracity was impregnable. The Senator did the job with his unsurpassed vocabulary. But the Senator is an honest man. Let me quote from his speech only seven months later. After indicating his regret at ever having delivered that first speech, he continued: ". . . To me the suggestion that we may devalue the gold dollar 50 per cent means national repudiation. To me it means dishonor. In my conception of it, it is immoral. All the legalistic arguments . . . have not dislodged from my mind the irrevocable conviction that it is immoral, and that it means not only contravention of my party's platform . . . but the promises of party spokesmen during the campaign. . . ."

And the New Deal passed a law preventing the citizen from access to the courts for justice and redress.

That was the beginning of New Deal standards in Financial Morals. It has not been the end.

We may take a more recent sample. Most of us favor old age pensions. We helped establish them in the states before the New Deal was born. We do not criticize that purpose of the Social Security Act. That Act, however, developed other purposes. The country was told it was a system of contributory old age insurance. It has turned out to be concealed taxation of the poorest of our people. It is said the collections are paid into a reserve fund. The collections last year were used for current expenditures of the government. You will have to be taxed over again to make it good. That scheme also obscures the real deficit and fools the people into thinking that their budget is nearer to being balanced.

To prove my language is moderate, let me quote some phrases from an editorial in the Democratic *New York Times* of about a month ago. The *Times* supported Mr. Roosevelt's election in 1932 and 1936. They call it "pious fraud," "a fraud and a

delusion," "not a reserve in the real sense of the word," "already been spent," "funds will have to be raised all over again by new taxation," "this hocus-pocus."

It is an intricate piece of morals. I am reminded of a postmaster who got in the habit of taking the cash from the till and putting in his I. O. U. The Postal Inspectors caught up with him and he received five years. In his application for pardon his friends urged strongly that he was a rigidly honest man, and as proof of it, they cited the fact that he put his I. O. U. in the till each time he took out the money.

This postmaster's "objectives" were no doubt good. He was no doubt building up a reserve for his old age. Certainly his confusion of objectives and morals had a modernistic flavor.

This juggling of government accounts to obscure the realities goes much further. If you will examine the published statements of the Treasury, you will find that collections from government recoverable loans are being used for current expenses. And yet they claim that recoverable loans should be deducted from their increase of national debt. And the old game of obscuring accounts between Regular Expenses and Emergency and Relief goes on and on. Mr. Roosevelt uses the expression "a layman's budget" every autumn. It serves effectively for the annual pledge of a balanced budget. And in the spring it serves to explain the deficit. Apparently in these days a pledge in the fall becomes an objective in the spring. And that postpones the feelings of the taxpayer.

There is one certainty about this "layman's budget." The layman is a person who is ignorant of a science. But in this case the bill may teach him something.

I delivered a whole address on samples of this particular form of government by deception two years ago. It is still unanswered.

SAMPLE V

There is another large department of New Deal morals that we may also explore. We hear much of social conscience and social justice these days. That is public conscience. I rejoice

in their continued rise and understanding. Public conscience is only the aggregate of personal conscience of the mass of the people. But public conscience will wilt away unless there is the still small voice of personal conscience. For thence spring good faith, honor, and personal integrity. Here rest intellectual honesty and justice itself. Where personal conscience dies there is no freedom for there is no justice. As personal conscience dies, social conscience becomes but a stepping stone of personal power.

I have recently visited many countries of totalitarian government—dictatorships, Fascists, Socialists, or Nazis. Their slogans are social conscience and social justice. But their outstanding characteristic is degradation of personal conscience.

As an example of personal conscience, we might examine the reasons given and the methods used by Mr. Roosevelt in his attempt to pack the Supreme Court. I am not going to enter into the demerits of packing the Court. I am concerned with the moral processes displayed in explaining the reasons for it to the country.

Urbanity of debate limits my use of the English language. I shall therefore quote wholly from those who have supported Mr. Roosevelt. I shall not tire you with long quotations. I will merely mention some of the hard words they use.

Mr. Walter Lippmann's expressions include "trick," "concealed his purposes," "lack of good faith," "lawless legality," "vicious legalism," "use the letter of the law to violate the spirit," "degrading," "reactionary," "misleading," "impairs the dignity of his office," "injure the moral foundations of the Republic."

The Democratic *New York Times* uses the words, "political sharp practice," "indirectness," "adroitness."

The Democratic *Baltimore Sun* says "disingenuous," "devious," "deceptive," intent to deceive."

The Democratic *Richmond Times-Dispatch* says "lack of frankness." The Democratic *New York World-Telegram* uses "too clever." Its correspondent says "trying to deceive."

Democratic Senators used about all the other anti-hypocritical phrases, "reasons that obscured its real purpose," "concealed aims," "unmoral reasons," "camouflage," "hypocrisy," and a lot of even harder words. But such friendly sentiments lead to purges.

I could continue indefinitely these phrases from pained Democratic supporters, who are now condemned to outer darkness. But I merely wish to illustrate what I mean when I talk of intellectual integrity in government.

SAMPLE VI

We may sample still another area of morals where grows the fruit of Mr. Roosevelt's New Deal Party. National conscience has hitherto embraced the notion of fidelity to truth in government.

It never has taken much effort or literary skill to tell the truth about what goes on in government. Yet this administration has installed some hundreds of skilled propagandists. The deluge of free mail sent out by the Government Departments in 1937 would have required \$34,000,000 in postage if they paid it. In the last year of my Administration it was \$9,000,000. That increase by nearly four hundred per cent does not include Congressional mail either. Surely it now takes a powerful effort to tell the truth. The increase is not devoted to unfavorable news about government activities.

But beyond all this is the radio. Every hour of the day somewhere in the country some person is painting the glories of this abundant life, or to use the more recent term, "our objectives."

The whole of this propaganda is impregnated with suppression of fact, the distortion of statistics, the creation of misleading slogans, the building of prejudice or hate.

The Democratic *New York World-Telegram* estimates the cost of these propaganda officials at over twenty million dollars a year.

You cannot have government by public opinion when opinion

of the people is manufactured by paid press agents of the government.

The first weapon of dictatorship is organized propaganda. A dozen democracies in Europe have been destroyed by mass persuasion and the creation of mass prejudice. That is the stuff that dictators grow from. It is the sustenance they live by. It is the stuff the New Deal lives by.

Every dictator in Europe has proved that by propaganda you can fool enough of the people all the time.

One play in the routine game of propaganda is to steal righteous phrases and devote them to evil-doing. Thus we have Good Neighbors and Social Security, National Planning, Reform and More Abundant Life. Another department is to attach repulsive phrases to your opponents. Thus we get Economic Royalists, Tories, Reactionaries, Feudalists, Wild Men and Copperheads, and Purge.

SAMPLE VII

And there are the moral aspects of stirring ill will, conflict and hate. Class hate is the rock upon which every republic has been wrecked. And this is the most classless nation yet born. And hate is preached from the White House for the first time. I shall not go further into it than to say it has set worker against employer, employer against worker, worker against worker. And I give you a statistic of only one of its consequences. In the three years of depression stress before the New Deal, the man days lost by strikes and lockouts averaged five million per year. In the five years of the New Deal, they have averaged eighteen million per year. That is an increase of 350 per cent. Is that building goodwill and co-operation?

SAMPLE VIII

Mr. Roosevelt invites the American people to join his New Deal Party which he calls Liberal. We can explore whether it is a party of liberalism and present at the same time a sample of hypocrisy and mass propaganda by government.

The true Liberal school of thought recognizes the purpose of liberalism as more liberty and the advancement of political morals. Are these exhibits of political morals evidences of liberalism? One of the first liberal parties in the world was formed to fight political debauchery. There are other parts of the New Deal program that would choke any definition of liberalism.

Many of Mr. Roosevelt's objectives are hoary with reaction. They include the destruction of the independence of the judiciary. That dates with Charles I. They include a new and avowed campaign to destroy the independence of the legislative arm. That dates with George III. It involves a centralization of government which invades the independence of local government. That is one of Mr. Hitler's successful ideas.

This devaluation of currency is a trick of Roman Emperors. They were not known to be liberals. These deficit financings are as old as the French Kings. It may go back to Babylon. You might look up the inscription at the Feast of Belshazzar.

Mr. Roosevelt himself in discussing my increase of the debt burdens on the taxpayer of about one billion (not five billion as he implied) said that was the rock upon which liberal governments were wrecked. Surely twenty billions increase in debt is a bump to liberalism.

Are these Socialist enterprises of our government liberalism? Is this Nazi dictation to labor, farmers, and business liberalism?

If this sort of stuff is liberal, then George III, Hitler, Stalin, and Boss Tweed are liberals.

Whatever the merits or demerits of such objectives may be, it is immoral to represent them as liberalism. Liberals have fought these things for centuries. What President Roosevelt is leading is not liberalism. Instead of bringing the past up to the present he is bringing the present back to the past.

These are the paving stones of the dangerous road which has wrecked liberal democracies all over the world.

Mr. Roosevelt denounces and accuses all of us who do not believe in these methods and these actions as conservatives. If being conservative on dragging America into the morass of

political immorality or into the Dead Sea of reaction is Conservatism then I cheerfully join that party. And that party will yet become the hope of American life.

Whatever name we may be called, we shall hold high that lamp of morals as the guide to the American people.

But we should worry less over what is a liberal than what is honest. That is the very headlight of true Liberalism in this dark world.

And if these were successful policies for a free country why have 11,000,000 unemployed?

CONCLUSION

Our opponents pugnaciously demand constructive alternatives with our criticisms. I have never made an address in debate on public questions without offering a positive and constructive alternative. I do so most cheerfully upon this subject tonight.

First. Be honest. Integrity lives not alone in the pocket. It lives also in the mind.

Second. Re-establish morals as the first objective of government. Give the nation leadership in moral regeneration as the road to national security. Greed and hate can be more easily cured by moral standards than by policemen. The people take their moral tone from those who occupy high office.

Third. Return the administration of Relief to non-partisan local committees even if the Federal government pays 95 per cent of their expenditure. That will stop its political prostitution. It will better serve the destitute.

Fourth. Demand the whole patronage system be abolished. Demand that Congress put every single official except a few at the top under Civil Service Merit System. Demand that every single appointee during the past six years be required to take merit examinations open to any competitor.

Fifth. Amend the Corrupt Practices Act to provide instant dismissal and jail for any of these job holders who speaks out loud on politics, and take the enforcement out of partisan hands.

Sixth. Repudiate the whole idea that the end or the "objective" justifies the means. Every one of these samples I have cited is the exact practice of this grim doctrine. That doctrine is a violation of the whole Christian ethics. It is the philosophy of all dictatorship.

In conclusion may I say again that the fountains of justice alone spring from truth and honesty. There is no double standard of morals, one in public and one in private life. Self-government in people decays when moral standards in the people fail. Moral standards in the people are sullied when moral leadership in government fails. It is alone the spirit of morals that can reconcile order and freedom. A people corrupted by their government cannot remain a free people.

These are shifting times and confusion of allegiance to principles. But there are lights upon the horizon. There is a moral purpose in the Universe. The yearning of men for freedom is not dead. Those are the roads over which the American people can be led from this wilderness.

Undermining Representative Government

Address delivered to Joint Republican Organizations

HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

[October 17, 1938]

THE election of the Congress of the United States is always a serious action by the people. But this election has been elevated to fateful heights not seen in generations. It is no conflict between Republican and traditional Democratic policies. It is a conflict between two ideas of life for America. That conflict started in 1933. It is not a conflict between the old and the new in American life. It is a conflict between age-old personal government and a government of free men under the rule of law.

Mr. Roosevelt now challenges the nation to line itself into what he calls the Liberal Party and what he calls the Conservative Party. Mr. Roosevelt has a right to make himself into a party all by himself if he likes. Whether parties or men are liberals or conservatives does not depend either on slogans or their own say-so or on Mr. Roosevelt's definitions.

The greatest Teacher of Mankind said, "By their fruits ye shall know them. Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?"

There are already five evil products from these years of the New Deal that have become self-evident.

The first is the degeneration of political morals to the lowest ebb in our history.

The second is the malignant growth of personal power in this Republic.

The third is heartbreaking growth of hate, class division, and disunity in the most classless country in the world.

The fourth is that underneath all this is a creeping collectivism that is steadily eating away the vitalities of free enterprise.

The fifth is that after six years of these policies we have 11,000,000 people out of jobs. Farm prices, reckoned in old gold values, are lower than ever in our history. We have before us 20 billions increase in national debt. We and the other democracies of the world in 1932 started recovery from the inevitable post war depression. They, except France, years ago recovered employment beyond pre-depression levels—France copied the New Deal. In the best of our hectic six years 8,000,000 men have ceaselessly walked the streets searching for work.

Whether we agree or disagree on the methods to halt these dangers, certainly no one will disagree that we are grievously confronted with them. These issues transcend all traditional party lines.

A few days ago at Kansas City I explored the corruption of morals by this New Deal brand of liberalism. I offered an alternative program. On November 5th I shall speak upon its economic consequences to the average man. Tonight I shall explore the consequences to representative government and freedom of men and women from this New Deal corruption of liberalism.

In all the centuries of the struggle to establish liberty under the rule of law, humanity has built stone by stone the safeguards against personal power. Every school child knows, or should know that the reason why this Republic of free men has flourished longer than any republic in modern history is because power was divided among the three branches as check and balance each upon the other. These are its protective barricades.

Liberty never dies from direct attack. No man ever arises and says, "Down with Liberty." Liberty has died in 14 countries in a single score of years from weakening its safeguards, from demoralization of the moral stamina of the people.

PART II

My first example of Mr. Roosevelt's "liberal" attack on liberty is his attempt to invade the independence of the Supreme Court. I do not need to refresh your minds much on that aggression of personal power. Nor am I here raising the question of the liberalism of the Ku Klux Klan.

The indignation which swept the country at these actions 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.

We also saw this rise of Indignation again over the so-called Reorganization Bill. The people at once sifted from a useful rearrangement of government bureaus the attempt again to invade the protections to liberty in the semi-judicial bodies and the Civil Service.

Some may think these assaults on the judicial bulwarks of free men are defeated and behind us. The words of the New Dealers do not confirm this hope.

PART III

And that brings us to the second assault on the safeguards to representative government, which is a major issue in this election. Our immediate task is to emancipate the legislative arm of the government from the personal domination of Mr. Roosevelt.

The independence of the Congress from domination by the Executive is just as vital as the independence of the Supreme Court. The safeguards of our liberty and the rights of minorities rest as much with the Congress as they do upon the

Supreme Court. And beyond all its own independent responsibility, the Congress alone can prevent Executive domination of the Judiciary. Nobody but the people can protect the Congress.

If we examine the fate of wrecked republics throughout the world we find their first symptoms in the weakening of the legislative arm. Subservience in legislative halls is the spot where liberty and political morals commit suicide.

For six years now, except for momentary gleams of independence, the country has witnessed an overwhelming majority in Congress blindly taking orders from the President.

Nobody will deny that the majority of these Congresses have been simply rubber stamps for the Executive. They don't deny it themselves. They claim support of Mr. Roosevelt's political machine on the ground that they have been 100 per cent. It appears that even 99 per cent is no longer a passing mark. This full 100 per cent constitutes Mr. Roosevelt's requirement for the degree of Doctor of Laws. And laws which are partly unconstitutional at that.

I perhaps know something of the relations of the Congress and executive officers from 15 years of daily contact. In view of my experience in 1931 to 1932, however, you may be surprised that I should today be defending the Congress. At that time with both a Democratic majority and the Republican Old Guard it was a troubled variety of co-operation. They were often possessed of the demons of partisanship. Despite the demons and their obstructions we got through the long list of constructive measures which started Recovery in the spring of 1932. I defended the independence of Congress then against public criticism. I defend its independence now because I want liberty to live in America.

PART IV

The whole concept of representative government is that Senators and Congressmen should be independent minded men chosen by the people of their districts and states. They

represent the forty-eight states and not the President. They should not be chosen by the President. They should not be run by him either.

It is true that Congress should co-operate with the President in constructive legislation. But co-operation is the relation of equals, not those of master and servant. Now I will be told at once that the evolution of party leadership has changed all this. That is not true. It is true that parties are the mechanism by which the people express their will as to the laws they want in government. Mr. Roosevelt justifies his reduction of the Congress to servitude on the ground that he must compel compliance with these mandates of his party. It would seem perplexing to a Congressman as to which are party mandates and which are Mr. Roosevelt's improvised ideas. We may assume, however, that the party mandates and not Mr. Roosevelt's improvised ideas were what the Congress was elected upon.

I dislike digging up fossil bones of dead mandates. But I must take the bunk out of this mandate stuff. Their platform of 1932 had something in it about reduction of government expenditures, economy and balanced budget. From what the New Deal has left of that skeleton you cannot even make out what the animal looked like. Also I faintly remember some turgid pledges to take the government out of all fields of private enterprise. There was a blistering pledge not to tinker with the currency. And there was a resounding pledge against the use of money in politics. I would not cause pain by the recall of the death of this original list of pious mandates.

Incidentally I find that Democratic platforms in olden days demanded a non-political civil service. There is not much of that skeleton left either.

But there are the mandates which Mr. Roosevelt discovered after the party had finished its platform in 1932. In that platform or the ensuing campaign there was not a single breath of the long list of acts which afterward were declared unconstitutional by the Courts. Again in 1936 the Democratic Platform did not even intimate the packing of the Supreme Court, or the Executive control of the semi-judicial bodies or the Civil

Service through the Reorganization Bill. So much for the alibi of a party mandate from the people. The so-called mandates seem to be the rubber part of the stamp.

However, I note that the New Deal with its usual variations from intellectual honesty has transformed that old-fashioned word "pledge," which connotes the immediate, into the pious word "objective," which connotes a long time off. That changed words "objective" does away with the element of time in President Lincoln's assurance that "you cannot fool all the people all the time."

PART V

And now let us explore in a little detail some of the definite responsibilities of the Congress which are today in process of destruction.

1. Obviously the members are elected to formulate the laws. The President does not make the laws. He is required to call public needs to the consideration of Congress. Instead Mr. Roosevelt submitted laws fully drafted and stamped "must."

His yes-yes majority did not even protect the dignity of Congress by appearing to formulate their own bills. They took it as if they were office boys. And they often got their orders from office boys. It takes free men to make laws for free men.

2. Members of Congress are under individual oath to maintain the Constitution. They are under no oath to say yes-yes. They are the first trench of Constitutional defense. Yet this yes-yes group passed measure after measure that was unconstitutional. If they did it innocently they were a dumb and deaf group of lawyers. They submitted to the President's orders to pass one measure even though they might think it was unconstitutional. And it proved to be so. But what is the Constitution among rubber stamps?

3. One of the highest functions of any legislative body in a democracy is sober consideration and effective debate. No piece of legislation has ever come before Congress that cannot be perfected by debate and discussion. Yet this rubber-stamp

majority had permitted their responsibilities so to degenerate that they passed arrogant rules limiting debate to a few hours or even minutes. And these measures were affecting the welfare of 130 million people. They should have had weeks of real consideration. The jobs of thousands of men would have been saved.

And this is more so because nearly a half of our people are opposed to most of the acts of this rubber-stamp majority. Yet this opposition is represented in Congress by less than 20 per cent of its members. This thin Congressional minority physically cannot investigate and competently debate legislation. The anvil of debate is the prime safety of democracy in forming its laws. That is the check on arrogance and personal power. Even the New Dealers admit that sometimes when they are trying to prove themselves Liberals.

4. When revolutionary measures are introduced to the Congress which have never been before the people in a campaign surely the people have a right to a few days in which to express their views and show the injuries which will be done them.

Even emergency never excuses that amount of haste. Later on the so-called emergency was over and prosperity was said by the President to have at last responded to Planning. Yet even then people were given no chance to debate, or even understand the proposals.

It is true the country was saved from two disasters—the packing of the Supreme Court and the Reorganization Bill. But that was only because a courageous minority in the Senate delayed action long enough for the people to realize their jeopardy and effectively protest.

5. The foremost purpose, from the very beginning, of all parliaments and all legislative bodies is the control of the national purse. Men died over a whole century to wrest it from the English kings. The control of executive expenditures by the people's representatives has been the battle of the people against dictatorial grasp since Edward I. That is the very root of the people's power.

And this supine majority of ours over the last six years has

surrendered this vital protection of the people for the first time in our legislative history. It has voted over fifteen billions of lump sums to the President to be expended at his will. That idea goes back to Charles I.

The surrender by Congress of power over the purse through appropriation of fifteen billion dollars of lump appropriations has placed fifteen billions of personal power in the hands of the President.

Thereby they conferred upon the President the power both to cajole and to purge the individual Congressman.

The old-fashioned pork barrel has become a whole pork-packing establishment—all under the leadership of the Executive. And many members of the not-quite-yes group have been kept in line by beguilement with pieces of their own pork.

All this is a flagrant moral debauchery of their sacred function of safeguarding the money squeezed by taxes from the toil of a people.

6. The Congress is supposed to be the people's watchdog over efficiency and honesty in the bureaucracy. If ever there was a mandate from the people to the Congress it is to preserve the merit system for appointments to Federal jobs under the Civil Service Commission. It has been the battle of the people against the politicians for fifty years. Once upon a time the New Deal gave it strong lip-service. Yet this rubber-stamp majority on the President's demand specifically provided that the alphabetical agencies should be politically appointed without regard to the merit system of the Civil Service Commission. It is not an imaginary idea that the yes-yes men also liked the notion of having some share in selecting 300,000 political appointees from their districts. These yes men have a full responsibility for this debauchery of political morals to the lowest ebb in our history.

PART VI

And that brings me to the third category of these sinister aggressions of personal power in this republic. That is the Executive attempt to control elections. That alone should make

the election of independent-minded men to Congress the first task of men who would be free.

We have seen Mr. Roosevelt mass this Praetorian army of political appointees to purge those men of his own party who have shown sparks of manhood, of independence, and obedience to their oath.

And this is not a quarrel in the Democratic Party upon which Republicans can look with glee. If these methods be applied to members of his own party you will not expect them to be withheld from the opposition party.

But it is far more serious than any question of party. It goes to the very roots of the independence of the legislative arm. It goes to the very core of the right of the people to choose their own representatives. It goes to the whole question of the independence of the ballot itself. It goes to the foundation of personal power in this Republic.

Mr. Stalin was the founder of the political purge. Or was it Mr. Hitler?

Mr. Hitler also has a parliament. You may not know it. It was also once upon a time an independent arm of the German government. But Mr. Hitler has rearranged its function. I quote him: "Individual members may advise but never decide; that is the exclusive prerogative of the responsible president for the time being."

Mr. Roosevelt is not however proposing the German form of parliamentary practice. He only has a passion for unanimity of view. And he likes leadership with a compulsory following.

In speaking in opposition I always find myself limited in the use of hard words lest I should overstate or be lacking in courtesy. It is, I hope, permissible for me to select some words from the sackcloth wails of the Democratic newspapers who supported Mr. Roosevelt.

The *New York Times* exclaims: ". . . How great an intellectual servitude the President now requires from his followers."

The *Atlanta Constitution* says: "He would turn the United

States Senate into a gathering of 96 Charlie McCarthies with himself as Edgar Bergen."

Lynchburg (Va.) Advance: "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?"

The *Charlotte (Va.) Observer*: "... A new Napoleon. . . . Crucifixion of the inherent liberties of the people. . . ."

The *Norfolk (Va.) Dispatch*: "... A personal ambition for unquestioned power. . . ."

Baltimore Sun-.: ". . . An act of executive arrogance . . . the President with more jobs and more public funds at his disposal than any other President in history. . . ."

Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle: ". . . if the citizens of Georgia do what President Roosevelt told us ... we must forget political independence as a thing dead and reconcile ourselves to complete dictation from the Chief Executive."

Macon (Ga.) Telegraph: "The President's duplicity . . . sheer malice . . ."

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. ..."
Descriptive terms concerning Mr. Roosevelt as used in his own political family are certainly expressive. All Republicans are at a disadvantage for we are such polite folk.

I welcome this rise of Americanism above politics. And I wonder if it occurs to these Democratic former sponsors of Mr. Roosevelt that this issue is wider than even electing independent Democrats. If we are to have an independent Congress it implies Democratic support where Republican candidates are fighting against Mr. Roosevelt's yes-yes men or even 99 or 90 or 80 per cent yes-men.

I noticed that the President in his speech toasting Senator George this August expressed his most affectionate friendship. I am reminded that when bold knights of old assembled they also publicly gave toasts of affection to each other. But custom

required that they stand in such a position that neither could purge the other with a dagger in the hand that was not clasping the loving cup. And the dagger is the control of elections. Up-to-date chivalry throws in a few bridges.

The 300,000 political appointees are only the officers of their Praetorian army. That army is the great rank and file of distressed people on relief and the other great groups receiving benefits from the government.

These officers no doubt pass down the hints of this new etiquette of chivalry. Lest this should appear to be biased from me, let me quote again 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 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."

But having been proved by their own investigating committees to have morally suborned the vote against their own members in the primaries, what think you they will try to do to the Republican candidates in this election? But far more important than that, what does all this mean in public and private morals? Is this liberty under law? Or is this personal government?

PART VII

We have a fourth category of these thistles and thorns of personal power from which we have no figs and no grapes. That is the group of ideas under the euphonious title of "Planned Economy."

Planned Economy once had a connotation of forward-looking, co-operative, and voluntary action. But like other good words it has been led into bad company, and it is now used to cover up a "dictated economy" or "compulsory economy."

Whether this compulsory economy is a creeping collectivism from Europe or whether it is a native American product, it has

the same result of building intolerable personal power in this Republic.

I am not here discussing the economic consequences of the New Deal. I shall do that two weeks hence. But I may say this here.

These ideas of dictated or compelled economy have been mixed into the American system, which is a system of free enterprise regulated to prevent abuse. Money and credit and subsidies have been manipulated to force that mixture. That mixture weakens the mainspring of free enterprise. That mainspring is the confidence of men that if they deal fairly with others they shall in the future enjoy the reward of their abilities and effort. This shackled economy limits the productivity of men. When it diminishes confidence it destroys the jobs of men.

And it is not confidence of big business that matters. Despite all you hear, big business is not an economic leader—it is only a follower. The economic leader is John Jones, who, made fearful and anxious, restricted and taxed, or out of a job, denies himself a steak or an orange, postpones buying a suit of clothes or an automobile, or building himself a house.

The net economic sum after six years of abandonment of the sure road to recovery is 11,000,000 unemployed, a distressed agriculture, a demoralized industry, and forty billions of debt. But worse than this, the number of the ill-fed, the ill-clothed, and the ill-housed has steadily increased.

But the central idea of Mr. Roosevelt's economic policies which concerns this discussion is the gigantic shift of government from the function of umpire to the function of directing, dictating and competing in our economic life.

We have now had nearly six years' experience with these ideas. They were put forward as for an emergency. And yet every session of Congress faces further demands. Power feeds only on more power.

The very mixture of power economics into free enterprise stirs up new forces which demand constantly increasing delegation of arbitrary personal power to officials. These forces involve

constantly greater centralization of government. They undermine the spirit and the responsibility of local government. They involve conflicts with the Constitution. They are the excuses for minimizing the independence of the Congress and the Judiciary. And all this mixture of government-dictated economic life involves somber questions of government morals and public honor.

You will recollect that Mr. Roosevelt in his well-known self-confession said, "In thirty-four months we have built up new instruments of public power. In the hands of the people's government this power is wholesome and proper." He concedes that in other hands "it would provide shackles for the liberties of the people." The very essence of representative government in this Republic is that no man should possess the powers to shackle the liberties of the people. I might remark that the word Liberalism comes from the word liberty and not from the word shackles.

We must not confuse genuine liberal reforms with this rise of personal government and its economic system of coercion. Constant reform directed to prevent business abuses is a necessity of a progressive nation. We have been doing it for fifty years and will need to keep at it forever, because free men will always produce change through new inventions and new ideas. They will invent new varieties of wickedness. Whatever the New Deal has constructively accomplished in that direction is right. But we do not need to pull down the temple of liberty to catch a few cockroaches in the basement.

And our civilization must be one of increasing humanization. The advancement of remedy to social ills, old-age needs, sweated labor, child labor, under-housing, relief of the destitute are proper functions of free government. The New Deal methods of advancing these long-established ideals are not always right. Certainly it is not necessary to have personal government to bring them about. And strangling the productivity of the nation is the sure defeat of all hopes of youth and old age. Already they are being supported only by borrowing from our children.

PART VIII

And there is a fifth direction where this thistle of personal power is spreading. The New Deal audits itself with slogans rather than cash registers. This department of New Deal liberalism is at least consistent in one particular. It is no longer haunted by the old ghost of a balanced budget.

These huge deficits and gigantic increase in debt have great dangers to free men. In their mildest form debt and taxes are a limitation on the freedom of men, for then men must work for the government and not for themselves. There is one thing you can put down both historically and economically. There are only three ways to meet the unpaid bills of government. The first is more taxation. The second is more devaluation, which is repudiation. The third is inflation in some form.

Those are the implacable dangers of profligate spending. Let us not forget that increasing debts some day accumulate to where democracy cannot be brought to the agony of sufficient taxes to carry them. When that day arrives liberty dies in the gutter. It is easy to overstate the dangers. But where recklessness drives, there danger shrieks.

These things are purported by this so-called New Deal liberalism to make for economic security and social justice. You reduce economic and social security when you limit and strangle the productivity of a people. You do not establish either economic or social security by blasting at the very foundations of free men and women.

PART IX

One of the products of this era of personal government has been the rise of bitter discord among our people. The stir of class hate in the most classless nation is but part of it. The constant coercion and reprisals of this government-dictated economy daily divide our people in bitterness and hate. Industrial conflict grows more and more disastrous each year. Unceasingly do we see workers warring against workers.

These suffering masses on relief, deprived of hope of productive jobs, are being daily moulded into a mass of dependents on government; and voted by the government. A hideous gulf grows daily between them and those who bear the burdens. We are a sadly disunited people. And no greater warning was ever given to America than that a house divided against itself cannot stand.

PART X

We of the opposition have not alone the duty to call a halt to these encroachments of personal power over free men and their consequences. It is our duty also to make clear that we are not demanding a halt to the needed and progressive solutions of changing problems which arise from the changing times. It is our further duty to urge the principles and methods that will return our people to work.

We have first to clear the land of some thorns and thistles.

We must have emancipation from the threat of a controlled Judiciary. We must free Congress from its subjugation. We must have regeneration of political morals. We must end the creation of hate and group conflict. We must extirpate the whole spoils system. We must have honesty in government. We must have a free and honest ballot.

We must have expenditures controlled by Congress. We must have a balanced budget. We must have a currency convertible into gold as the only way to get it out of personal dictation. We must have a credit system independent of personal control and socialistic methods. We must have new and genuine banking reform. We must destroy exploitation and coercion of the people whether at private hands or government hands.

We must have emancipation from the creeping collectivism of dictated economy. We must take the government out of business in competition with the citizen. We must have freedom of business, labor and farmers from government dictation. We must grant genuine relief to farmers and restore the farmer's judgment in control of his business. We must have reform

in the Labor Act to deal equal justice to all workers and all employers. We must have the only basis of liberalism, that is the rule of law and not of men.

We must reform relief under the administration of non-partisan local committees. We must reform the old age pensions to make them just to the workers. We need to adopt real measures which enable people to obtain better housing. We must advance the whole question of medical attention to the indigent.

We have need to replant the land with measures which will restore confidence among men and hope among youth.

There are a host of needs of the people. The vast revolution in the powers of science and technology has placed within our grasp a future and a security never hitherto glimpsed by mankind. Yet the people cry out for employment. They yearn for security. All these will come if we do not stifle and shackle the productive genius which alone thrives in free men and women. The people hunger for this freedom of spirit. But it shrivels at once under the threats of personal government. It glows instantly with sure respect for the safeguards of personal liberty.

These are the roads from the slough of poverty. It is thus only that we may decrease the ill-fed, the ill-clad, the ill-housed.

PART XI

This is no lawyers' dispute over legalisms. It is not dispute over old-time custom. It is a fundamental battle of the people.

We may sum it up. Under a screen of fair-sounding phrases we have seen the President of the United States steadily driving for more and more power over the daily lives of the people. We have seen him attempt to control the Supreme Court. We have seen his domination of Congress. We have seen personal control of expenditures. We have seen the attempt through the power of government expenditure to pollute the ballot. We have seen the attempt to mix in a system of free enterprise a system of creeping collectivism. We have seen a vindictive campaign to array class against class and group against group.

PART XII

All this is the destruction of freedom and prosperity. If freedom is to reign on this continent the American people have to attend to it themselves. They can no longer leave it to the government.

You may ask: What can we do in the face of the formidable thing this personal power has become?

If we had an independent, courageous Congress we could find a start at solution of our ills. Therefore my first recommendation to you tonight is: Elect to Congress independent-minded men. Elect men who will stand on their own feet. Elect men of character and capacity.

Second. Defeat every man of the kind who says he is a follower of any President 100 per cent or 50 per cent or any other per cent. Such a man is not fit to serve. Members of the Congress of the United States, if they are men, do not take orders from anybody. If you will test the New Deal candidates as to whether they will oppose every one of these five attacks on free men which I have enumerated tonight, you will find them wanting.

Never before in all American history has there been a greater need for the people to protect themselves. And it is in the power of the people to do it now. They alone can make Congress the sword and buckler of their liberties.

The New Deal and its yes-yes men in Congress have been experimenting with the American way of life for six years at dreadful cost in human misery and despair. It would seem that the experiment has not been a success.

The voter might well experiment for himself for once. He might vote for men who would halt this whole movement. For a nation to take the next two years to stop, look, and listen is an experiment that could not make the situation worse. It is not a very great risk for the voter to take.

Such an action, by demonstrating that the Federal government had changed its present direction, that this is still a self-governing republic of

free men, would restore hope and confidence to a weary people. It would restore productive jobs to millions of men. It would enable them to buy the farmers' products.

It might prove the experiment that saved the freedom of men and women of a great nation.

The Economic Consequences of the New Deal

Address delivered to Joint Republican Organizations

SPOKANE, WASHINGTON

[November 5, 1938]

A FEW weeks ago at Kansas City I spoke on the moral harvest from the New Deal. At Hartford I spoke on its peril to representative government and free men. Tonight I shall speak upon its economic consequences and what we should do about it.

Last evening Mr. Roosevelt spoke highly of his success in creating economic stability, prosperity and security for the average man. Naturally he did not mention the 11,000,000 unemployed or farmers' prices, and some other instabilities and insecurities.

He probably thought I could be relied upon to supply those omissions tonight. I will do that and several others. But I shall rely upon debate and appeal to reason, not upon smearing.

I shall show that the consequences of New Deal morals, their undermining of representative government and their economic policies not only cancel out the humanitarian objectives which it professes and to which all Americans aspire, but that they undermine all hopes for progress in standards of living to all our people.

Truly this is not a nation of economic abstractions or a nation of machines. But behind all our hopes and purposes are these

economic forces which sweep the nation. They bring blessings or they bring woe to every cottage door.

OUR ECONOMIC PURPOSE

We have two dominant concerns in American economic life.

The first and immediate is jobs for 11,000,000 idle men and the rebuilding of agriculture.

The second is beyond this. If we stretch our vision, what is it we want the economic system to provide for all Americans? To answer we must dig deep into the whole system of life. And we must dig deep into what has happened in the last 20 years.

What do we want as a minimum standard of American living for all the people? We want American children born in health. We want them brought up with plenty of vitamins in the sunshine. We want our race physically stronger with every generation. We want our youth high in ideals and resolute in character. We want them inspired with the spirit of human brotherhood. We want them trained to make their own living, to contribute to the advancement of the nation. We want every one of them to have a job to start in life. And we want them to have constructive joy all through the process.

We want old age serene in security from poverty or the fear of it.

And we want profitable work for the great middle groups between youth and old age, for they must support the whole. The focus of their lives is the home. We want them to own their own homes. We want the gadgets that replace drudgery and give joy in these homes. We want each home to have a job or to own a farm or its own business. We want Americans to be secure in that job and get living and comfort out of it. And above all we want them to have that American personal liberty which makes the rest worth having. This is no impossible ideal. I am for whatever economic system will bring it about.

How are we to attain all this? The question is which is the right road? Which road leads to danger?

OUR ECONOMIC SYSTEM

In all the history of the world mankind has found only two ways of doing the work of feeding, clothing, housing and providing comforts for the people. One is the way of liberty in which every man and woman is free to plan his own life, choose his own calling, and start his own adventures, secure in reward of his effort and ability. That is the system of free enterprise.

The other way is the way of compulsion by which men work for slave drivers or governments, or as dictated by governments. The dictators of Europe have softened that rough statement by calling it Planned Economy. And right here we come to the first quality of free enterprise. It has been proved in all history and is proved again in 16 nations today that you cannot have free criticism, free speech and free worship with a coercive economic system. For free men will fight coercion. And coercion to live must crush free men.

And let me emphasize that when I speak of free enterprise I do not mean that men can abuse or destroy the freedom of others by monopolies or any other kind of privilege or exploitation of business, farmers or labor. That destroys freedom itself. No one pretends that ours is a perfect system. There will be no perfect system until men are perfect. And economic life requires constant progressive reform and change. The reason is simple. Free men constantly find new inventions and new ideas. Some of them find new varieties of wickedness. And let me interpolate that it was Old Republicans who, beginning fifty years ago with the Anti-Trust laws, established seven out of ten of the principal Federal agencies which exist today for the prevention of monopolies and business abuse. But we do not need to sink the ship just to drown the rats.

I have seen the other systems of Europe at work. I am for free enterprise not because it is a property system or a profit system or a Chamber of Commerce slogan.

I am for it because I know it is inseparable from intellectual and spiritual liberty. Because it is the only road to higher standards of living.

Because it is the only system under which morals and self-respect of men can survive.

THE ECONOMY OF PLENTY

I am well aware of the weaknesses of the system of free enterprise. But from an economic point of view there is a superlative quality which makes that system worth fighting for. In the period after the war free enterprise had so stimulated technology and efficiency as to give us the highest standard of living ever known in all the history of mankind. It created an unparalleled economic middle class of more than 80 per cent of the people. It proved itself the very mother of plenty. We proved we had the method to furnish the bricks and straw from which we could build the ideal of American living. Not 5 per cent of the people in Russia or 10 per cent of the people in Germany or Italy today enjoy the standard of living which 80 per cent of our people possessed at that time.

Free enterprise can well be called the economy of plenty.

Two major weaknesses developed in that period. Both were the ills of rapid progress. Both could be remedied. The first was weakness in organization and streaks of wickedness in the financial system. The second was that in the national concentration on production we gave too little heed to the fair diffusion among all the people of this triumph in production. A margin of some thousands got too much of the productive pie for the services they performed. This was on its way to correction through inheritance taxes. Another margin of some 20 per cent got too little. But workmen had jobs. Farmers in general could see daylight in their accounts. The nation was, however, much too slow in social action that would lift the earnings and ease the life of the less fortunate groups.

Nevertheless, we had so triumphed in the long march of mankind from scarcity to plenty that we had ascended Mount Pisgah, where we looked over the Promised Land of ideal American living.

And then our progress was halted in 1929 by the faults in

our financial system. Then the hurricane of European liquidation of the World War struck us. And then our principal job was to get our people back to work.

One thing is certain. It is recognized by every authority that depression was overcome and recovery begun the world over in the early summer of 1932. Every great country including the United States surged forward. The United States alone hesitated, when Mr. Roosevelt was elected.

THE CONFLICT

The major problem America confronts today is whether we shall shape our economic system on free men or whether we shall introduce into it a mixture of personal power with coerced or regimented men. That is the naming conflict in the world today.

With Mr. Roosevelt's election America became involved in this conflict of systems.

No one will today doubt the enmity of many of Mr. Roosevelt's associates to free enterprise. With beguiling phrases Mr. Roosevelt has mixed some of the working parts of these coercive systems into American life.

The introduction of this power or compulsion economy into free enterprise is not always direct. It is often indirect through monetary and credit policies and spending. It is in part by beguilement of subsidies with public money and disadvantage to those who do not take it. My constant curiosity is whether it leads to complete Fascism, or to complete Socialism, or just plain economic nonsense.

In any event these children of men have erected a new Tower of Babel which they also camouflaged under the European term, Planned Economy. The true name is Coerced Economy. The headlines tell us of its bricks and mortar—Government Devalues Currency; Government Manages Currency; Government Manages Credit; Government Deficits; Government Debt Double Great War; Government Forced Monopolies in the N.R.A.; Government Dictation to Business, to Labor, to

Farmers, Government Competes in Business with Citizens, Government Fixes Prices, and Government Restricts Production, Government Pump Priming, Government Controls Elections, Abundant Life, and Objectives.

It mixes all the stimulating drinks on the bartender's shelf. This does not make for sobriety.

You will find every one of these powers and 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. All that at least has a faint odor of totalitarian government.

If you do not believe something has been mixed into the American system of free men I give you a Great Mystery.

There is the mystery that if you produce less you will have more. There is the mystery of raising costs of production by government action. In that case you increase prices and then wait for the people to buy more. There is the mystery of how you fill pay envelopes while the government stimulates war between labor unions. There is the mystery of how citizens can compete in business with the government, which sends its bills to the taxpayer.

There is the mystery of how money taxed from the citizen and spent by politicians will produce more employment than the citizen can give. There is the mystery of how politicians can run the specialized business of the country better than citizens can do it. There is the mystery of how farmers can use their own judgment amid orders shouted from the national capital.

There is the mystery that devaluing the dollar like shortening the yardstick makes more cloth in the bolt. There is the mystery of how frightened men will undertake new enterprises even if the banks are jammed with printing-press credit.

And there is the mystery that Santa Claus can reign throughout the year and never pay his bills.

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 is 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.

There is the mystery of the ever normal granary. Then surely prices were to go up. And behold, the farmer filled the granary to the roof and out into the yard. And the world saw the granary was full and they all said it was good neighbor policy. They said we do not need to buy for the present, for our good neighbor is keeping it in store for us and will always sell it at what it cost him. And the price went down. Now we propose to dump the ever normal granary onto the foreigner at less than cost. Even Joseph did not do that. And now Mr. Wallace admits it all a failure and says he should have some more power to perform some other mystery.

When you solve these mysteries you will know something has been mixed with free enterprise. It is probably all clear to you, now that coercive economy has been renamed Liberalism.

Mr. Roosevelt's Babel of Confused Economy certainly never reached to heaven. But like the people of Babel the speech of men is confused and their energies scattered.

THE CONSEQUENCES

And where have we got to now? We are six years from the beginning of the New Deal. The other democracies in the world were as deep in the world-wide depression in 1932 as we were. All of them, except France, have years ago regained employment for their people, and such degree of prosperity as new war fears or wars permit. And France adopted the New Deal. She is now trying to abandon it. We—free from these fears of war—have 11,000,000 or more unemployed. We have 30,000,000 people who are living on relief or some sort of

pay from the government. Our farmers are still in distress with prices lower on the old gold basis than ever before. We shall see a rise in the national debt to over 40 billions. It does not seem to have been a self-supporting prosperity. However, we are daily assured that our recovery is fully planned. And now let us explore these six years in a little more detail.

It has been a hectic six years, shot through with artificialities and afflictions. At the period when Mr. Roosevelt announced that we had prosperity we still had 8,000,000 men walking the streets ceaselessly looking for jobs. There was a period of 18 months from the spring of 1935 to the winter of 1937 when we felt real hope. At the beginning of that period the Supreme Court suddenly shot a bolt of sense through this murky mixture. It found that various parts of this coerced economy were violations of the rights of free men. At once the spirits of men rose in hope. Again they believed America was safe and recovery showed signs of life. But that period ended in February, 1937, when Mr. Roosevelt began his attempt to subjugate the Courts. In March other parts of the coercive system came into action against prices and bank credit. And if this were not enough, by condoning sit-down strikes the New Deal gave further reminders of a coercive system.

Mr. Roosevelt's artificial Tower of Babel structure could stand no such shocks as all these. We have never seen so precipitate a smash in all American history. Unemployment leaped to more than 12,000,000 men. The prices of grain collapsed 40 per cent. Cotton dropped 36 per cent, while things the farmer buys dropped but 3 per cent. The value of securities fell 30 billions. We crashed to a point within 12 per cent of the low point of the depression in the spring of 1932. It took a world war to bring us to that point in 1932. One New Deal, working alone, was within a few per cent of the same bottom in 1938.

A recent investigation and report by the New Deal itself states that poverty is increasing in the land.

With 11,000,000 unemployed after six years we did not

need an elaborate report to prove it. All that it proves to me is that the New Deal slogan might be two families in every garage.

We certainly can conclude that: *The economic forces created by this mixture of European coercive systems into free enterprise have failed to bring recovery or security.*

RECOVERY OF OTHER DEMOCRACIES

We do not have to depend on our own home experience to show that Mr. Roosevelt led America astray.

Mr. Roosevelt said last night: "Our economic and social program of the past five years has definitely given to the United States a more stable and less artificial prosperity than any other nation in the world has enjoyed."

Fortunately we can test the accuracy of that statement here and now. We could compare a dozen other democracies. We take the largest of them for an example—that is Great Britain. Theirs is a representative government. Their economic system was the same as ours. Their losses from war were far greater than ours. They were at the depth of the same world-wide depression in 1932.

The British started out of the depression at the same time we did. That was five months before Mr. Roosevelt's election in 1932. But they had no New Deal. They maintained the initiative of free men, and got their daily fun out of Mr. Roosevelt's white rabbits.

To translate their progress in the race to get men back to work we must take account of the difference in population. If we make that adjustment Mr. Roosevelt should have had less than 4,000,000 unemployed 18 months after his election. Yet Mr. Roosevelt had 11,000,000.

Even today British business activity is higher than pre-depression levels and we are 30 per cent below. But there is more to it than that. Mr. Roosevelt is increasing our national debt by 20 billions. The British had increased theirs by but

a billion. The British have had no smash in the last year for the simple reason they had not been blowing bubbles.

We can here conclude that: *The experience of those democracies that held to free enterprise shows we could have recovered on that highway.*

Mr. Roosevelt last night discussed the relative merits of slumps and depressions. And I use the word depression. It is not a term of avoidance.

Depressions and recessions feel very much alike. But believe it or not there is a difference. A depression is an economic mud hole in which the whole world wallows together. A recession is the same mud hole when we wallow in it alone. There is another distinction based on whether a Republican or a Democrat happens to be President.

The grim depression of 1929-32 was a combination of a collapsed homemade boom and the far more disastrous but inevitable liquidation of the war in Europe. That was as inexorable as a Caribbean hurricane.

I cannot take the time tonight to contrast the great measures taken by a Republican administration to protect the people from the storm and to aid them back to recovery with those of the New Deal. A contrast would prove the recuperative powers of free men. The tide to recovery did turn. And those sound Republican actions were not futile juggling which violated economic law, morals, the Constitution and the structure of American liberty which have brought us a second depression.

Mr. Roosevelt last night seemed to be proud that his depression is less disastrous than the world-wide depression of 1929-1932. He said: "That the slump (of 1937) did not become a major depression is the best kind of proof that we are on the right track." It is a mighty bumpy track.

Aside from war, depressions are the worst of all human calamities. And this whole question of depressions remains to be solved. And outside war origins they could be largely prevented if we had a thoroughgoing reorganization of our banking and fiscal system instead of New Deal methods which only breed them oftener and faster.

MR. ROOSEVELT'S ALIBI

And at this point let me explode that phantasmagoria with which the New Deal always attempts to justify its actions. They say when they came into office the people were neglected and starving. That is a lie. In various words they monotonously claim that the depression proved that free enterprise had failed. They assert the nation was bankrupt, that it was in ruins. They chatter tragically about the tramp of marching revolution. These men misled the people that they might impose a new system of life.

Certainly it is true Mr. Roosevelt's approach to the White House was greeted with a panic of bank depositors.

People were trying to remove their money from the reach of inflation or devaluation. A recent report issued by a leading group of economists confirms flatly that the incoming administration (that is the Roosevelt administration) was conclusively responsible for the panic of bank depositors and the dosing of the banks.

But even a temporary bank depositors' frenzy does not bankrupt a nation. Our government could then borrow billions in any market in the world. It had four billions of 100 per cent gold dollars in its vaults. We owed the world nothing.

Maybe our country was bankrupt. But if so we were attending the bankruptcy proceedings in our own 20,000,000 automobiles. Nor is attendance at revolution usually by automobile.

CONTINUING DESTRUCTIVE ECONOMIC FORCES

We have explored the visible consequences of this Administration's mixing of coercive economy in free enterprise. Now let us examine some of the invisible forces that continue to undermine real recovery.

This American economic system of free enterprise depends for productivity and consequently the jobs for men on two most sensitive human emotions. Those emotions are confidence and fear. That is confidence that the country is going forward. Confidence

that a man shall be secure in the enjoyment of his efforts and his savings. Fear instantly shrivels and blights free enterprise.

There are two kinds of confidence among men—short term confidence and long term confidence. There are likewise two kinds of fear—short term fears and long term fears. In the depression of 1929—32 we had short term fears but no man doubted the ultimate progress of America. Today we are haunted by long term fears. We are living on short term confidence.

Let us examine this force which is constantly undermining the long-term confidence of men.

1. Six years ago the Republican Administration handed Franklin Roosevelt the Constitution intact in spirit as well as in letter. The safeguards of liberty among men were unquestioned. The independence of the courts was inviolate. Men had been appointed justices who commanded universal esteem. The Congress was respected as an independent arm of the government. The rights of the states had not been impaired.

Today not a single one of the ideals and institutions committed to Mr. Roosevelt is unqualifiedly secure.

That certainly diminishes the security of men and undermines long-term confidence.

2. There is an unmoral doctrine adopted by every government which seeks to take power from the hands of the people. That is that the end justifies the means no matter how dishonest. These exhibits all around us of wholesale political corruption undermine long-term confidence of men in the future of America.

3. A large part of the nation has been compelled or taught to depend upon the government.

The self-respect of states and local governments has been bought or sabotaged. Governors of great states and mayors of great cities stand hat in hand before the appointive nonentities in Washington, begging for a handout from moneys taken from their citizens. And these appointive nonentities act as if it were their money given as favors.

The New Deal has apparently given up all hope of returning America to full productive employment. Their relief officials tell us that the W.P.A. or something like it must be permanent. That attitude toward these distressed men is the abandonment of hope for return to their productive jobs and decent wages. The attitude is wrong but certainly this does not establish confidence in the future of America.

4. And out of all this comes another evil force. That is disunity in America.

The great human objective of an economic system must be to lift the marginal substandard group into the economic middle class. But far from it today, we are on the road to the creation of a Europeanized proletariat, institutionalized by government, supported by government and voted by government.

We have workers organized against workers. We see section arrayed against section. That makes for neither social justice nor social security. Nor is it America, for a house divided against itself cannot stand.

Mr. Roosevelt last night naturally mentioned the need of national unity. How about these policies of organizing workers against workers? Of section against section?

Mr. Roosevelt said: "I am proud of the fact that I have never called out the armed forces of the state or the nation except on errands of mercy." Mr. Roosevelt omitted to mention that the Governors have been compelled to call out the National Guard, which is part of the armed forces, not once but 90 times during his administration to put down conflict stirred by New Deal policies. He neglects also to mention that in the Hoover Administration no Governor ever had to call out a single soldier to put down industrial conflict. In fact the National Guard was called only once and that was to compel the inoculation of cows in Iowa.

All this stirring of conflict does not build confidence in the future of America.

5. New Deal monetary credit and inflation policies leave every man uncertain as to what the future value of his dollar will be. His every venture, every insurance policy, even his

daily business is a bet on the currency. These policies stimulate speculation in the stock market instead of creative enterprise. They constantly undermine confidence in the long term future.

6. This trail of government spending and mounting public debt comes to one of three precipices. It must be repaid by taxes, by inflation, or by devaluation. Certainly taxes at \$5,500,000,000 have already risen to the highest point in our history, even higher than during the Great War. We cannot stand much more. And these taxes coming in large part from the people who toil steadily reduce the purchasing power of the people. But beyond this through ignorance or design the method of taxation discourages initiative and enterprise and confidence.

7. As to how we will pay the increasing debt, I don't know. As for tonight I accept the New Deal theory. That is, we will not have to pay for it. Our children will do that. And they will pay it with tears and bitterness toward our generation. At best it will grievously handicap their every opportunity in life. For a third of their days they will be working for the government. Certainly this constant increase in debt rots confidence in the future.

8. And there are the incessant and indiscriminate attacks upon business. Do they make for confidence in the future?

And these attacks go further than upon business men. How about the Labor Board for example? An agency to protect the right of collective bargaining? Yes. To prevent the coercion of workmen by employers? Yes. These do not destroy confidence in the future; they build it.

But what about the coercion of other workers by this board? What about the coercion of employers? And what of this un-American combination of powers of legislator, prosecutor, judge, jury and executioner in any group of men? That is a violation of every process of justice known to the American people. The most emphatic demand in the first constitution of Massachusetts was a government of laws and not of men. All this, however, may be merely a morning exercise in Fascism.

But does it establish confidence in the future of America?

And I am not talking about the effect of confidence or fear

upon Big Business or banks or Wall Street. I am talking about John Q. Public. Big Business never leads. It is always ready to do business. It waits on orders for goods or services or investment of savings by John Q.

John Q. sees all these mysteries and dangers about him. What does he do? If he is conservative he and his wife delay building that house. They delay buying that davenport or refrigerator. They postpone buying that piece of land. They are afraid to buy a bond for fear the government will drive or tax that industry out of business.

If John Q. is of a more reckless mind he concludes that with all these alphabets about him he might as well spend what he earns. He thinks thrift is futile. He looks for more joy in life rather than to save for the government to take it away before a rainy day. He refuses to undertake that long term speculative enterprise which pioneers new industry.

From both John Q.'s actions business lives hectically; employment is uncertain. Because it cannot get capital, it slows down on its improvements for the future and more men are out of jobs.

And now let us explore the practical proof of this entire breakdown in long term confidence. And it is very practical. If we look back we will find that this country in the six years prior to 1932, which includes two years of the depression, spent about 4.5 billion 100-cent dollars on private construction work. That is homes, factories, electric power plants, machinery, etc. That is building for the future. That is the product of long term confidence.

Now let us look at the six years subsequent to 1932. And that includes Mr. Roosevelt's prosperity years. In that period we spent only 17 billions on private construction.

The governmental public works in the two periods shows only 2 billions increases to offset 28 billions loss of private construction. If you search those figures you will find a large part of the reason why at the very top of Mr. Roosevelt's planned prosperity there were 8,000,000 men walking the streets looking for jobs. The New Dealers' self-justification

is that their "objectives" were to help the underdog. They surely have got him under.

Today millions of Americans are again struggling gallantly for recovery.

I have no doubt that through natural forces and pump priming we will make some recovery. That is under way. Free enterprise has proved itself fairly tough. It is still in the ring but it is pretty weak. Recovery will increase greatly if enough Republicans are elected next Tuesday to demonstrate that New Deal coercion economy is on the way out. That would restore long-term confidence. But until then we shall not see the day when unemployment relief will vanish under the sunshine of productive jobs.

OUR HUMANITARIAN PURPOSE

Now let us for a moment explore the economics of our larger purpose. That is the enlargement of our whole American standard of living.

We hear much of New Deal "objectives." That word has now been substituted for "the abundant life." Such words can be made to scintillate like the Aurora Borealis. And they have proved about as effective in illuminating the long and difficult highway of human progress as the Aurora itself.

Even if we assume these objectives to be sincere, certainly it is time to remember that the road to Paradise is not paved either with professions of good objectives or good resolutions. The hot spot we are now in is paved all over with "objectives."

There are a multitude of these objectives which you may surmise I do not approve of.

What of personal power, of coercive economy, of these steps toward Fascism and Socialism, this destruction of free enterprise, this weakening of the safeguards of liberty, this reckless spending, debt and unbearable taxes, of immorality in government, and others?

I have repeated elsewhere the test given us by the Greatest Teacher of mankind, "Ye shall know them by their fruits.

Do men gather grapes from thorns or figs from thistles?"

The New Deal has given emphasis to humanitarian objectives. The country needed it. However, they in fact seek to cloak all their objectives with that appeal. My criticism is that many of their other objectives destroy the hope of humanitarian progress. They cancel out any real hope of full employment and higher standards of living to all the people labor and farmers alike. In fact the sum of these New Deal objectives cancels themselves out in poverty.

In discussing humanitarian objectives common sense is the hardest of all commodities to sell. Emotion is the easiest of all things to distribute.

Truly we wish for the abolition of sweated labor, or child labor. We want shorter hours, more leisure. We want real farm relief. We must have protection of women and children. We must have collective bargaining. We want old-age pensions, relief of the unemployed and support to war veterans. We want increasing public health services, spread of medical attention, hospitalization and education. All these and many more resolute objectives of progressive men were going concerns before the New Deal was born. The New Deal deserves credit wherever it has in reality advanced them. And they are all a part of establishing the ideal of American living.

I do not wish to assert that the so-called humanitarian objectives of the New Deal are insincere.

But when you scan the newspaper headlines and find Grand Juries, Senatorial committees and the press charging that the administration of these humanitarian measures is impregnated with the spoils system, corruption of public officials and of elections, you at least wonder if the primary objective is not power rather than humanity.

The people grow poor in personal liberty when its officials grow rich in personal power. And you wonder if idealism can live in the same land with moral debauchery. What has a nation profited if to gain any objective it has lost its own soul?

And what hope is there of these humanitarian objectives if the nation cannot bear the cost of them? They can be supported

only by the maximum productivity of the nation. That plenty which free enterprise can alone produce is the only hope of proper protection and development of the young and support of the old. It is the only hope of winning the ideals of living standards to every American family.

But how are we ever going to restore production under these monetary policies, these shackles on industry, this coercive economy, this discouragement of the initiative of men, this decay of confidence in the future? And much of these humanitarian objectives must be paid for by taxes. They cannot be paid for either by mystery plays or hypnotism. These annual Federal deficits of billions are the exact proof that we are not meeting the bill today. We are using money borrowed from our children. How are they going to pay for them?

The greatest humanitarian objective of them all is jobs for 11,000,000 men. Another is farm stability. Another is to lift the standard of living of all the people. It would seem that these are the forgotten objectives.

CONCLUSION

This administration proposes to go back to the same old treadmill of shackled economy, of pump priming, of fear of more inflation and more dictation.

But what should we do to restore these 11,000,000 men to productive jobs, to give real relief to the farmer and the business man and to start America on the road to progress? Mr. Roosevelt said he would not let the people down. The time has come to let them up.

I am not going into a long program. I do not suggest that the nation go backward. Progressive men never go backward. Let us resume the American road and go forward. And let us flee from the dangerous road we are traveling, for its end leads to a precipice. Let me give you a few fundamental things that must be done first.

I. Resume honor to the Constitution of the United States, and thus give men confidence that the safeguards of free men will be upheld.

2. Resume common morals. Both morals in thinking and morals in governmental action.

3. Resume the American system of free enterprise. Clean out these European mixtures of coercion. Correct the faults of private enterprise, but do not destroy its productivity. Without that all else fails.

4. Trust 130,000,000 free people in the United States to have more sense than a dozen starry-eyed boys in Washington.

The first step to start us on our way is to elect independent men to Congress in the place of these yeses men.

To insure a free government, to maintain free enterprise we have long since learned that the Congress must be independent of the President.

Make Congress independent. That will be a sign to America that we have changed our national road from compelled men to free men. It will bring new confidence in the future that will quickly make jobs.

This must come before we can restore productive Jobs for these 11,000,000 unemployed.

And this is also the first measure of farm relief, for the farmers' first market is full dinner pails at home.

Then a confident, alert, alive, and free people, enthused with incentive and enterprise, will quickly repair losses, repay debts, and bury mistakes. It will make economic security a reality for the worker and for the farmer instead of a broken-down objective.

Give us the election of a new Congress of independent men and watch America come back.

The Real State of the Union

*Address delivered to
Fifty-third Annual Lincoln Day Dinner of the
National Republican Club
NEW YORK CITY
[February 13, 1939]*

EVERY year at this time Americans express gratitude for the birth of Abraham Lincoln. Recently both Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Browder have claimed him as a founder of their faiths. I was under the impression he was a Republican.

But Abraham Lincoln towered far above political partisanship. He rests in the hearts of the American people not as a politician but as a great American who died fighting for the most precious of American possessions—the liberty of men.

During the past month those temporarily in control of the government have expressed their views upon the state of the Union. Tonight in many assemblies over the nation you will hear views on it from the Party of Lincoln.

Eighty years ago if an observer could have looked down on this Republic from the high stratosphere he would have seen a nation sadly divided and confused. It was a nation professing liberty yet holding millions of slaves. It was furiously debating property rights, states' rights, decisions of the Courts, and secession.

But high above all this din and confusion Lincoln heard the supreme chord of all human emotions—the liberty of men. In the triumph of that deepest of all moral and spiritual issues

the old discords sank away. With that renewed inspiration from Abraham Lincoln this nation marched on to a glorious progress unparalleled in the history of mankind.

THE CONFUSED STATE OF THE NATION

Today if the observer in the high stratosphere were to look down on this Republic he would find a people more sadly divided and confused than at any time since Lincoln's time. He would see the torch of human liberty dimming on every continent.

He would find the richest and most powerful nation in the world confused by its own inventions; disordered in its economic life; hurt by the weakening of private and public morals; arming from fear of foreign violence; discouraged by vast destitution in a land of plenty; frustrated by failure of age-old panaceas. He would find strange doctrines of class struggle, of personal power, of extravagance, of debt, and of hate. He would see our nation still professing liberty yet pursuing ideas which limit and endanger the liberty of men.

Yet none the less again today above all this din and discouragement rises that same supreme chord of all human emotions—the liberty of men.

THE START AT CLARIFYING CONFUSION

Three months ago this observer might have despaired of us. But today he would see flashes of light. He would find that Americans have by the ballot again spoken their demand that the safeguards of liberty be maintained. The people have restored much independence to the Congress. They have returned to office men who fought staunchly for the independence of the Courts. They have lifted to leadership many young, vigorous governors and backed them with high-minded legislatures. The people have proved that elections cannot be controlled by government subsidies.

Today this observer would see another ray of light through all this confusion. He would see the people steadily forcing a

clarification of national thought. Those who adhere to the traditional liberalism upon which the Republic was founded and which Lincoln sustained are crowding away from the pseudo-liberalism of the New Deal.

That philosophy of conscious or unconscious left-wingers is steadily and openly unfolding itself. It becomes visible as a mixture of coercion, collectivism and lust for personal power poured into the American system of free men. And it mortgages the next generation to pay for it. Anyway their new system is satisfying enough to receive the illuminating support of the Communist Front and their fellow travelers.

Here indeed is a paradox. The Republican Party has become the conservative party in the sense of preserving true liberalism.

The spirit of true liberalism is to create free men; it is not the coercion of men. True liberalism is found not in striving to spread bureaucracy and personal power but in striving to set bounds to it. And it is equally certain that we can no more have private economic power without checks and balances than we can have political power without checks and balances. Either one leads to coercion. True liberalism seeks freedom from both bureaucracy and private privilege in the confident belief that without such freedom the pursuit of other blessings is in vain.

Whatever this New Deal system is, it is certain that it did not come from Abraham Lincoln.

THE ROAD TO DISUNITY IN A PEOPLE

The President in his last message on the state of the Union made a moving appeal for unity in the people. But the acerbities of the times were not much allayed when a few days later at the Jackson Day Dinner he smote the to-be-purged Democrats with hints to get out of his party. That was more of a mustard plaster than an ointment of unity.

Then Mr. Roosevelt took in still more ground of combat when he observed: "Does anyone maintain that the Republican Party from 1868 to 1938 was the party of Abraham Lincoln?"

He excepts possibly his own fifth cousin. He ought to read the views of Theodore Roosevelt on such policies as his. He seems to wish to purge the Republican Party also. But the President of all the people did not add to the happy chemistry of national unity with this smear on the political faith of half the people. Certainly Mr. Roosevelt's formula of appeasement does not follow Mr. Lincoln's method of "with malice toward none, with charity for all."

When the great spirit of Abraham Lincoln looks through the long corridor of time upon the party he founded he sees that from the day of his passing on the torch, until the last day of the Republican Party in office, it held aloft the light of inalienable liberties of men. And he knows that party never deviated from the Constitution which he fought to preserve, either in letter or in spirit. And he sees the Union he preserved under adherence to these principles grow to the greatest nation on the earth.

He would witness a people constantly confronted with new human problems which were the very product of their own freedom and progress. Mr. Lincoln would not be fooled by the notion that economic righteousness and social good burst upon the world with the New Deal.

He would see that a generation after his time, when big corporations and mass production entered national life, it was the Republican Party that first established the concept that business must be regulated by government if the freedom of men was to be preserved. Indeed, it was the Republican Party that first initiated regulation against monopoly and business abuse in the states. Over the last fifty years it created seven out of the ten great Federal regulating agencies of today. It was Republicans who created the income and estate taxes, that fortunes might not accumulate so as to oppress the nation and that there might be relief of tax burdens upon the poor.

Abraham Lincoln would have watched anxiously when the growth of humanitarianism began to press upon government. And he would have seen it was Republican state administrations

that first created the limitation of hours for women that started the abolition of child labor that initiated workmen's compensation acts, state old-age pensions, mothers' pensions, public health, and a score of other social reforms. It was Republican national administrations that first brought these problems into national scope. It was they who first proposed the Federal amendment to abolish child labor, which first restricted immigration, who first declared the right of collective bargaining through the creation of the Mediation Board, who first established national public health service. It was Republicans fighting for morals in government who established and in every administration strengthened Civil Service.

Mr. Lincoln would not be fooled that the New Deal first discovered conservation and public works to benefit the people. It was Republicans who first built up every single one of the great Federal policies dealing with these problems. All over this nation are parks, forests, mineral reservations, irrigation districts, navigable rivers, harbors, great bridges, and canals, all the initiative of Republican administrations. The New Deal has added a few per cent to the area or totals. And they have charged them to the next generation.

It was Republicans, following Mr. Lincoln's own platform pledge, which held protection to workers from foreign standards of living by tariffs and sought to hold the home market for farmers against peasant labor abroad.

Lincoln would have seen it was a Republican administration which first announced the responsibility of government aid in time of great depression. When the Federal Reserve System, admirably added by Democrats, failed to meet the storm of 1929, it was a Republican administration which again proposed drastic banking reform. It was Republicans who, pending such reforms created the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Home Loan Banks, the Agricultural Credit Banks, and brought the strength of the government to protect savings and homes and insurance policies of all the people.

Mr. Lincoln would have witnessed a Republican administration in 1930 the first to announce the national obligation that

no American through no fault of his own should go hungry or cold, and first to organize nationwide relief for the unemployed. And it organized relief in a fashion which excluded corruption, waste, and demoralization of community responsibility. It is high time to return to a system that does not play politics with human misery.

And Republicans discovered one thing eighty years ago which the New Deal has not rediscovered yet. That is, the greatest gift of government to the ill fed, ill-housed and ill clothed is fidelity to government obligation, less taxes, a balanced budget, and a convertible gold currency.

And Mr. Lincoln would observe that all these years it was Republicans who held to the system of free enterprise which, while it had weaknesses, yet produced the highest standard of living known in any nation in the history of the world. And it is the New Deal destruction of that energy, enterprise, and productivity which today imperils all the humanitarian work of these eighty years.

We followers of Lincoln lay no claim that the Republican Party or any other party has always been perfect. It has at times sorrowed many of us by its lag in prompt action and its faulty action. And we likewise credit the Democratic Party with great service in years gone by.

One thing is sure. With the millions of Americans with faith in this party and with the task now laid upon it to restore liberty in this land, it is certain that the spirit of Abraham Lincoln has not joined the New Deal.

REPUBLICAN UNITY AND PURPOSE

But the high points of achievement of a political party have two values. They are proof of its fidelity to principles of this Republic. They are proof of its ability to find methods within these principles which meet the scene which changes with the progress of invention and new ideas. After all a party is only an instrumentality for future service. The first chore of a political party out of power is corrective opposition. The

oxygen of representative government is exposure of the witchery of half-truth and the curb of arrogant and extreme action. Its other great duty is to present to the country a program of reform and forward action.

With our reinforced leadership in new governors and in Congress we are strengthened to these purposes. New vigor and courage have come to us by the rise of youth in our party.

The points of opposition and programs for the future are rising daily from county and state organizations, from our youth and women's organizations, from our Republican leaders and our Program Committee. I have made it my business to study these expressions diligently. And I can say at once there has never been a time in the history of the party when in major questions there is such unity as there is today. We may differ among ourselves as to details. We may differ in expression. But we stick together in principle. We are engaged in no purges of honest men.

These many statements of Republican purpose unswervingly demand that moral standards in public and private life be regenerated; that humanitarian action be sanely advanced; that economic productivity be restored; that thrift be enthroned as a national virtue; that private enterprise be sustained and regulated to prevent abuse; that personal liberty be safeguarded; that representative government be purified; that peace be maintained.

And the methods they propose are based on sanity, common sense, and constructive action.

What the everyday people of America want is not labels or slogans, either imported or domestic. They demand emancipation from coercion and taxes and a restoration of their jobs.

Now that you have for once heard a few words favorable to the Republican Party, let me add a few words about the New Deal. The President has introduced us to the seventh New Deal since 1932. It is also the most expensive one. The new gamble with the fate of a people presents some startling features. We have need of bold debate today as never before.

I wish here to applaud the President's grasp of one hint from the election. That is the demand that the Congress be independent. The spirit of his acceptance, however, reminds me of the small boy who took the clock to pieces. When reprimanded he suddenly turned on his Dad and said: "If that is the way you feel, then you put the thing together. I want to play with my soldiers."

We also are grateful for the President's assurance that we have passed the period of experiments and should now be free to invigorate the processes of recovery. This is comforting. And it confirms our belief that millions of our people have had to stand aside for six years in unemployment and destitution to make way for ill-fated experiments.

THE FINANCIAL STATE OF THE UNION

The country may therefore now take up its greatest humanitarian task. That is to restore 10,000,000 to jobs, revive a paralyzed agriculture, and thereby really relieve 20,000,000 destitute. And that task must not be obscured by proposals of entanglement abroad.

The President's solution of this problem is that the government spends on a still larger scale. These 9 billion expenditures and a promise of 50 billion debt are the most startling budget proposals ever laid before the American people in peacetime.

I have felt some anxiety for the punctuation points. They are living a sad and hectic life wandering around among regimented ciphers trying to find some of the old places they used to know. I fear that like the Administration they are moving steadily to the left.

An ancient statesman advised that the art of politics was to find new names for policies that had become unpopular. Mr. Lincoln would probably have phrased this as the art of fooling part of the people a little longer. So today I suppose we ought to be more cheerful when we know that national spending and deficits have become "investing in prosperity." Extravagance with other people's money is shifted from a sin to a virtue. The President in his last message described some

new schools of thought. In fact several of them. In them all, songs of economic hallucination substitute for the brutal clang of the cash register.

The first grade of this high school of economic romances teaches that we should get back to 80 billions of yearly national income which we once enjoyed under Republican administrations. We are grateful that the New Deal adopts Republican attainments as the ideal. But the President says that inasmuch as our present income is only 60 billions, we only have to spend as if we had 80 billions in order to lift ourselves up to the Republican level. As the ancient prospector said: "There ain't no gold in them rainbows." That 80 billion national income under Republican administration was due to the people spending their own money, not in taxes but on reproductive enterprises, creating new jobs for men.

The next higher grade of this new school of budgetary magic seeks to hide these gigantic expenditures by claiming government loans and public works are investments. On the basis of this hallucination my administration would have shown a surplus of 2 billion. In fact the budgets of all administrations for seventy years, except the war years, would have shown a surplus. We should have had such an accumulated surplus today that we should have to build a vacuum to hold it.

The recoverable loans are a relief to the taxpayer but public works are not a monetary asset to the government. They are the clothes the nation wears. And they wear out. They only in small degree increase the earning power of the people. Public works and public buildings have social value. But as assets with which to relieve taxpayers they are about as useful as liabilities on a balance sheet. And I trust the time off for precinct work by the WPA is not included as an offset to the national debt.

The New Deal's third grade of economic make-believe teaches that the entire debt of our national economic system, public and private together, is not larger today than it was in 1929. But that is not all the truth. Public debt is paying for a dead horse. Private debt is buying a live one.

They finally graduate from this school of high finance with the valedictory that expenses cannot be reduced. And this in the face of the fact that yearly for ten years prior to the New Deal, on their basis of accounts and excepting loans since recovered, the expenditures were 3.5 billions instead of 9 billions. But that was Republicans.

I should like to see a new school established with some home truths for its curriculum. That school would say that to restore jobs and agriculture the fear of men of their government and the shackles and taxes upon their energies must be removed in order that free men may have hope and confidence in the future.

That school would say that most of the New Deal measures can be lived down, improved, cured, or reformed but that these monetary and financial policies may defeat the nation.

That school would say that some day all this will have to be paid for. If it be through taxes, men and women will be handing their wages to the government instead of buying things for their own betterment.

Nor is that the most important consequence it should teach. That school would say one of the deadly causes of destruction to twenty democracies in twenty years has been government spending and inflation. Mr. Roosevelt says "this generation has a rendezvous with destiny." The most probable spot for that rendezvous today is inflation. When this generation has gone up that alley it will find freedom has gone, and our rendezvous will be with a full-sized dictator.

IN CONCLUSION

In conclusion let me again say that this Republic is founded on inalienable liberties. It is dedicated to the dignity and personality of individual men and women. It is consecrated to truth, justice, tolerance and mercy. These liberties and obligations are inseparable. If political freedom, intellectual freedom, or economic freedom are any one of them undermined all the others will fall.

These high purposes of this nation are being undermined by the policies now pursued at home and by alien theories from abroad. The first great mission of the Republican Party is the preservation of these principles.

Today economic progress is being paralyzed. That destruction is the destruction of social progress. The imperious necessity of America is to restore economic productivity and thereby jobs for men. That alone can support our humanitarian aspirations. For social progress in care of the aged, the young, the ill fed, the ill clad, the ill housed there must be parallel economic strength. Economic restoration is the second great mission of the Republican Party.

We do not want to become entangled in another World War abroad. The third great mission of the Republican Party is peace for America.

We are the living custodians of the torch which fell from the hand of Abraham Lincoln. We may again rekindle the heart and mind of America with the glow of hope and promise for the future. Never since Lincoln has a political party faced such an opportunity for a service to a great people.

Our Most Important Domestic Issue

Address delivered to the Nebraska Republican Organizations

OMAHA, NEBRASKA

[February 12, 1942]

PART I

WE meet today primarily as Americans to express our gratitude for the birth of Abraham Lincoln. That we do with a full heart for his invisible presence.

It has become customary to mark Lincoln's and Jackson's birthdays by discussion of our great national questions. Public men take time off their other occupations to present their points of view. I shall follow these precedents by taking time off from efforts to relieve the appalling suffering in Finland and Poland for a discussion of the transcendent relief needed for our American people.

We are in the midst of the deepest crisis of civilization since Lincoln's time. Over two-thirds of all the people in the world are at war. There is in reality peace only in the New World. For that we are grateful to Almighty God.

But as tragic as are the conditions abroad, tragedy also stalks our own people. We have needed to put our own house in order.

PART II

The outstanding problem in the United States is unemployment. To get our people back to work is the greatest humanitarian action of our day and age.

This unemployment is no symptom of a passing depression.

It is the result of something far deeper in the forces of American life.

It is not merely a period of economic adjustment following upon a worldwide depression arising from a World War. It is more serious than that. For mind you we have gone through ten years with seldom less than 9 millions of our fellow Americans out of work. We have 9 millions idle today. Even the economic fillip of European wars has not restored real living for their families. And from this unemployment comes a large part of the palsy to agriculture. To overcome it we must have far more than the mustard plasters of politics. This is an illness in our system more serious than any since Lincoln's time.

There is no measure to the human tragedy of being out of a job. It means men ceaselessly walking the streets in search of work to provide for their families. It means constant fear and anxiety in their homes. It drains their self-respect. It brings understandable discontent with a system under which such misery can come upon millions through no fault of their own.

Pending its solution the government must provide for relief. Americans cannot allow their fellow citizens to go hungry.

Yet relief cannot go on forever. The current cost of relief— in all its aspects, Federal, State and local—is nearly four billion yearly. We are borrowing the money. Taxes which would pay these deficits would asphyxiate the whole productive system. We must restore these people to self-support before relief fails.

And to cure it is the only safety of our Republic. Unless we can do so the America of Abraham Lincoln will perish from the earth. It was mainly chronic unemployment and its impact on the farmers and government deficits that caused a dozen European nations to abandon democracy as incapable of solving their grief's and their problems.

Our 9 million idle comprise nearly one fifth of the productive energies of the American people. They want work. The nation needs for them to work. To get them working and to buying more farm products is the first plank in any real farm relief.

To get them working is the road to balance the budget. For tax receipts increase with increased national production and the cost of unemployment relief disappears when the unemployed get a job. And it is the way to restore self-respect and faith in America in these people.

PART III

Tonight in the atmosphere of respect for the great founder of our party let us go deeper into this question than partisan criticism. Let us get down to fundamentals of productive life.

We must diagnose before we can find a cure. And first we must eliminate a lot of confused notions as to what does cause our unemployment.

THE SYSTEM OF FREE ENTERPRISE IS NOT THE CAUSE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

First I do not accept the idea that unemployment is a chronic disease in a free system. To accept that is to admit that a free system is impossible. The inevitable alternative is to drive us over to a totalitarian system which creates jobs by force. I do not accept the defeat of human freedom.

The proof that this gospel of despair is false lies in our own record. We have had unemployment before accompanied by all this same pessimism. Yet over the major years of our national life we have had reasonably full employment for all those who wanted to work. Before our economic system ceased firing on all four motors we had won for America the greatest triumph in all history. We had a productivity which brought us into sight of the Promised Land of Abolished Poverty.

We can have a higher aspiration than stabilized depressions.

OUR FAILURE DUE TO DOMESTIC POLICIES

And now let us clear another lot of confusions. We cannot blame our unemployment upon foreign causes. The present war has even contributed something to lessen it.

We can no longer blame it upon the World War of 1914 to 1919. We can no longer blame it on the worldwide crash. The world turned out of that depression in the spring of 1932 and all the great democracies except us marched out of it by 1935. We should have been on the front line. The British had jobs for their people five years ago. Before the present war they had not only recovered their national income but had risen to 25 per cent above the high year of 1929. We have lagged along mostly about 20 per cent below par. Our national income is about 70 billion. With the growth of population and recovery it ought to be 100 billion.

Thus our plague arises within our own borders. And there is a red rash with it.

LABORSAVING DEVICES NOT THE CAUSE

And there are a further lot of confusions. In reality they are ghosts. The toughest of these ghosts always materializes whenever we have hard times. It is as old as when Eli Whitney invented the cotton gin. It is that laborsaving machinery or new methods are responsible for our unemployment.

As a matter of fact two thirds of our new inventions produce new articles and new jobs. A study of shifting occupations during the decade of the 1920's showed that in 19 major occupations there was a decline of about 800,000 jobs due to improved methods. But due to new articles and cheaper production from new inventions, there was an increase of 2,300,000 jobs. For every man in the livery stable yesterday there are twenty in the garage today.

I do not disregard the suffering that comes from technological unemployment. It is temporary and we can make provision to carry men over the transition when the nation is marching forward. Then technology makes more and better jobs.

END OF NATIONAL GROWTH NOT THE CAUSE

Some of our confused Jeremiahs explain our plant is overbuilt. That we have come to a dead end. That we shall have

no more inventions. That the era of national expansion is over. It is said we have no more frontiers upon which youth can go west and grow up with the country. They say that we must share the existing jobs.

These Jeremiahs forget that electricity and the gas engine, with their train of powerhouses, telephones, automobiles, hard roads and hotdog stands, are furnishing more jobs at a better standard of living today than the whole of the nineteenth century movement to free land in the West.

They overlook the fact that today new invention is born faster than ever before. Invention is no longer limited to the genius in the garret. At the beginning of the century we had about 30 laboratories devoted to abstract science research. Today we have something like 300. They produce the raw materials of applied science and invention. In twenty-five years we have increased our applied science laboratories from 200 to 2000. Every one of them is fairly bursting with new ideas, new methods, new products, new vistas of human comfort, and new jobs.

THE CONFUSIONS THAT WE DO NOT HAVE CAPITAL OR CREDIT

Other economic doctors say we are out of breath for lack of private capital and credit with which to build more houses and power plants and everything. It is not lack of capital that is the matter with us. As a matter of fact our private capital has gone into air raid cellars. Our surplus bank deposits have piled up above the private demand for them by over 17 billions in six years. We also buried something at Fort Knox.

IT IS NOT DUE TO SOCIAL ADVANCES OR BUSINESS REFORM

Nor is unemployment due to advances in the social field. The advancement of old age pensions, unemployment insurance, and the prevention of sweated labor or child labor are necessary parts of a humane civilization. If these reforms are honest and workable they do not create unemployment.

Nor is unemployment due to proper reform in regulation of

business. But to keep the patient alive that operation should be performed with a scalpel and not a meat axe. And the surgeon should be a man who wants to keep the patient alive. Also his knife should be made in the U. S. A. But regulation can be misused, and destroy jobs. Regulation which truly liberates competition, which prevents exploitation, which gives full opportunity for new enterprise, adds to employment.

PART IV

THE DYNAMIC FORCES OF EMPLOYMENT

Now having eliminated a dreary lot of things that are not the cause of unemployment, we must explore what really keeps these millions of people out of jobs and depresses our agriculture.

There are certain dynamic forces which must be combined to make jobs in America. The major forces are:

Intellectual, spiritual and economic liberty;

The moral strength of a people;

Natural resources;

Constant new scientific discoveries and inventions.

We have all these. And when these great forces are firing on all four motors, they can make employment for all of our people.

Now let me repeat something that is perhaps elementary. The gas which moves these motors is sustained initiative and enterprise of men. Its flow is dominated by a most delicate valve. That valve is the attitude of men's minds. Men act when they have hope and confidence of bettering the condition of themselves and their families. They strive if you will for profit. Or to keep ahead of the Joneses. Or to do good for their fellow men.

They hesitate when they meet discouragement or interference. They slow down when they become uncertain of the future. Their initiative and their enterprise stop when they become fearful. And red ink is no stimulant.

They at once postpone buying something or starting something. And then men lose jobs. And right here we can find the major cause of our unemployment.

There are other causes but they are less important.

PART V

Therefore the dynamic forces in national life are deeply influenced by the thinking of the people, and by attitudes of the government. Abraham Lincoln changed the whole direction and conduct of the nation by changing national thinking on slavery and on the inviolability of the Union.

Wrong ideas are as poisonous as the germs of a disease. There are three notions which in recent years have brought paralyzing confusion into these dynamic forces of progress. There are others of less importance but these three would be enough.

The first notion or attitude is that the whole system is wrong and must be made over. That is what they call revolution in Europe.

The second is that government officials can plan, direct or operate the economic life of the people. That is what they call Stateism in Europe. And mark that word; it is full of meaning for us.

The third is that governments can spend and spend and borrow and borrow without thought of tomorrow. That is what we one time believed was the rock upon which liberal governments were wrecked. It did help wreck some twelve democracies in Europe.

MAKING THE SYSTEM OVER

This making of the whole system over is the economic theory that the house must be burned down to kill the rats. We now deal by law with labor as if it were all sweated. We deal with agriculture as if every farmer's judgment is weak. We deal with business reform as if all business is evil. And we settle all things with publicity agents.

Before the Machine Age got out of gear more than 85 per

cent of our people lived better than any race in history. At least 95 per cent of business was honest. Some got too much of the productive pie for the service they gave, some got too little. But both were minorities. They are marginal problems that can be solved without paralyzing the whole economic middle class. And that middle class includes farmers and mechanics as well as lawyers and doctors.

We do have an obligation to the unfortunate, the sick, and the unemployed. But these are also minority groups. We have to regulate business but that is a marginal problem.

This country cannot be run for either privilege or damnation of any minority.

STATEISM

There is a border line in the activities of free government. On the right of that line the government is umpire, is commercial traffic cop, chases evil men and solves marginal problems. On the left of that border line is Stateism with its political bureaucracy, directing, dictating and competing with farmers, labor and business.

Stateism thinks in phrases and slogans rather than in the dynamic forces which make for progress. And slogans do not even pinch-hit for reason.

No one will deny we have injected a huge dose of Stateism into our national system. No one will deny that bureaucracy greatly controls prices, wages, farms, production, industrial output, and investment. It is doing it directly and is doing it indirectly through managed currency, credit, interest rates, pump priming, and taxing power. It has stretched regulation of business from prevention of abuse by bad men over to the dictation to all men. Stateism always corrects its errors by more laws, more coercion. It never dares trust the inherent decency of free men.

Whatever else may be said this has been a movement away from free men. It is a movement away from historic liberalism. For true liberalism seeks the just freedom of men as the basis of all other progress.

The two concepts, one of Stateism and the other of a free

enterprise regulated to prevent abuse, cannot be long mixed. The reasons are simple.

The mixture at once foments destructive conflicts. It develops pressure groups each trying to get theirs or else. It stirs violent divisions within labor. It makes war between employers and workers. It generates violent attacks upon business and enterprise. It distorts the income of industrial wage groups against the farmers. It sets up class hate in the most nearly classless country in the world. Indeed it has made us a sadly divided America.

And there are combats among the planners. Some promote monopolies and others strive against them. Some reduce tariffs and others increase them. Some add more land to cultivation and others decrease it. Some advocate the use of laborsaving inventions, others decry them. They all drive left of the center and sideswipe the whole traffic.

Every grasp of government which reaches into free enterprise otherwise than to prevent abuse slackens somebody's initiative, somebody's enterprise somewhere. These conflicts and the unpredictable economic action of bureaucrats muss up men's judgments. Every farmer, every little businessman has every hour to keep his eye on Washington or its agents. It all puts sand in the gears.

Free enterprise regulated to prevent abuse is the most difficult of all systems. But it is everlastingly true that the plain people will make fewer mistakes and are more honest than the politicians. And the people will produce more goods and provide more jobs.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

And I do not need expand upon the effect of government expenditures, deficits, debts and taxes. They certainly take the ginger out of new initiative and new enterprise. Spending and taxes are the drinks that make Stateism delirious.

Do you wonder that men worry, hesitate, become uncertain, and become fearful? Do you wonder that they lose confidence in the future? Do you wonder that their energies slacken? The name of this disease is anemia in initiative and enterprise.

PART VI

AN EXAMPLE

Now someone may say that this is philosophic and theoretical. But I can give you a gigantic example in tragic fact.

If we explore the economic front, we will find that it consists of two parts. These are the consumption goods, with the services, and the durable goods. For this discussion the consumption goods and the services are those we quickly use up. They are not only drinks, but food, clothing, gasoline, cosmetics, lawyers, movies, and such like.

Durable goods are our equipment for living, working and making consumption goods. They are homes, buildings, machinery, railways, factories, schoolhouses and such. We need more of them every time the population gains a single baby.

Now if we examine the functioning of our economic body we will find we are producing about the same volume of consumption goods as we were in 1929 before the worldwide depression. People have to consume to live. With increased population and new invention it should be about 10 per cent more today than in 1929. But we will let that fond objective pass.

If, however, we examine the construction and improvement of our plant and equipment—that is, the durable goods—we find a different story. These are the things which require special enterprise and initiative. This is the area where men at once postpone action when they become fearful or uncertain of the future. The slowing down in production from this part of the economic body is from 35 per cent to 42 per cent during most of the last nine years.

And if we calculate in money the amount of this lag in the durable goods over these past few years, and we turn that money into wages, and then add the consumption goods that would be bought by these extra wages, we come out with jobs for about all the 9 million unemployed.

And if you want still more concrete figures I may point out

that in the ten years of the 1920's we built an average of about 680,000 new family housing units every year. In the past seven years we have built less than 230,000 a year and that with government subsidies. And today we need four million new houses.

There is a Nemesis which catches up with all Stateism. It cannot control the consumer's mind. He at least holds that free will. It cannot control the producer's fears. It is not the effect of these forces of uncertainty, fear and hesitation upon Big Business, or banks, or Wall Street that shakes our system today. It is its effect upon John Q. Consumer and Mrs. Consumer. Big Business never leads. It always waits for the orders for goods or services or investment from John Q. John Q. and his wife are the only place it can get business from. That is, except from the government. And even that is paid for out of John Q.'s earnings.

John Q. sees all these frights about him. What does he do? If he is conservative he and his wife delay building that house. They delay buying that refrigerator. They postpone buying that farm. They will not make an investment in bonds or stocks which makes new enterprise. They let their savings pile up idle in the banks.

If John Q. is of a more reckless mind he concludes that he might as well spend what he earns. He thinks thrift is futile. Instead of providing for the long term future he decides to go on a joyride with some sort of consumption goods.

And unemployment becomes chronic.

But all these cold statements and these cold figures are no measure of the stream of frustrated lives and human tragedy. And its hardest impact has been upon youth. To them it means frustration and discouragement.

PART VII

CONCLUSIONS

Our national task is to restore productive jobs for these 9 million unemployed men and women. I could at this point

debate on the solutions of our many marginal problems. I could outline a series of steps that should be undertaken. I could debate the detailed reforms and relief and changes in policies which the nation requires. But there is something more basic that must come first. If changes, remedies, reforms are to be of any value we must first determine our national philosophy, our intellectual approach to their solution. And in this we are facing the same task in national thinking as faced Abraham Lincoln in the Great Debates with Douglas in 1858. We must have a vigorous shift in ideas,—of point of view in the nation.

First: We must reverse our national drift toward Stateism with its shackling of men to making a civilization of free men.

Second: We must change from envisaging our problems as requiring transformation of a whole system to an attitude that our faults are marginal around a heart and hearth which are well founded.

Third: We must firmly adopt the concept that it is only through steadily increasing productivity of the nation that we can make progress. And productivity comes when we free our machines and methods of restraints. We should drive our machines to the utmost; it is men we must conserve, not ideas or methods.

Fourth: We must resolutely turn from government spending to national thrift.

Fifth: We must reestablish morals and intellectual integrity in government.

Sixth: We must reverse our direction from class conflict, pressure groups and disunity and seek unity. That was the spirit of Lincoln.

Seventh: And we must keep out of war.

Suppose we shift our ideas, our attitudes, and our direction in these fashions, what will be the result?

These powerful forces of united minds will instantly regenerate confidence and hope. That will abolish hesitation, uncertainty, fear and pessimism. Then we must confirm these great purposes by a detailed program of action.

And to do it we do not need to abandon any real reform or any security to the young or the old or any constructive action.

Truly science and invention are ready with new frontiers, new inventions and new opportunities. We have gigantic national resources. The virility of our race is still in our bones. The cravings for liberty are still strong in our souls.

An alert, alive and free people, primed with confidence, filled with dynamic initiative and free enterprise, will quickly increase the productivity of the nation. That will bring immediate relief to the farmer. And that will balance the budget. That will give jobs to the 9 million unemployed.

Out of the confused forces today we can make a pattern of American life, preserving all that is good. A pattern can be strengthened by which men can look forward with confidence to plan their own life; to get a job; to do creative work; to prove their own worth; to speak freely; to secure promotion and achievement; to undertake their own adventures and to receive their own reward; to champion justice and right for the downtrodden; to raise a family in better circumstances than they themselves enjoyed. That sort of life can be built only in a land of live moral and physical dynamic forces.

And that will assure the America of Abraham Lincoln.

PART II

ADDRESSES UPON FOREIGN POLICIES

America and the World Crisis

Address delivered to the Forum on Current Problems

NEW YORK CITY

[*October 26, 1938*]

THE European crisis of the past year left the air full of war talk. It raised a multitude of discordant voices and great alarms in America. And it has left a world full of fears.

Perhaps we should strip some of the emotion and trappings off this situation and appraise it frankly from an American point of view. We should appraise it in the light of the situation today and not that of a year ago or even sixty days ago. And twenty minutes permits reference only to the high spots. But any appraisal requires blunt and sober statement.

Certainly the world is living dangerously. Much of it lives in anxiety and more of it lives in a state of terror.

Truly force and might have been rising in the world. Their present form of ideological despotisms is not alone impregnated with militarism but with increasing brutality. The Russian executions and the heartbreaking persecution of the Jews would prove that.

But why have these forces returned to the world? It is true they have been brought by age-old fears, hates, and blunders of peace, undying imperialism, and a dozen other evils. We at times superficially attribute this to the spread of perverse ideas or the rise of a man on horseback. That is part of it, but the horse was the impoverishment of peoples by the war.

PART II

The first question before us is whether the philosophies of Communism, Fascism and Liberalism can live together on the same earth.

Militaristic and totalitarian philosophy is not new in the world. Mechanization has changed its details, but it is the same old system of personal power.

The democratic nations have always had to live with such bedfellows. And the first conclusion we can reach is that democracies must reconcile themselves to the fact that nations of that sort are going to continue on the earth. Now obviously if the world is to have peace there must be peace between the totalitarian governments and the democracies.

The maintenance of peace among them has two aspects.

The first is a conflict of ideologies. The ascendancy of the totalitarian ideas has been marked by an era of unparalleled persecution of minorities and the defamation of free men. These actions naturally create deep emotions of sympathy, of impatient resentment and of fear in the democracies. But despite this, America has always stood and must always stand for the rights of peoples to adopt any form of government they like in working out their own destinies.

Now the alternative is wars between government faiths or ideologies. That can repeat all the hideous results of religious wars of the middle Ages.

In any event modern war sows only the dragons' teeth of world impoverishment, from which the despotisms themselves spring.

It would be an endless treadmill of war and a destruction of civilization.

The second aspect of these dictator governments is their external aggressiveness. We need no more evidence of the aggressive characters of these ideologies than the daily exposure of Communism, Nazism or Fascism in our own country. But the aggressive attitude of the Fascist governments has another impulse. The German, the Italian and the Japanese

governments are under great pressure to find appeasement to their people from shortages of food and materials and from drastic standards of living of today.

So that the first question Americans have to consider is: Do these totalitarian governments threaten our safety? And this question divides itself into three segments. Are the forces for war today greater than the forces for peace between the totalitarian governments and the Western democracies of Europe? And even if they do come to conflict is there sufficient reason why we should join in a war? Do they threaten directly the Western Hemisphere? Now the answers to these involve calculating the weights of indeterminate forces. But we must calculate a little if we are to have a chart.

In discussing questions of purely European relations any American travels upon difficult ground. I have no taste for Americans to advise on policies of other nations. But in view of the appeals of some European democratic statesmen to us we have a right to look into their situation for a moment.

The realities of the situation indicate that the despotisms can gain no substantial relief from their shortages of food and materials by war on the Western democracies or by territorial acquisitions overseas. Moreover, there is little hope of complete economic relief for them through overseas trade in the present demoralized state of the world.

There are, however, such opportunities in the economic expansion and development of Eastern Europe. It is probable that their faces are directed to the east, not to the west. It is probable that their objectives in this direction for the present moment are economic and not territorial. Certainly it is my belief that neither Germany nor the other Fascist states want war with the Western democracies unless these democracies interfere with their spread eastward.

The changed situation in Czechoslovakia has to do not alone with the Sudeten Germans but with removal of impediments to this eastward movement. Nor can I mention Czechoslovakia without that emotion which arises to a heroic people and to a heroic world figure—President Benes.

There are further weights in this balance toward peace between the totalitarian states and the democracies. One is the increase of defensive armament in the Western European democracies. Even if the totalitarian nations are aggressive under great economic or imperialistic pressures they will move on lines of least resistance and that is not westward. The Western European democracies can also defend themselves from any direct attack.

Now there are still other weights for peace in Western Europe. The land fortifications for defense have increased in power faster than the offensive land weapons. If fighting were limited to the ground today it is my belief that this ratio amounts to a near stalemate. And the shift of war to the air has profoundly affected all war thinking. The brunt of air war will fall upon civilians. They are no longer remote from the battlefields. It has a sobering effect upon popular emotions in all countries, including the totalitarian states. In this last crisis we heard no drums and fifes, and no songs of glory. Emotional pressure for war has been distinctly muffled.

There are other hopes for building of peace in Europe. With imminent dangers removed, economic life should improve and by that very fact some of these pressures be relieved for food and material.

And in all these forces of peace in Europe there is one of superlative value. The democratic statesmen of Europe are determined to give the healing processes of peace a chance.

Now whatever the criticisms of their Munich agreement may be, we can at least conclude that some immediate strains have been appeased, and that war is today more remote. And it for the present lessens our American dangers.

PART III

SHOULD WE JOIN IN EUROPEAN WAR?

The further question is: If there should be war between the Western European democracies and the despotisms is there sufficient reason why we should join?

There is to my mind four reasons why we should not.

The call to join is based upon the preservation of personal liberty in the world. Free economic life is not built on war. Any major war means that our country must be mobilized into practically a Fascist government. It will be so organized. It went some distance in the last Great War, although we did not use that term at the time. It would have gone much farther if the war had extended longer. The lowered vitality of free enterprise and the necessity to subordinate our enormous peacetime national debt both enter into the improbability of after war demobilization of a further centralized power.

Those who would have us go to war to save liberty might give a little thought to the preponderant chance that we should come out of such a struggle with personal liberty restricted for generations. Moreover it is even less likely that the European democracies would emerge as democracies.

If European war should take place between liberal and totalitarian countries the only hope for survival of democracy is for us to stay out of it and keep the lamp of liberty alight in this world.

The second reason for staying out is the futility of American intervention in Europe. We can make war but we do not and cannot make peace in Europe.

Our people do not have the knowledge and the willingness to compromise ideals and principles which meet their necessities. There is the ever-present factor of a thousand years of European history that on a score of boundaries there exist zones of mixed populations, each with its own age-old hates and its aspirations. Whatever way these boundaries may be drawn, some people will be separated from their "fatherlands." These agitations are the key to much European war history. There are also economic factors which necessitate the joining of peoples of diverse races. In war fed fears and hates they are certain to evolve balances of power for their defenses. There is no clear base of idealism or principle for making peace in Europe. It is a matter of compromise.

And the third reason for keeping out of the European situation

lies in the fact that there is no clear call of liberty from Europe. France has her own special alliances and her policies, including an alliance with dictatorial Russia. She believes that is necessary for her defense and we have no right to criticize. But if we are involved, far from standing on the side of Liberty, we should be standing on the side of Communism. And Russia is certainly not a democratic state.

And as great a democracy as is the British Commonwealth and as vitally important as it is to the continuance of civilization, she also has interests of her own that we can scarcely be called upon to defend.

There are the fourth, and the fifth, and a dozen reasons for keeping out of any war that does not involve our very independence. We have ample proof that the destruction, and the suffering, and moral degeneration do not end for a generation.

In any event I am convinced that if Americans stay out of European wars it will best serve the world. It will best serve liberty itself.

PART IV

OUR DIRECT DANGER FROM TOTALITARIAN AGGRESSION

We have a remaining segment of this question to examine. That is the threat of direct action by the totalitarian governments, either in combination or singly, upon the Western Hemisphere. And this Western Hemisphere is where we can surely dominate peace. These possible aggressions are again of two forms—first, penetration by territorial encroachment, and second, ideological propaganda.

There is little likelihood of territorial encroachment on the Western Hemisphere from this quarter. The peaceable trade relations with the United States are worth more to the totalitarian states than all the other possible Western Hemisphere advantages ever to be gained. And in one hundred and seventy years, with a proportionately weaker Western Hemisphere from a military point of view, the Monroe Doctrine has been

ample to prevent this. The Atlantic and Pacific Oceans have not yet lost all of their value as frontier fortifications.

With Japan weakened by war, with her face turned towards Asia, with the present forces of the European dictatorships and their responsibilities at home, this barrier still continues effective, provided we are prepared to defend it.

We must not only be just. We must be respected. And this raises at once the question of our preparations. We have already increased our military expenditures in the past six years by 450 million, from about 650 million dollars per annum to about 1100 millions of dollars. Before we again expand this burden upon the people we should be told frankly what dangers have so increased as to warrant it.

Now there may be reasons, but according to all public information there is more realistic hope of military peace for the next few years than there has been for some time.

The other segment of this question we have to explore is the propaganda penetration of totalitarian philosophies into the Western Hemisphere with a view of setting up their systems in this region and thus creating political and trade situations which would be more exclusive to them.

We can expect the people of the other Western Hemisphere states to value their own independence and their own way of life as we do and to resist these forces. Certainly action by the United States on these propaganda drives is not in the military field, unless of course there are established bases of threat to the United States, either military or of limited trade character.

Now time precludes adequate discussion of this propaganda, but in its final aspects in relation to the United States, I may ask a question. If the Communists were to succeed in setting up a Communistic State in South America would we go to war with Russia on that account? Would we go to war with and reform that South American state? Are we any more likely to do anything of this kind in a Fascist state? Most certainly not, unless our safety or our economic independence were threatened.

PART V

OUR PART IN PEACE

While I am convinced that we should keep out of other peoples' wars, that does not mean that Americans should disassociate themselves from efforts to maintain peace of the world.

We assert and we should continue to assert that the basis of international relations should not be force but must be law and free agreement. We assert this as a principle of life and a principle of civilization. We should give moral support to that principle on all occasions. But it is a destroying inconsistency to seek to impose it upon the world by force.

If we look over the world at this moment, as I have already pointed out, we shall find that the pressures for war today are predominantly economic. The greatest healing force that could come to the world is prosperity. Exchange of goods is stifled by the new devices of quotas, the instability of currencies, the flights of capital, and the desperate drives for self-containment. They are far more potent in the destruction of economic life than our old-fashioned trade arrangements. A great vision of world economic remedy is needed today as never before if we are to find peace. And the first step should be to resume the world conferences which were ended by our country in 1933.

Relief of economic pressures would do more than contribute to peace. It would do more to relax these philosophies of despotism and to remove their brutalities than all of the armies and navies in the world. Food and clothing, and general welfare make the atmosphere in which we can alone expect personal liberty to again assert itself. And peoples who have experienced intellectual and economic liberty once will some time regain it again.

That is the hope of the world in the struggle for peace.

President Roosevelt's New Foreign Policies

Address delivered to Council on foreign Relations

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

[February 1, 1939]

I WISH to talk on peace. We are deluged with talk of war. Our minds are being prepared to accept war as inevitable. We need to keep our heads.

And I say this as one who in positions of responsibility saw every stage in the development of the last war. And I have seen the bitterness of its failure to bring blessings to mankind.

I have no need to recite the malevolent forces rampant in the world. In twenty nations desperate peoples have surrendered personal liberty for some form of authoritarian government. They are placing their trust in dictatorship clothed in new ideologies of Utopia. Some of them are making war or are aggressively threatening other nations. The world is taut with fear. Five times more men are under arms than before the Great War.

We in America are indignant at the brutalities of these systems and their cruel wrongs to minorities. We are fearful of the penetration of their ideologies. We are alarmed at their military preparations and their aggressiveness.

Their neighboring democracies are consciously or unconsciously flooding us with propaganda that we, too, are in danger, that we will inevitably be drawn in.

We have needed to strip emotion from these questions as much as we can. They are questions of life or death not only to men but also to nations.

We have needed to appraise coolly these dangers. We have need of sober, analytical debate upon the policies of government toward them. We must do so without partisanship.

OUR FOREIGN POLICIES

Amid these agitations, President Roosevelt has now announced a new departure in foreign policies.

Beginning with his suggestion of fourteen months ago of quarantining dictatorships, he now states: "We have learned that God-fearing democracies . . . cannot forever let pass without effective protest acts of aggression against sister nations. . . . There are many methods short of war, but stronger and more effective than mere words, of bringing home to aggressor governments the aggregate sentiments of our own people."

Mr. Roosevelt has also proposed to the country a huge increase in our already large armament. Under his plans we are on the way to become possibly the largest naval power and certainly the largest air power in the world.

Let me say at once that if our defense requires it every American will willingly bear that burden though it contributes to lower the standard of living of every American and though it plunges us further into debt.

It does mean an increase in our military expenditure from 650 millions of only six years ago to 1400 or 1500 millions next year.

But the proper degree of our military preparedness depends first upon what our foreign policies are to be, and second, upon where and from what our dangers come. When these are determined then the size of our armament is for our Army and Navy experts to say. Without these determinations they can give no competent advice.

Our foreign policies in these major dimensions must be determined by the American people and the Congress, not by the

President alone. The citizens can also in some degree appraise our dangers. After all it is the people who are made poor and who sacrifice their lives and the lives of their sons.

OUR TRADITIONAL POLICIES

For a hundred and thirty years before the Great War and since we rejected the League of Nations our foreign policies have been simple and emphatic.

First, to keep out of foreign entanglements and other peoples' wars; not to interfere in the affairs of other nations.

Second, our armament to be for defense, not aggression.

Third, that defense to include the Western Hemisphere by enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine.

Fourth, to protect by force if necessary the lives of Americans who are of necessity abroad, but to depend upon the peaceful processes of negotiation to protect their rights and property.

Fifth, to cooperate in peaceful movements to promote peace and in economic movements to promote world prosperity. And to insist that neither by spirit nor action do we imply either military or economic force for these purposes.

Sixth. Under the recent Neutrality Law we presumably prohibit the purchase of arms in the United States by other nations while actually at war, together with some restrictions upon credit and travel. Such purchases are without restrictions until we declare that a war exists. And let me say parenthetically that this arms provision needs immediate revision. In effect it compels us to take sides rather than be neutral.

I believe these are the full dimensions of American policies that have been approved by the American people up to now.

MR. ROOSEVELT'S NEW EXPANSION OF FOREIGN POLICIES

Mr. Roosevelt now proposes to expand these policies. The sum of his proposal is that we make effective protest at acts of aggression against sister nations. He says we must use methods

stronger than words and short of war. He asks for armament to back his extensions. As Daniel Webster said in his reply to Hayne, "Let me run the honorable gentleman's doctrine a little into its practical application."

First. The only known effective methods short of war and more than words are that we either support one side with supplies of food; raw materials, finance and munitions, or we deny these to the other side by embargoes, boycotts or other economic sanctions.

Second. The aggressions against sister nations that Mr. Roosevelt is discussing are not alone in the Western Hemisphere. They are in reality aggressions across the Atlantic and the Pacific, in Europe and Asia.

Third. This new policy means that we are to determine who the aggressors in the world are.

The determination of the who and when of aggression sounds easy. It sometimes is easy. But if one examines the history of the world the distinction between legitimate expansion and wicked aggression becomes confused. The League of Nations after some years of effort failed to find even a definition of aggressor. We are to set ourselves up as the oracle of righteousness in age-old quarrels that began before our nation was born. A large part of the United States was the result of aggression under any definition; likewise parts of the British Empire and France. The world will not remain static, for the pressures of populations, economic life, and defense are not static forces. In any event, it does not seem to be a job that America should undertake. More especially as each case must needs be debated in Congress and divided by the emotions of our racial origins.

Fourth. These proposals to use some sort of coercion against nations are of course a complete departure from neutrality in other peoples' wars. It is the method of coercion, not persuasion. It is in direct violation of Secretary Hull's reaffirmation, on which the ink is but sixty days dry, of an old American policy that "the intervention of any state in the internal and external affairs of another is inadmissible."

Fifth. Such measures are obviously futile unless undertaken

in cooperation with other nations. Without joint action supplies of food or oil or cotton or munitions can be obtained elsewhere. And joint action means at least temporary alliances with countries in Europe or Asia.

Sixth. Such policies are provocative of reprisals and must be backed by armament far beyond that required for defense of the Western Hemisphere. If we are to provoke we must be prepared to enforce.

Seventh. Economic pressures inevitably run into pressures upon civil populations. Civil populations are mostly women and children. The morals of starvation by force rank no higher than killing from the air.

Eighth. Any nation which sets up such policies and builds an armament of dimensions to back them is sure to arouse fear. This idea of America sitting alone determining who and what in the world shall stop and go would make us suspect of the whole world. It is certain that combinations of power will arise against a nation which does that, no matter how good neighborly its words may be.

Let me say at once that any form of direct or indirect coercion of nations is force and is the straight path to war itself. No husky nation will stand such pressures without bloody resistance.

Those who think in terms of economic sanctions should also think in terms of war.

It will be said that these measures will preserve peace, that if nations know we will throw our weight into the balance they will not transgress on others. That is worldwide power politics. That is the exact theory of joining in the balance of power throughout the world. That setting has in the long and tragic history of Europe inevitably exploded in war.

All this becomes the most momentous change in American policies of peace and war since we entered the Great War.

Moreover the European democracies have accepted it as a complete change of national policy by the United States. If it is not a proposal to change radically our policies then they are under a misapprehension.

But to determine the issue, let me propose some questions that the American people deserve to have answered.

1. Shall we reverse our traditional policies at this time?
2. Shall we set ourselves up to determine who the aggressor is in the world?
3. Shall we engage in embargoes, boycotts, economic sanctions against aggressor nations?
4. Shall we do this where the Western Hemisphere is not attacked?
5. Shall we provide an armament greater than that necessary to protect the Western Hemisphere from military invasion?
6. Shall we take collective action with other nations to make these more than words and short of war policies effective?
7. Are we to be the policeman of the world? Certainly it is due to Mr. Roosevelt, to the Congress, and to the American people that we know exactly what this means. The Congress should have this adventure clarified before we go blindly into great increases in armament.

THE DANGERS OF THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Before we answer these questions and before we venture into these paths of force and conflict, even short of war, we should realistically examine how serious the so-called imminent dangers are from aggressive nations.

Our dangers are obviously in two forms—the penetration of their ideologies, which would destroy democracies, and their military aggressiveness.

And their military aggressiveness has to be appraised in two aspects. First, the direct dangers to the Western Hemisphere, and second, our further concern in the dangers to our sister democracies in Europe and Asia.

PENETRATION OF IDEOLOGIES

The first segment of this danger is the ideologies. The penetration of these ideologies, whether it be the Communism of

Russia, the National Socialism of Germany, or the Fascism of Italy, is an internal problem for each country where they penetrate. Ideas cannot be cured with battleships or airplanes. I say this as I do not assume that we intend to attack dictators or extirpate ideologies in their home sources. That would lead the world to worse destruction than the religious wars of the middle Ages.

Our job of defense against these un-American ideologies is to eliminate Communist, Socialist and Fascist ideas and persons from our own institutions. It is to maintain the ideals of free men, which make this unprofitable soil for such alien seed.

I am confident that if the lamp of liberty can be kept alight these ideologies will yet die of their own falsity. They spring not from moral and spiritual inspirations but from the cupidity of men. In any event no additional appropriations for arms will settle those problems.

THE MILITARY DANGERS

The second segment of danger is that of military attack of the dictatorships upon democracies.

And we may first explore the imminent dangers of military attack upon the Western democracies. And again we should consider it in the light of realism rather than the irritating words that emanate from world capitals.

Our people must realize that even if there were no dictators present, the blunders in the peace treaties, the pressures of population, the impoverishment of peoples will create periodic European crises. That has been the history of Europe since long before America was born.

As terrifying as these crises look in the morning paper, there are more realistic pressures for peaceful adjustments than for war.

Since the Great War land fortifications for defense have increased in power faster than offensive land weapons. The dictatorships know that if they were to attack the Western democracies they would probably find their land and sea defenses

impregnable. Attack from the air offers hideous destruction, but it also brings sobering reprisals. It stiffens resolution and it does not capture capital cities. It is my belief that the Western democracies of Europe can amply defend themselves against military attack.

And in this connection we must not close our eyes to one condition under which the American people, disregarding all other questions, might join in European war. We are a humane people, and our humanity can be overstrained by brutality. That was one of the causes of our entry into the last war. For instance, if wholesale attack were made upon women and children by the deliberate destruction of cities from the air, then the indignation of the American people might not be restrained from action.

I do not believe officials of any nation have become so foolish nor dare the depth of barbarism of such an undertaking. The indignation in the United States today at such killings in Spain and China, where it is excused as the accident of attempt to demoralize munitions supply, should be warning of the temper which would be raised.

There are other realistic forces which weigh against military attack by the dictatorships on the democracies. Despite various so-called "demands" the dictatorships are in reality mainly interested elsewhere. The face of Germany is turned more East than toward Western Europe. The face of Japan is turned west into Asia. The Russians are amply engaged at home. The Italians claim grievances with England and France arising out of the treaties under which they came into the Great War, but these are not impossible of solution.

Beyond all this, every one of the totalitarian states has its own grave internal weaknesses.

Above all, the common people in no country in Europe want war. They are terrified of it.

Do not think I believe the situation is not dangerous in Europe. Far from it. But it is not as imminent as the speeches abroad might make it appear. And what is not imminent is often preventable.

Obviously our dangers are much less than those of the overseas democracies. The Western Hemisphere is still protected by a moat of 3000 miles of ocean on the East and 6000 miles on the West. No airplane has yet been built that can come one-third the way across the Atlantic and one-fifth of the way across the Pacific with destructive bombs and fly home again. In any event, these dictatorships have nothing to gain by coming 3000 miles or 6000 miles to attack the Western Hemisphere. So long as our defenses are maintained they have everything to lose.

That any of these dictatorships, whether Japan, Germany, Italy, or Russia, or all of them together, have the remotest idea of military attack upon the Western Hemisphere is sheer hysteria.

It will be said that we must be prepared to go across the seas and enforce lawful rights for American trade by military action. I do not agree with that thesis. There always comes a time, with patience, when such ends can be accomplished by the processes of peace.

SOME ULTIMATE POSSIBLE CONSEQUENCES

There are other factors that we need to consider also before we decide to use force beyond protection of the Western Hemisphere. We must not refuse to look at the possible ultimate before we start down these paths.

If we join with force in Europe or Asia, even though it is short of war, we must consider its consequences should it lead to war. For that is the most probable result. The call to join is based upon the preservation of human liberty in the world. Our first purpose is to maintain liberty in America. If civilization based on liberty fails in the United States it is gone from the earth. We must safeguard that, not only in our own interest but in the interest of the world.

Personal liberty and free economic life are not built for modern war. A great war today is a mobilization of the whole people. That means democracy must temporarily surrender

to dictatorship, no matter what one may call it, in order that we may bend our full energies to war.

It means that our country must be mobilized into practically a Fascist state. It would be so organized. It went some distance in the last Great War, although we did not use that term at the time. It would have gone much farther if the war had extended longer.

I speak of this not from hearsay but as one who participated in the economic organization of the Great War. I saw the rise of opposition to demobilization of the interests which benefited. But we secured the immediate and courageous demobilization of this economic power over the daily lives of our people because of the backing of a real lover of human liberty—Woodrow Wilson.

Today the lowered vitality of free enterprise, the necessity to subordinate or repudiate our enormous peacetime national debt to make way for finance of a new war, together with the ideas of economic power which impregnate our government, all drive to the improbability of after war demobilization of centralized power.

If it were that or the loss of our national independence it would not be too great a price. But let us at least recognize that a war to save liberty would probably destroy liberty. In my view another great war will make dictatorship universal.

Even if we escaped this result, yet the sacrifice of our sons and the moral and economic destruction are a bitter prospect to contemplate. Surely we learned this from the last war. As we look back over our participation in that war there is still another cup of bitterness. America can make war but we cannot make permanent peace in Europe or Asia. The peace after the Great War sowed the dragon's teeth whose growth confronts us today.

CONCLUSION

And now a word in conclusion. As a nation we must weigh all these experiences, these forces and factors as best we can.

We may not agree upon the importance to lie upon any one of them. But from the total of them it is my belief that at this time the country should say an emphatic No to the questions of clarification which I have proposed above.

This world can never reach peace by threats and force. If this is to be the blind leadership of men, nothing can save the world from a catastrophe to civilization.

No nation has alone built this civilization. We all live by heritages which have been enriched by every nation and every century. And to save this civilization there must be a changed attitude of men. Our country standing apart can make a contribution of transcendent service in holding aloft the banner of moral relationships.

If we are to hold that banner of morals aloft the people of America should express unhesitatingly their indignation against wrong and persecution. They should extend aid to the suffering.

We should not be isolationists in promoting peace by the methods of peace. We should not be isolationists in proposals to join in the most healing of all processes of peace—economic cooperation to restore prosperity.

But surely all reason, all history, all our own experience show that wrongs cannot be righted and durable peace cannot be imposed on nations by force, threats, economic pressures, or war. I want America to stand against that principle if it is the last nation under that banner. I want it to stand there because it is the only hope of preserving liberty on this continent.

That is America's greatest service to mankind.

Foreign Policies Today

Article in *Liberty Magazine*

[April 15, 1939]

THERE is no subject more difficult to discuss rightly than foreign policies. They compound our affections and dislikes as well as our interests and ideals. Few of us will agree upon the weights we attach to every argument or fact. The indignation of every one of us at the ravishing of Czechoslovakia adds difficulty to sober discussion. But we simply must have conclusions on national policy. That cannot be sidestepped.

The United States cannot pursue a policy of isolation in the world. We have too many dangers, too many interests, and we have enormous responsibilities. The Monroe Doctrine, with its requirements on our part to defend South America against any Old World invasions, is in itself a negation of any policy of isolation. That area of our international relations was settled for us many years ago, and we have confirmed it repeatedly.

The other large immediate question is our attitudes toward the area of Europe, Asia, and Africa. There are two widely divergent directions which we can take in respect to them at the present time. Neither is isolation. But their destiny is as far apart as the two poles. The one makes for peace in the world; the other envisages force or war.

The first of these is to hold to broad neutrality and thereby exert the moral influence of the United States to lessen the causes of controversy and war in Europe and Asia. That method proceeds through peace treaties; through diplomatic

effort, through encouragement to meet at the council table; through arbitration; through promotion of international law; through the establishment of such agreements as the Kellogg Pact, the Hague Tribunal, a properly reorganized Court of International Justice; through promotion of land disarmament, limitation of navies, and through control of aircraft and submarine misuse; through dignified protest at persecutions, through moral refusal to recognize gains of wrongdoing; through mobilization of world public opinion against transgressors. And especially through economic cooperation can world strains be reduced. All these are the constructive processes of peace. They build for peace and good will. They may not always succeed, or hold for long at a time; but while they do hold they prevent war and they uphold the standards of international conduct.

The second direction that we could take is to depart from neutrality in the controversies between other nations and to exert the physical force of the United States on one side of a conflict. That method proceeds through declarations of support, through alliances which shift the balances of power in the Old World, or through threats or through economic pressures, such as punitive tariffs, or through economic sanctions, or through military force, and finally through war. None of these are processes of peace.

All in this category of actions are provocative actions. They have hitherto always cracked up in war itself. They make also for division of the world by hate and friction. They solve nothing. They render any service through the first category almost impossible.

It is my belief that the first category of relations represents the long view and the realistic view; that the second category represents the short view and the emotional view. For if civilization is to be preserved and to prosper, it will be through the first category of international relations, not by wars and threats of wars.

The League of Nations was a heroic attempt to build peace by associating all nations, whether democracies, kingdoms, or

dictatorships. Its purpose was to replace the theory of balances of power and military alliances which had invariably plunged the world into war. It was wrecked on several rocks. The first was the prompt building of balances of power and military alliances by certain nations—ideas utterly antagonistic to the whole concept of the League. The second was that it attempted to combine these two categories of international relations; that is, force and the processes of making peace. There were other reasons for failure, but these two are pertinent to the situation today. The League also proved to have great values where it exerted itself in making peace and not attempting force.

During the whole history of our country, except that period of three years between entering into the Great War and up to our rejection of the League of Nations, our policies have been of the first category in our relations to European and Asiatic nations.

Beginning a period of fourteen months ago, Mr. Roosevelt has shown a certain sequence of steps in the development of a change in these traditional American policies in respect to Europe and Asia. The full extent of the President's proposed change in policies has not been made public. His private statements to the General Staff and to the Senate Military Affairs Committee are naturally not officially available. He has given some public indication of them in his proposal "to quarantine dictators"; his message to Congress proposing that America should determine who are aggressors against other nations in Europe and Asia and apply to them methods stronger than words and short of war; and the reported statement to the Senate Military Committee that the American frontiers were some place in Europe. The expressions of Ambassador Bullitt certainly warrant the European democracies in the belief that they may look to the United States for some sort of aid. These expressions are vague enough but at least indicate a radical departure from the categories of peaceful processes into the categories of force.

The *Baltimore Sun* sums it up as "the prospect of revolutionary change in the role played by the United States on the

world stage." Any such change in policies should be frankly submitted to and confirmed by the American people.

The time to debate a momentous change which involves peace and war is before we enter the paths of force. After we have traveled that path for a while debate is silenced as moral treason.

I have seen too much of international life and friction not to know that the world changes and that the scene shifts, and that other policies may be necessary. But our job is to examine the situation with which we are faced now. And this is an appraisal of the outlook now and the policies which should be pursued by America.

Before we examine the reasons for adopting one course or the other, let me clear some underbrush as to some conclusions that we generally agree upon.

1. We all agree that we must have adequate defense to hold the Western Hemisphere against military attack from overseas in any combination. Whatever our Army and Navy say is necessary for this purpose we will make any sacrifice to provide. We have no quarrel with proper defense programs for this purpose.

2. Most of us intensely dislike every color of Nazism, Fascism, Socialism, and Communism. They are the negation of every ideal that we hold. They are the suppression of all liberty. In Germany the persecution of the Jews, the attitudes toward the Christian faiths; in Russia the wholesale executions, the destruction of Hebrew as well as Christian worship, the ruthless starvation of millions of peasants when resources were available to save them—all of them outrage our every sense of justice. While we stand it in the name of free speech, we resent the Bund, the Communist and Socialist parties in the United States taking advantage of our liberties of free speech and free assembly to preach doctrines which would destroy these very liberties.

It is not with any approval of these un-American activities that we reserve the question as to whether America should send her sons to Europe to die in a war against these ideologies,

or that we should enter into measures that may lead to that end.

3. There is no objection or any legal prohibition against England or France buying airplanes or munitions in the United States. What we are concerned with are what changes in our foreign relations have surrounded these otherwise purely commercial transactions.

Those who advocate that we should depart from neutrality and join nations in Europe and Asia with processes of force base it on one or all of three different grounds:

First: They claim that we have an obligation and a duty to maintain liberty throughout the world.

Second: They insist specifically that if the democracies of England and France are attacked we must come to their support, not only to maintain liberty but in fear if they were overcome we would be the next victim.

Third: They insist that if we throw or threaten to throw our weight now with France and England, they will not be attacked at all.

The problem is not so simple or the conclusions as certain as this description would assume. At this moment most of the proponents of these policies deny that they want us to go to war. Maybe not, but they want us to act warlike, and we need to look down this alley to see where it ends. Propaganda is built up that way. As it goes along some time we may get to the stage where our emotions will be forced by the cry that we are quitters and cowards or have let down those who have relied upon our vague expressions.

Most of us are sympathetic with these countries, but a vast and resolute majority of us are against being drawn into war.

Before we start on these departures from the processes of peace into the path of force there are several major questions to consider.

1. The basic premise of many of these assertions about the situation in Europe is open to question.

The American people are deluged with propaganda and unreliable reports. Despite all contrary appearances the forces pressing to war which would necessarily involve the Western

European democracies are at the date of this writing not as strong as the forces pressing to avoid war. No one is so foolish as to say that there is not an immensity of combustible materials in Europe. But the universal knowledge of them and the experience of the last war make men far more cautious than they were in the year 1914.

Furthermore, most competent observers agree that Germany and Italy have no present notion of making military attack upon the British and French.

Moreover, England and France can, in the belief of competent observers, amply defend themselves against attack. No one can deny that the superiority in land fortifications of the French and British make them impregnable from any land force that can be brought to bear against them. They have three times the naval strength of the dictators. They have the industrial resources, the men and the money to either buy or to build superior air fleets if they wish to organize themselves for these purposes. Their populations, their empires, and their natural resources give them ample man power and far greater reserves of manufacturing capacity and of war materials.

The relative positions of England and France to their possible opponents are far stronger today than they were in 1914.

No competent observer believes that the dictatorships, singly or in combination, could successfully attack the Western Hemisphere even if they were inclined to try it, which they are not. And this applies both before and after the next European war, if any. They would be far weaker after the next war than today, no matter what the outcome.

Altogether, while the situation in Europe requires watching as to its effects upon us, yet those who are promoting American entanglements in Europe are ringing the alarm bells of American dangers entirely too hard.

2. From an American point of view, the reason we would enter into these paths of force is purely ideological. We want no economic advantages. We have no desires for territorial expansion. There need be no fear that we cannot defeat any attempt of foreign dictatorships in encroachment upon the Western Hemisphere

The appeal is solely on the ground of saving liberty, either abroad or at home. Thus it becomes an appeal to idealism pure and simple. While England and France are countries of stanch idealism for liberty, they are naturally long-established imperialistic democracies, controlling millions of subject races. Germany and Italy are imperialistic states also seeking possessions for trade and raw materials. Italy obviously never received the territorial possessions promised her by England and France under the treaty of 1915 by which she entered the Great War. England and France, on the other hand, do not wish to surrender any of their possessions. In other words, there is here a conflict between "haves" and "have-nots."

Without taking any position on the right or wrong of these controversies, we can at least conclude that their differences are not wholly ones of idealism for liberty alone.

3. Particularly is the case of Italy a good example of where right and wrong are beyond our determination. Americans should be slow to deny the justice of her claims under the war treaties. We were not a party to them, but we do become a party to this controversy if we line up to support France against Italy. As a matter of fact, the equitable settlement of that controversy would contribute more to the world's peace than any other step that could be taken this day. In any event, it all emphasizes that it is not liberty alone which is at stake.

4. These exponents of vague use of force in association with European democracies would be much more logical, much more frank and open, and in fact much more effective in their purpose, if they would straightforwardly advocate a formal military alliance right away. That would need the approval of Congress, and our people could have something to say about it. Their purpose is, either ignorantly or in fact, to get us so involved that we would have to join in war if it came. If we had a frank and open military alliance we would possibly have something to say about controversies in Europe which might lead us into war. We have no such voice under these vague proposals.

A test that these exponents of abandonment of processes of

peace for processes of force might apply to their own thinking is just this:

Are they prepared to openly advocate military alliance with European democracies?

5. Those who propose even a vague alliance of force with England and France should inform the American people how they are going to avoid marrying the alliance of France with Communist Russia. France is committed lock, stock, and barrel to Communist Russia. They should also explain fully why the United States should assume for instance that Italy is our enemy. For twenty years Russia has tried to undermine our government; Italy has done no such thing. Italy has been a firm friend of the United States ever since our country was born. Moreover, they should explain how far the United States will go to guarantee the possessions and policies of England and France in respect to their subjective people in every part of the world. That is what it would mean. It is not necessary to go into the merits or demerits of these important phases to at least indicate the labyrinth of commitment we may be venturing into.

6. Another question enters into this problem, and that is, how long these destructive ideologies, especially the most aggressive ones in Germany and Russia, can last. It is my belief that they have reached their high point.

The common people in both Germany and Italy are equally as terrified at being drawn into war as are the people of other countries. Their economic systems are showing signs of degenerating weakness. Having enjoyed liberal institutions, the vast majorities of their people have constant desire and hope for return of greater liberty. Public opinion is making itself felt despite the restraints.

Communism in Russia is rapidly disclosing itself as a purely gangster government. And the gangsters are quarreling.

Patience on the part of the democracies might well see a considerable part of these dangers decrease from these internal pressures.

7. It is proposed that we take upon ourselves the job of

determining and aiding to stop aggressors in the world. The theory and practice of stopping aggression is a difficult and costly role. That was to be one of the functions of the League of Nations. But the League was supposed to combine the intelligence of all nations outside the controversy and to make judgment. The League split repeatedly upon the facts of who was the aggressor. It seems a difficult role for America to undertake alone, and for many reasons. One of them is that warlike acts are the result of long antecedent history of mixed rights and wrongs. Another of our difficulties would be that we are composed of all nationalities, some of whom will be clamoring for their fatherlands on both sides of every single case that come up. It would add sadly to the divisions of an already divided people. We should also become, even more than today, the battleground of every foreign propaganda on earth.

Moreover, the whole theory of stopping aggression is in fact an attempt to maintain the *status quo* in national boundaries all over the world. We need only to look back even one hundred years of history to see how many fights we could get into. In fact, we have been aggressive in our time. Otherwise parts of the Rocky Mountains and California would belong to Mexico today.

We will be told that the job of determining the aggressor is easy because we know today who the world's aggressors are. And we are told we can stop them with more than words and less than war. There is no other nation in the world who would believe that this can be done and keep from provoking war for long. It is certain that the highly realistic democracies in Europe will make no such declarations of national policy.

But over it all is something more important. We cannot become the world's policeman unless we are prepared to sacrifice millions of American lives—and probably some day see the entire world against us. In time they would envisage us as the world's greatest bully, not as the world's greatest idealist.

8. We ought, in coming to conclusions, to recollect our own experience with the Great War. We went into that war for many reasons, including direct war upon American citizens and

ships. Above all, we hoped and believed that we were going to "make the world safe for democracy." It was to be a "war to end war." No one will deny that we failed in these latter hopes. The violence of the peace treaties and the destruction of war created these brutal dictatorships. Many students of European affairs, including those of our former allies, hold that political action by some of our former allies in Europe greatly contributed to the death of the peace loving democracies, such as Germany, which sprang up after the war. Whether this is true or not, it must be obvious that America has not the power to impose a course of action upon the nations of Europe which would end war for the future or would make the world safe for democracy. All European history is a treadmill of readjusting boundaries among mixed populations. It is a treadmill of war for power and mastery. It is certain that we engage ourselves in these age-old controversies the moment we throw our might into European balances of power.

9. We should also examine the question of where we will be after even another world war to save democracy. We should consider what would likely happen to us if we become engaged in another such war, whether we win or lose. I recently stated:

"Our first purpose is to maintain liberty in America. If civilization based on liberty fails in the United States, it is gone from the earth. We must safeguard that, not only in our own interest but in the interest of the world.

"Personal liberty and free economic life are not built for modern war. A great war today is a mobilization of the whole people. That means democracy must temporarily surrender to dictatorship, no matter what one may call it, in order that we may bend our full energies to war.

"It means that our country must be mobilized into practically a Fascist state. It would be so organized. It went some distance in the last great war, although we did not use that term at the time. It would have gone much farther if the war had extended longer.

"I speak of this not from hearsay but as one who participated in the economic organization of the Great War. I saw the rise

of opposition to demobilization of the interests which benefited, and I have seen the attempts to restore these measures ever since.

"Today the lowered vitality of free enterprise, the necessity to subordinate or repudiate our enormous peacetime national debt to make way for finance of a new war, together with the ideas of economic power which impregnate our government, all drive to the improbability of after war demobilization of centralized power.

"If it were that or the loss of our national independence it would not be too great a price. But let us at least recognize that a war to save liberty would probably destroy liberty. In my view, another great war will make dictatorship universal.

"Even if we escaped this result, yet the sacrifice of our sons and the moral and economic destruction are a bitter prospect to contemplate. Surely we learned this from the last war."

These are but a part of the reasons which can be advanced for our keeping neutral on European controversies.

In conclusion, the question of our foreign relationships rises far above partisanship. And those citizens who hold views on either side should not be charged with politics, pacifism, or militarism. We are discussing the sacrifice of life of millions of our sons and we are discussing the lives of women and children. We are discussing the future of our republic and the future of liberty.

What have not been stated yet are sound reasons which at the present time warrant us from departure from our traditional policies. One thing is certain: This nation should be taken into full confidence as to what Washington is doing and proposing. And we will then debate it further.

Beyond all this is an even greater question: What can the United States do within the processes of peace in contribution to peace today?

The world has many staggering problems. One is reduction of the armament which is impoverishing people everywhere and which builds only toward disaster. Another is to secure immunity of women and children from hideous attack by blockade

and from the air. The witness of that might indeed enrage us into war. Another is to secure relief of millions from religious and racial persecution. That persecution, most dreadfully directed against the Jews, results not only in their sufferings but it brutalizes the people of any country where this cry is raised. Another problem is to end the present economic war and secure economic progress for the world. Economic suffering drives nations to exploitation of others and to war.

Is not contribution to solution of these and many other problems a larger purpose for America in the field of foreign relations? There are great things we could do to bring peace and tolerance and prosperity to the world—to add to humanity and to lessen brutality. But that is possible only if we hold to our neutrality. And that question must be settled before we can begin upon constructive processes of peace.

Shall We Send Our Youth to War?

Article in the *American Magazine*

[July 15, 1939]

THE American people are today tense with anxiety lest they be led into another great war. And some of our people seem to be accepting glib talk of war as if it were something more good than evil. Truly many years have already gone by since we ceased to feed boys to the cannon. It seems difficult to believe that only about one third of the living American people are old enough to remember the World War well.

We have urgent need today to recall the realities of modern war. And we have desperate need to take into our national thinking the gigantic yet invisible forces behind war which are again moving in Europe.

I am perhaps one of the few living Americans who had full opportunity to see intimately the moving tragedy of the World War from its beginnings 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. I am perhaps justified in recalling that experience.

Before the War I knew Europe—Russia, Germany, France, Italy, and England—fairly intimately, not as a tourist but as a part of their workaday life.

I was drafted in 1914 to preserve the lives of ten millions of people in Belgium and northern France who had been overrun by the German armies. Here was a service that by common consent was a sort of semiofficial state. It covered not alone

food, but the economic life of these people. It operated within the lines of a hostile army and moved through the blockade of a hostile navy. In that service I moved constantly in and out behind the trenches on both sides of the conflict. I witnessed the misery and backwash from war in their most hideous forms. My duties required that I meet constantly with high military and civil officials in England, Germany, France, and the neutral countries in contact with the invisible forces behind the War.

When America joined in the War I was asked by President Wilson to return to America to become a member of our American War Council and to administer the food supplies of our country and for our Allies.

At the Armistice I was drafted back to Europe to direct activities of the Allied and Associated governments to defeat unparalleled famine and pestilence, to restore economic life among both the victors and the vanquished. In this service I spread an organization of thousands of American men and women over twenty-three nations—many of them boiling with revolution. Our job was not alone the extension of a hand of kindness. Its purpose was to secure order out of which peace could be made. Constant dealing with those many peoples and their officials brought a flood of knowledge of the political, economic, and social currents which sprang from the War.

I did not participate in making the peace. I was daily called upon for advice and information. And I observed its disastrous course. Subsequently, during a period of eight years in Cabinet position I dealt with the troubled seas of unceasing political and economic storms the world over.

As President I dealt unceasingly to bring about reduction of arms, economic readjustment, and peace.

A year ago I spent some months in Europe with unique opportunity to discuss its problems with leaders in fourteen nations.

That is twenty years of opportunity to observe European peoples and their leaders, with all the forces of good and evil

in which they live, and to relate them to our American scene. The searchlight of this experience can well be turned upon some phases of the present scene.

First, let me say something from this experience of what war really is. Those who lived in it, and our American boys who fought in it, dislike recalling its terribleness. We dwell today upon its glories—the courage, the heroism, the greatness of spirit in men. I, myself, should like to forget all else. But today, with the world driving recklessly into it again, there is much we must not forget. Amid the afterglow of glory and legend we forget the filth, the stench, the death, of the trenches. We forget the dumb grief of mothers, wives, and children. We forget the unending blight cast upon the world by the sacrifice of the flower of every race.

I was one of but few civilians who saw something of the Battle of the Somme. In the distant view were the unending trenches filled with a million and a half men. Here and there, like ants, they advanced under the thunder and belching volcanoes of 10,000 guns. Their lives were thrown away until half a million had died. Passing close by were unending lines of men plodding along the right side of the road to the front, not with drums and bands, but with saddened resignation. Down the left side came the unending lines of wounded men, staggering among unending stretchers and ambulances. Do you think one can forget that? And it was but one battle of a hundred.

Ten million men died or were maimed for life in that war. There were millions who died unknown and unmarked. Yet there are miles of unending crosses in a thousand cemeteries. The great monument to the dead at Ypres carries the names of 150,000 Englishmen who died on but a small segment of the front. Theirs was an inspiring heroism for all time. But how much greater a world it would be today if that heroism and that character could have lived.

And there was another side no less dreadful. I hesitate to recall even to my own mind the nightmares of roads filled for long miles with old men, young women, and little children dropping of fatigue and hunger as they fled in terror from

burning villages and oncoming armies. And over Europe these were not just a few thousands, but over the long years that scene was enacted in millions.

And there was the ruthless killing of civilians, executed by firing squads who justified their acts, not by processes of justice, but on mere suspicion of transgression of the laws of war. Still worse was the killing of men, women, and even children to project terror and cringing submission. To the winds went every sense of justice. To the winds went every sense of decency. To the winds went every sense of tolerance. To the winds went every sense of mercy. The purpose of every army is to win. They are not put together for afternoon teas. They are not made up to bring good cheer or justice or tolerance. They are made up of men sent out to kill or be killed. Whatever the theory, the act that wins is justified in war.

And there were the terrors of the air. In a score of air raids I saw the terror of women and children flocking to the cellars, frantically, to escape from an unseen enemy.

In another even more dreadful sense I saw inhuman policies of war. That was the determination on both sides to bring subjection by starvation. The food blockade by the Allied Governments on the one side, and the ruthless submarine warfare by the Central Powers on the other, had this as its major purpose. Both sides professed that it was not their purpose to starve women and children. But it is an idiot who thinks soldiers ever starve. It was women and children who died of starvation. It was they who died of the disease which came from short food supplies, not in hundreds of thousands, but in millions.

And after the Armistice came famine and pestilence, in which millions perished and other millions grew up stunted in mind and body. That is war. Let us not forget.

We were actually at the front in this war for only a few months, but it cost us the lives of 130,000 men. It has placed 470,000 persons on the national pension list already. It has cost us 40 billions of dollars. And that represents more than just dollars. Today we have a quarter to a third of the American people below a decent standard of living. If that 40 billions

of wealth had remained in America, these people would not be in this plight. A large segment of our people has already been impoverished for a quarter of a century. And the end is not yet.

We may need to go to war again. But that war should be on this hemisphere alone and in the defense of our firesides or our honor. For that alone should we pay the price.

The endless books tell us how the Great War originated. They do not agree. But some salient facts do stand out that are pertinent today. It began by a quarrel between three dictators— the Czar of Russia and the emperors of Germany and Austria. They were competing for "power." France, a democracy, was dragged in because, out of fear of the dictators of Germany and Austria, she, a democracy, had made a military alliance with the Czar. The British democracy was drawn in partly out of idealism to defend liberty, but also partly to save its trade and its possessions from too great a concentration of "power" on the Continent. We finally joined in the war wholly out of idealism.

I dodge no responsibility. I reluctantly joined in the almost unanimous view of our countrymen that America must go into that war. We had been directly attacked. But, more important, I believed we could bring the endless slaughter to an end. I believed that with our singleness of purpose we could impose an enlightened peace, that we could make it a war to end war. I believed we could make the world safe for the spread of human liberty. If experience has any value to nations, there are in the wrecking of these hopes a thousand reasons why we should never attempt it again.

When President Wilson arrived in Paris, the common people of the world were praying for a real peace. There were good men there, and there were high aspirations. But there were also concentrated there the invisible forces of age-old hate and greed. Mr. Wilson met a determination to crush the enemy in a Carthaginian peace. He met the sinister demands for power. He met a greed for possession of world resources. Above all, he met with the pressures of populations and the unsolvable problems of European boundaries and economic life. He worked valiantly to combat the evil forces. He spread

American idealism at the peace table. He argued and cried out for reason and justice—not because he felt the enemy was guiltless, but because he felt that mankind must turn its face to the future and its back on the past. When Germans blame him, little do they know what Germany would have looked like had it not been for Woodrow Wilson.

To Mr. Wilson I criticized bitterly the provisions of the peace treaties before they were signed. I felt that instead of healing the wounds of the world they would spread disaster over a generation. I have before me a memorandum that I gave to Mr. Wilson two months before the treaties were signed, urging their lack of vision and the dangers to America. He won some victories for sanity. He helped some nations to freedom. He hoped that, with time for hate and avarice to cool, the League of Nations could reconstruct the failures of the treaty.

Americans will yet be proud of that American who fought a fight for righteousness although he partially lost. But he proved that American idealism and American ignorance of the invisible forces in Europe can only confuse the grim necessities of European peace.

What is happening today? Europe is suffering repeated earthquake shocks from the fault of the Treaty of Versailles.

But, beyond all this which is obvious, something else is moving. Europe is again engaged in a hideous conflict for power. Stripped to its bones, today the quarrel is much the same. Dictators in Germany and Italy rise to power on opposition to Communism, launched into their peoples by the Dictator of Russia. Again the dictators are in conflict for power. Again France, a democracy, ties herself to the dictatorship in Russia. England becomes endangered should the dictators of Germany and Italy overwhelm France. And thus again begins this dreadful treadmill.

What is proposed? That we join to stop inevitable movements and readjustments of peoples; that we engage in ideological wars. Who will pay for it in blood and treasure? Our children.

In Europe they constantly use the word "power" in a con-

notation that is strange to many Americans. That is the "power" of peoples and over peoples. This "power" may be a political authority held in a man. It may be the "power" of a nation, the "power" of alliances, or the balance of "power." And they speak daily of international "power" politics. They often speak of it in terms of a game. They play power politics as sheer necessity for national defense, and they play it for national aggression.

The players change and the forces in the game shift constantly. It is a game of delicate moves. It is not a game of open covenants openly arrived at. Nor is the self-determination of nations one of the rules. Those who play with power politics, like those who play with matches, always deny that they intend to set the conflagration of war. Their moves are based not alone on bluff but on guns. When we take sides in their controversies, when we talk of using force of any kind, we are playing power politics at the European chess table.

I do not believe we should sit in that game, either in their interest or ours. Our idealism and our uncertainties of policy only befuddle the movements of expediency and delicate adjustments in which they are compelled to live. And our stakes are the lives of millions of sons of America. The stakes are another twenty-five years of hideous national impoverishment. The stakes are the progress of all mankind for half a century. The stakes may be the sinking of intellectual and spiritual liberty for a century to come.

The time may come when we could arbitrate the quarrels which arise in that game at some point before shooting begins. But if we sit in the game we shall never be arbitrator and we may be drawn into the shooting.

And let me inject that Europe plays power politics against us. There is the instance of the European war debts to us. Part of the debt was for supplies and cash to carry on the war. From one third to one half of that debt, however, was material and money we supplied after the Armistice to aid in reconstruction. At that time the war was won. We had no need in our own interest to loan another dollar. We settled the debts for much

less than the full sum. The whole, including the reconstruction advances, has been repudiated.

The repudiation has a double sting, for over years following the Balfour note the Allies publicly and repeatedly informed the former enemies that the reason they exacted reparations and indemnities from the enemy was because they had to pay it over to the Shylock of the Western World. They stated they would reduce the indemnities by whatever the United States, in turn, would cancel to them. By such power politics they consolidated Central Europe into their propaganda and pressure to cancel the debts. Moreover, their propaganda told us, and a host of Americans reechoed, that they could not pay because they could not transfer money in such great quantities from one nation to another. That is true in a depression, but let me recall that these very nations today have shipped 4 billions of money to this country for investment since they repudiated their debts.

I have no desire to recall these incidents. My purpose is to stir up reason among the American people against doing it again.

The dangers of our being dragged into war lie in these directions:

1. Foreign propaganda to inflame our emotions and to mold our minds to war.
2. Preachments of our own mistaken officials and citizens which, in effect, support these propagandas.
3. Steps taken by our own government, which, while denying that they are intended to take us into war, yet entangle us with these very controversies, the end of which may be war.

If deliberate attack were made upon women and children, which modern airplanes and modern food blockade make possible, our indignation might not be restrained from action. Remember the part indignation over Belgium played in our entry into the last war.

And here we can examine one of the methods of power politics. That is propaganda. During the World War, propaganda was first developed into a national weapon no less potent

than killing men. When peoples and governments believe that independence or their national survival or their possessions are at stake, they instantly justify untruth and lies as a part of national policies. When they weigh the sacrifice of their sons, then truth, honesty, tolerance, and justice are thrown to the winds if a lie will serve better.

The Great War was the first time in history when all the powerful agencies of publicity and manipulation of news were organized without moral restraint under the genius of skilled men. There were built up a skill and a technique in front of which every citizen was helpless to know the truth. And since that time the radio has become an additional weapon.

We, ourselves, when we entered the war imitated the others. We created great propaganda agencies. The managers of them have since confessed frankly that they distorted fact and created news without truth. They built hate as well as altruism as a necessary emotional foundation of modern war. And no man dared question or answer under this fierce organized condemnation.

Propaganda has three directions: internal, to mobilize emotions, external, to influence neutral nations, and aggressive, to influence the enemy.

From the beginning of the Great War I saw the development of the propaganda directed at the United States from both sides. I was so impressed that I collected this material for years. The War Library at Stanford University holds stack after stack of this emanation from every government at war. And, in the light of what we now know really happened, it comprises the greatest collection of part lies on the face of the earth. It ought to be studied.

There are certain types of propaganda in motion today which fertilize our soil for our entry into war. For instance, one of these volleys of propaganda asserts that a great war in Europe is inevitable. That is a half-truth. The setup in Europe has made a general war inevitable every hundred years since the Romans kept the peace. And until mankind makes much greater progress it will continue to be inevitable. But the pounding in

of that phrase is either sensational journalistic speculation or European propaganda of the preparatory type.

We are told that we must join in war or democracy will disappear from the earth. From the alliance of the democracies with several totalitarian states that ideological issue seems somewhat confused.

My sympathies are with the democracies. But the democracies of Western Europe have the resources to defend themselves. They comprise great empires of hundreds of millions of people with all the resources needed to secure their defense. Whether they preserve their democracies is a question of their own will.

We are told that if they fall we shall be the next victim. I do not agree that they will fall. But if they do fall the exhaustion of the dictators will be such that these countries will leave us alone for a quarter of a century at least.

It is dinned into our ears that we shall inevitably be drawn into this inevitable war whether we like it or not. That just simply depends upon our own will to keep out.

And propaganda showers upon us in other forms. I have for the past few months checked back on headline stories from Europe which have subsequently proved untrue. There are twenty such stories on the list. That is not the fault of our news service. These stories usually start as "information from a responsible source." That means a foreign government official. But they leave a trail of fear, of hate and prejudice, and help to condition our minds for war.

One of the curious happenings of these days is that our newspapers print more alarming war news than the European press.

And another form of war conditioning of the public mind is the firing of words by our government officials at the nations we don't like. So long as we confine it to words, the dictators will fire back an equally insulting lot of words, and we wind up even. Soapbox oratory is the necessary equipment of modern dictators, and they excel. Only the really neutral nations could judge as to who wins in these jousts of billingsgate. But they build up hateful emotions both ways.

And that does not imply that we should ever neglect to express indignation at great wrong. But the terms we use are important if it is results we seek and not propaganda.

The second danger of war comes from the policies of our own government. President Roosevelt has taken a seat at the table where power politics is being played. He has joined in the chessboard of Europe. He lines us up in the balance of power. It is said we can do this without joining in war.

It is said we will do something more than words and less than war. When we open fire on the front we are in the fight. The enemy will fire back with more than words. If the more than words fail to overcome him we have to go farther. For then we have to win or be overcome on our side. Let nobody say that you can do such things without danger of war itself.

If the dictators believe we will stop short of war they will credit us with having small chips in this game. Their chips are soldiers and guns. If our partners believe our chips of more than words and less than war are valuable, it is because they believe that when we have exhausted these chips we will put our soldiers and guns into the game and they will edge us in.

And right before our eyes the game shifts. We were originally going to quarantine dictators and again save democracy. Today we have two or three dictators on our team. We have had to drop the "democracy front" and "dictators" and talk of "aggressors." That only indicates how rapidly we can move from sheer idealism into combat.

We may think we can take part in controversies and quarrels in Europe without going to war. We may think our strong will to keep out permits us to start down this road and stop when it looks as though we are being involved in war. But, when we get to that point, our will to stay out is not only weakened, but our angers and hates are aroused to a point where our will to stay out no longer has any control.

Today the European anti axis press is confident we intend to join in their wars if they come. If they are rudely awakened, their peoples will hate us for a generation. And they will deluge us with cries of cowardice by way of further propaganda.

Space prevents adequate discussion of another phase of this situation. The whole totalitarian structure upon which these aggressive dictators are supported is weakening. That is equally true for the Communists, the Fascists, and the National Socialists. Their concept of brutal intolerance, of suppression of every right of free men, is raising its own opposition within them. Peoples who have known liberty will yet regain it for themselves. The vicious persecutions of Jews and other religious groups have raised the hate of the world. Their economic systems are failing to produce the standards of living they have promised. It is a sad thing that we in America have to endure the propaganda of the Communists trying to get us into war, and of the Bund trying to implant Nazism in the United States. We endure it only because we hold to free speech. And both of them take advantage of our tolerance to tear down our liberties.

And what profit it if, by our joining in war to extinguish these systems, we also lose our own American life? It is not alone the price of war we lose. But we can never go through another great war without becoming a totalitarian state in order to fight effectively such a war. When we have finished we shall not have established peace in the world. We shall have sacrificed liberty for generations in the United States.

America can be of service to the world. We can hold up the standards of decency in the world.

We should hold that basis of international relations should not be force, but should be law and free agreement.

The greatest immediate service that we can render is to join in economic co-operation with other nations to relieve the economic pressures which are driving the world constantly to instability. A great part of these pressures for war are economic. The greatest healing force that could come to the world is prosperity. There is a vast field for American action which is free from political entanglements. We should resume the conferences which were started under such good auspices by our country in 1932.

But, far beyond that, we can hold the light of liberty alight

on this continent. That is the greatest service we can give to civilization.

We as a people can keep out of war in Europe if we have the resolute will to do so. Our will can be weakened by propaganda. It can be insidiously undermined by sitting in the game of European power politics.

We hear much of laws that will preserve our neutrality. But the question is not legalisms. It is our will to stay out. Staying out is a matter of tactics and strategy almost as difficult as the strategy and tactics of war. And, if there is not the adamant will to stay out, no amount of law can keep us out. The first thing required is a vigorous, definite statement from all who have responsibility, both publicly and privately, that we are not going to war with anybody in Europe unless they attack the Western Hemisphere. The second thing is not to sit in this game of power politics.

These are the American policies that will make sure that we do not send our youth to Europe for war.

A New Proposal for American Action

*Address delivered to
International Convention of Christian Endeavor Societies*

CLEVELAND, OHIO
[July 6, 1939]

LAST night I spoke on the *American Magazine* hour against sending our youth to war in foreign countries again. I stated, however, that America can be of service to peace and humanity. Among other things I suggested that we can build up the standards of decency in the world. We can take action which will lessen both the causes and the barbarities of war. We can do it without involving ourselves in foreign wars. I shall make a concrete proposal for such constructive action tonight.

You represent the youth of many nations. And you are profoundly interested in peace. You are profoundly interested in the growth of humane spirit in this world. And if war should come you are interested in all possible protection of humanity in that war.

Last night I referred to the suffering of women and children in the Great War. I know. For years it was my sole occupation to care for the homeless, the foodless, the frightened, and the helpless. I have witnessed their sufferings in twenty nations. And when one speaks to me of war, I do not see the glorious parade of troops marching to the tunes of gay music. I do not think of great statesmen planning and worrying in their chancelleries. Nor do I think of those dazzling chambers where the peacemakers of the world meet to settle the affairs of mankind.

I see the faces of hungry, despaired, and terrorized women and children. These are the real victims of modern war.

The violence of war is year by year falling more and more horribly upon the civilian populations. Starvation by blockade and killing from the air has become weapons of attack in modern war. At least they have become methods of reprisals. Put bluntly that means wholesale killing of women and children.

THE FOOD BLOCKADE

Industrial civilization has increased the numbers of people in many countries far beyond their domestic food supplies. They must import food from overseas.

In the last war both sides struggled to bring victory by starvation of the whole enemy people. The food blockade by the Allied Governments on one side and the ruthless submarine warfare by the Central Powers on the other had starvation as a purpose. In the last war both sides professed that it was not their purpose to starve women and children.

But it is only hypocrisy to say that the blockade is directed to starvation of soldiers, munitions workers, or government officials. They levy a first call on all food. It is only the deluded who think that these ever starve. Armies and munitions workers were not short of food in blockaded Germany in the last war. All over Europe it was the women and children who, weakened from scanty food supplies, died not in hundreds of thousands but in millions. It was the children who grew up stunted in mind and body. Who can say that the confusion in Europe today is not partly the result of the horrible lives of the children of those years?

DEATH FROM THE AIR

And in equally dreadful sense I saw a newer method of war develop. The bombing of civilian populations from the air first appeared as a part of war strategy during the Great War. The bombing plane was then scarcely developed. It was a weakling

when the Germans used it against British and French cities. But even then I have seen with my own eyes a score of air raids where terrorized women and children knocked to cellars uselessly and frantically to escape a rain of explosives.

No country then possessed great numbers of these planes built purposely for bombing. Today each nation numbers its fleet in thousands. And today each plane will carry ten times the death dealing explosives. In terror every European nation is equipping everybody, even the babies, with gas masks. Every country is preparing to evacuate women and children from the cities. One of the dreads of Europe today is that these great fleets of planes will be used to destroy whole cities.

Again it is hypocrisy to say that the sole purpose of bombing planes is to destroy soldiers, communications, and munitions works. That is not the full intention. The purpose is terror and weakening of the morale of the civil population. That means the killing of women, children. The experience in China and Spain in the last two years only confirms our worst fears.

THE STRATEGY OF MODERN WAR

The ancient chivalry for the protection of women and children has departed in the violence of the times. But why these pressures and terrors against women and children?

To break down the morale and resistance of the civil population at home has become a part of the methods of war. There was a time when wars were carried on exclusively by soldiers and sailors. The civil populations went about their routine daily tasks.

Today war is a battle of whole peoples. They must be mobilized to the last atom of their economic and emotional strength. All fit young men and boys are conscripted and thrust into the battlefields. The pressure on their women and children by the enemy is supposed to react upon the conscripts at the front. It is supposed to weaken their courage and the resolution of these huge armies. Or it is presumed to make the enemy people supplicate its own government for peace.

THE MENACE OF INCREASING ARMAMENT

Whether the intention is deliberate direct attack or only a threat of reprisals, this fear for their women and children is one of the driving forces of increased armament by every nation.

One impelling reason for increasing naval fleets given by every country in Europe and Asia is not only to blockade the enemy's food but to keep open the lanes of their own food supplies. Up to the last war the strength in the starvation battle rested with the country which possessed the battleships. But during that war the German submarines demonstrated a capacity to destroy the food supplies destined to England and France, even against their superior fleets. It brought British and French food supplies into extreme jeopardy. Since then the submarine has been greatly improved and its numbers vastly increased.

One of the impelling reasons for unceasing building of bombing planes is to prepare reprisals for blockade starving of women and children or reprisals for air attacks.

This killing of women and children haunts every council table and affects every move of power politics. It drives not alone to armaments. It drives to more and more military alliances that breed war.

Until this menace of killing women and children by food blockade and from the air is removed, there will be little relief from increasing navies and air fleets. There will be little decrease in the fear that is driving the world to its own destruction.

The standard of living, the comfort of all men is today being steadily lowered by this race of armaments. It is the backs of the men and women who toil that carry this load of war preparedness during peace. It is nonsense to say this is paid for by the rich. The pay comes from the productivity of the people. It is breaking the backs of nations today.

And the United States builds correspondingly to meet the menace of these swelling navies and air fleets.

OBJECTIONS TO LIMITATION OF WAR METHODS

Surely the time has come when men should renounce the starvation and massacre of women and children as methods of war.

I am well aware that any protest or any proposal to limit these horrors in future wars will be decried by the militarists as futile. They will say that the world has tried to do this sort of thing and failed. Civilian authorities in these desperate times may decry it as impractical. It will be said that war is itself immoral and to suggest moral restraint in conducting war is a hopeless contradiction.

Even if nations subscribe to it in peace it will be said there can be no dependable enforcement after war begins. Long reasons will be adduced to support its unenforceability. It will be said that in modern war national existence is at stake. National institutions will be destroyed by the inevitable revolutions that follow to the defeated country. Long years of indemnities and oppression are the penalty of defeat to the vanquished. Therefore, it will be said that despite any agreement to protect women and children, every nation when once engaged in war will justify every weapon as a part of its defense, no matter what their humanitarian agreements may be. I shall comment upon some teeth that could be put into enforcement in a moment.

The old fallacy will be produced that the prospect of war becoming more terrible frightens nations into keeping the peace. But the fact is nations go to war out of desperation at these very threats. The fear of frightfulness does not make for peace. It creates fear, hate, and desperation which drive nations to war. The prospect of killing of women and children makes war more likely.

Another old fallacy will be produced. That is, the more terrible war is, the quicker the sickened nations will make peace. But war has become more terrible every year since the invention

of gunpowder. Every half century has seen more and more men sacrificed on the battlefield. It has seen more and more women and children sacrificed at home. Human courage rises far above any terror yet invented.

This same fallacy pretends that putting the screws on the civil population gets war over quicker. Such a policy is thus said to be more humane. The last war proved that starvation and bombing only sharpened hate and hardened resolution to continue.

Even supposing all these arguments are true, are we to accept defeat of international decency? Are we not to try every method, explore every channel that might allay these causes of war and armament and that might lead to protection of the lives and minds of innocent women and children? Must we accept such a collapse of western civilization? Must we accept the despair of return to barbarism?

A PROPOSAL

I am going to risk a proposal that might end the worst of it. My proposal is that all nations who are willing to do so should enter an agreement:

1. That vessels laden solely with food supplies should be placed upon the same basis of immunity as hospital ships. They should go freely. Blockade should not apply to them. There should be no attack upon their passage by either warships or submarines.

2. That there shall be no bombing of civil populations and no bombing anywhere except in the field of actual fighting men on land or sea, and at works devoted strictly to munitions.

Nations who are not willing to enter such obligation will have at least declared their shameful devotion to barbarism. They will be proved outcasts from civilization.

There is humanity in the peoples of all combatant nationalities. Their own public opinion is shocked by barbarities. That is evidenced by the fact that all statesmen in the last war sought to justify such acts to their people as reprisals for the barbarities

of the enemy. And through all discussion of preparedness today they find justification in their fears of this frightfulness against themselves.

ENFORCEMENT

Now for the moral teeth that I propose for enforcement. That is the definite participation of neutrals of the world in protection against these barbarities. As a part of such agreement the neutral nations should become the referees announcing in authoritative way any fouls that take place.

To effect this, such agreement should provide further:

3. That the shipment of food supplies in war to any blockaded nation may be in full cargoes under the management and jurisdiction of a commission of the neutral nations.

4. That neutral observers should be continuously in session within every belligerent country to determine the facts of any killing of civilians from the air.

The whole of this enforcement by neutrals must be based upon moral forces and not on military force or entanglement in the controversy. Should any belligerent be convicted of deliberate violations, then neutrals should withdraw. Awful as it may be, no doubt the hells of reprisals from the injured side would then be turned loose.

The real teeth behind this enforcement are public opinion among neutrals. That is one of the most potent forces in modern war. If it be pointed up by definite conviction beyond all the whitewashing of propaganda it can be far-reaching in its consequences.

In the strategy of modern war one of the utmost anxieties of both sides is to hold the good will of neutrals. Or at least to prevent their indignation forcing them to aid or to join the enemy. The ill will of neutrals or their citizens at once induces informal boycotts of credit and supplies even do they go no further. To influence neutral public opinion in the last war every combatant spent millions in gigantic propaganda. And they are spending it again today.

Public opinion in neutral nations does not react much to the

legalistic question of whether cotton is contraband or no contraband. It does not react much to imperial ambitions of combatants. It does not react much to specious circumventions of such instruments as the Kellogg Pact. But it does react to the horror of killing women and children.

It is asserted that public opinion of neutrals had no effect in the last war. Contrary to that, when the final verdict of history is given, it will be found that the losers lost not by lack of valor or courage. They lost not by lack of efficiency or even from starvation. They lost by failure to heed the public opinion of what were originally neutral nations. Had the American sense of humanities not been outraged over years, there is little likelihood that we would have joined in that war. And with us half a dozen hitherto neutral nations joined also. The emotional reaction of the American people upon a conviction of wholesale killing of women and children in another great war would come nearer to driving our people to intervention than all the other arguments in the world.

If this moral standard of protection to women and children were once erected in the world the violators could confidently expect that the indignation of neutrals would bring them to disaster.

SOME EXPERIENCE

Incidentally, on Armistice Day in 1929, I made the part of this proposal relating to the immunity of food ships. It was approved by the leaders in a score of nations. Those nations who did not regard it with favor thought it one-sided. But they now find themselves hideously menaced from the air. The double proposal should now commend itself to those who then thought it one-sided.

In 1932 I proposed to the World Conference on Land Disarmament a limitation on the use of bombing planes which was accepted by the representatives of many nations. I did not then propose enforcement through organized neutral action as I now do.

To those who doubt the practicability of the idea of ships

moving through blockades, I may point out that the Belgian Relief Commission delivered more than 2000 full cargoes of food through two rings of blockade. It was done by international agreement under neutral management operating continuously for more than 4 years. It proved that this could be done.

Moreover, the conventions as to the Red Cross were fairly well held to in the civilized countries during 1914 to 1919. The agreements as to protection of prisoners were also fairly well held. At least some agreements to mitigate barbarity have been kept in war. These growths away from barbarism lend hope for further progress toward protection to women and children.

If we wish to lower our vision from the transcendent questions of humanity involved, we can find an impelling interest to neutrals in these proposals.

In the last war the blockade initially reduced demand and every farmer in the world suffered. Then as the long lanes of food from the Southern Hemisphere could not be used because of diminished shipping and the submarine, the demand was concentrated on North America. And the farmers of the Southern Hemisphere went bankrupt during the war. Perhaps someone thinks our farmer benefited. He did not. He has for years and is today still suffering from the expansion of sub marginal lands and the inflation of land values due to the high prices of the war.

CONCLUSION

Today's is perhaps a poor atmosphere to make any proposal to mitigate the barbarities of war. So many are desperate with fear, so many have learned to hate. So much hatred and fear are being stimulated by the artifices of propaganda.

It is true the processes which lessened the causes of war and made for peace have been greatly weakened. It is a tragic fact that in 6 years the treaties limiting the navies have been abandoned. The hopeful negotiations to limit land arms have died away. Encouraging international action by the world conference to restore the prosperity of the world was suppressed.

Nations have lawlessly violated their pledges never to use war as an instrument of national policies. Every large nation is arming to the teeth. The standards of living all over the world are being lowered to pay for increasing arms. Fear is rampant. The only methods of peace today seem to be military alliances, threats of force, and delicate balances of armed power.

All this may seem discouraging. But there are times when lifting again the banner of moral standards are essential. For unless it is raised there will be no morals. Because hate and violence have arisen in men is no excuse that we shall forsake reason and humanity.

For America to voice these ideas on behalf of women and children requires no use of force. It needs no military alliances, no leagues, and no sanctions. It requires no power politics. But that voice when raised on behalf of humanity can be a most potent force in the world today.

We possess a great moral power, and we should use it to save mankind from the barbarities of war. Thereby we shall promote peace. In this we shall be right at all times.

We Must Keep Out

Article in *the Saturday Evening Post*

[October 27, 1939]

THE American people will be confronted with the issue of war or peace as long as this war in Europe lasts. That is the most fateful issue that can come to a people. Each generation faces new issues, new problems, and seeks new solutions. But the invisible forces which make war, peace, and revolution are old, and they repeat. And to make sound progress nations, like individuals, must test their solutions with the stern and often inhibiting measure of human experience. And like individuals, the memories of nations are sometimes short.

I spent nearly a score of years from the outbreak of the Great War in 1914, dealing with these forces, and I may sum my conclusions at once: America must keep out of these wars. It can keep out of these wars. It has nothing to fear for our own independence from the result of these wars. This is no case of "hope" that we may stay out of war; it is the time for will and inflexible resolution to stay out. Our greatest service is a strong America to aid the rebuilding of a European world which will be tottering no matter who the victors in this war may be. Our greatest service to civilization is to put our own house in order and maintain true liberty upon this continent. For it may be that otherwise liberty will sink for centuries in the night of despair.

War and peace are not cold mathematical problems. Our decisions will be determined by our emotions as well as our reason. Today we have two dominant attitudes. We are against

joining in the European and Asiatic wars. That attitude is the dominance of reason. We are incensed at the dictatorships, their ideologies, and their aggressions. We sympathize with Great Britain, France, and Poland. Our danger is that our indignation will displace our reason.

WHAT MAKES WAR IN EUROPE

First, let us examine the invisible forces which drive the fates in Europe.

To many American eyes Europe consists of magnificent cities, historic cathedrals, art, music, literature, great universities, monuments of human heroism and progress. It possesses peoples of fine hospitality, of the widest cultivation and attainments. For four centuries since the Renaissance men in Europe have fought and died to build the structure of personal liberty, to lift the dignity of men, to bring security and peace. And from every country—England, Germany, France, Russia, and all the others—we have received magnificent inheritances of human thought upon which our civilization has built.

But Americans too often see little of the gigantic but invisible forces of disintegration that so often dominate these peoples. Here are 26 races of 400,000,000 people, outside of Russia, living cheek by jowl in an area two-thirds the size of the United States. Through them surge the forces of nationalism, of imperialism, of age-old hates, memories of deep wrongs, fierce distrusts, and impellent fears. There are the conflicts of religions and persecution. Long before the World War these forces were in added ferment because of new ideas from the industrial revolution. There is here a hell's brew of malign spirits.

And these spirits find tangible expression in the rivalry of economic development, the setting up of barriers of trade, the struggles for political independence, the pressures of population, the grabs and quarrels over vast areas of the earth for colonization and for exploitation. These all add to the centrifugal forces.

The existence of great areas of mixed populations makes exact boundaries between nations almost hopeless. In every one of these zones some races are separated from their fatherland. On both sides the existing governments unceasingly seek to impose their national language and customs upon these minorities. The outcries of these oppressed to the sympathies of their racial brothers across the borders are unceasing stimulants to friction. And these boundaries shift from every war and the conflicts flame up in new areas.

To all this must be added the destruction of the last war and the loosening of moral restraints.

And periodically there boils up among these peoples some Pied Piper with silver tongue calling some new Utopia, or some man on horseback calls followers to wars of aggression. History, even since the foundation of our Republic, has been a succession of Napoleons, Kaiser Wilhelms, Lenins, Stalins, and Hitlers.

Resistant against all these furies are the benign forces of human liberty, of religion, of education, and of morals which have fought these evils over centuries. And among these peoples are great leaders of thought and of men, whose aspirations and whose life services have been given to allay these evils and to build up hope and faith and peace.

Yet, with a vicious rhythm, these malign forces seem to concentrate at some spot and drive peoples, like the Gadarene swine, over the precipice of war.

During the whole of our relations with them, Europe has had only intervals of unstable peace. It has lived always on a war footing. Its periods of peace have been a groping for a balance of power through groups and alliances based upon fear and upon arms.

The job of European statesmen of good will is to engage incessantly in power politics, by which aggression is checked and the malign forces allayed, in order that tenuous peace can be extended a little longer. It is a delicate job in which loyalties to agreement by any of them constantly give way to expediencies and self-preservation.

As the years have gone on, with the growth of economic interdependence, of communications between nations, of power in weapons, the entire world has been affected more and more by these wars in Europe and their destructions. The interest and sympathies of nations 5000 miles away are enlisted. Our own people suffer in unemployment and misery from this world dislocation. The effect of European wars upon early American life was but a faint echo of the thunderous blows we receive today.

We, therefore, are increasingly sensitive to every force that moves Europe, for good or evil. And we have our opinions about these forces. But being 3000 miles away, unable to appraise their movements in half a billion people, with our own form of government based upon slow moving public opinion, idealistic in its approach and impossible of continuity in foreign policy, with racially divided emotions, we are wholly unequipped to take part in the hourly shifting power politics.

The voice of experience calls out sternly that we cannot solve the problems of, or keep the peace in, Europe.

THE PERIOD BEFORE WE CAME INTO THE WORLD WAR

We have had over a century and a half of constant repercussions from these forces. But 22 years ago, for the first time, we joined in their wars. However, that was not the first cry from Europe that we should join to save civilization. Students of history will find much of interest in the propaganda that America should join to save the French Revolution and, later, that we should save the world from Napoleon—and it created bitter dissension in our country.

Be that as it may, our next really dangerous experience was 1914. During the three years of the Great War before we joined in it, two violent forces poured upon us. The first was the call and the propaganda that we must join to save civilization. The second was the economic impacts. And despite the dangers, we did little in military preparedness to secure respect from nations at war.

PROPAGANDA

In the World War the good opinion of neutrals for the first time loomed up as a vital factor in victory. If they were friendly, even though neutral, they could facilitate supplies and credit. If neutrals were unfriendly, they could be embarrassing, even if neutral. Of far more importance was to persuade neutral states to join in the war on one side or the other.

The old-fashioned processes of persuasion rapidly developed into a new science of propaganda. And it was of threefold purpose: to inflame hate for the enemy; to secure favor to one's self among neutrals; and to discourage the enemy people. And propaganda became a weapon no less potent than tanks, guns, and men.

All people in war are convinced that they are fighting for their firesides and their independence. Their boys are being sacrificed in hourly holocausts. Under these racks people unhesitatingly justify immoral use of words and lies. War sanctifies killing of men. It sanctifies the killing of truth. Truth, justice, tolerance are thrown to the winds when a mere lie promises to save a life or gain an advantage.

The major fact is that, in this period before we entered the Great War, propaganda was organized without moral restraint and was poured upon us with all the genius of war strategy. And do not let us be smug accusers. We did it ourselves the moment we entered the Great War.

For 3 years I saw the pernicious technique of propaganda develop. Almost every month, in directing the works of the Belgian Commission, I crossed the lines to the capitals of all the major nations at war to deal with their leading officials. On both sides I witnessed the incidents of war, while dealing with its backwash and its thousand tragedies and miseries.

Armies are not pink teas. Dreadful things were done to civilians. But daily I read of atrocities on both sides that, to my knowledge, were sheer inventions. They were invented by the thousand to create hate. I read of bloody revolutions in

the streets of the enemy over which I had peacefully passed at the very time. I read all these things and a thousand others constantly reflected to the American press. I read false incidents and false news of cunning design to build up hate, malice, and dissension in America from all sides.

Every nation at war clamps down strict censorship. It is not alone censorship to prevent leaks of military information. One great object of censorship today is to control the news and create propaganda. There is not a dispatch out of Europe that is not tainted by half-truth or untruth. And it is not the fault of our correspondents, under the conditions imposed upon them they do the best they can.

In the World War we were called upon hourly by the democracies to witness the wickedness of despots. They would overwhelm the world with their savagery. We would be the next victim. Liberty could live only if we joined in the struggle. We were told by the Central Powers that it was a war to destroy their trade and competition, to rob them of colonies and foreign possessions.

That we joined in the Great War because of propaganda, no man will say. But we can say that the public mind was conditioned to high indignation at any incident, no matter how minor or how defensible. How quickly the public mind can shift is shown by the fact that 6 months before we went into the war we elected a President on the cry, "He kept us out of war."

One effect of propaganda and the events of war were to focus our whole emotions and our thoughts upon the incidents and the peoples at war. We lost sight of our own country. Fascinated by this fight in the ring, we forgot our family at home. Our sense of right and wrong in those quarrels became our dominant discussion. When we concluded as to who was wicked, it was but one step to the feeling that somehow, someway, we had a duty to see right triumph among our neighbors. And we went out "to lick the Kaiser."

The major purpose of propaganda is to build up hate. Hate is the most potent of war emotions. It is the most malign of

all human emotions. With a little urging of hate we can be made to forget even the fine inheritances of our own civilization. We can be made to forget Goethe, Schiller, Beethoven, Luther, or Roding, Voltaire, Pasteur, or Tolstoy, or Dante, Michelangelo, Verdi, and Cavour, and a thousand others. Do these hates make an inheritance for our children?

ECONOMIC IMPACTS

And the voice of experience from the economic disruption of the last war has advice for today. Prior to our joining the war the demand for supplies and munitions created riot in our economic system. We expanded our farms and our factories; we speculated madly in goods and stocks; we advanced prices. We loaned money recklessly to warring nations, which would never have been repaid, even had we not gone into the war. We utterly disregarded the inevitable impoverishment of the world after war, and its certain demoralization, whether we joined or not. We had built for ourselves a castle of economic cards that would have collapsed had we stayed out.

Some of this cannot be prevented in the situation today, but the voice of experience says right here and now:

We should not expand our equipment beyond that which we can later employ for peace purposes. We should not sell to belligerents on credit. Our industries should seek their workmen from the already unemployed and not draw men away from their steady jobs into war industries that will shrink and displace these men from their livelihood at the end of the war. Our business world should be content that increased volume will bring increased profits, and should, for the sake of its own soul and its future, not raise prices except insofar as abnormal increases in wages or raw material necessitate. We should remember that profits and stock prices will collapse in the general impoverishment of the world when it is all over.

Here is a case for voluntary action, for business statesmanship. These results cannot be secured by government without making us a Fascist state.

PREPAREDNESS

The period before we came into the Great War was marked by our unwillingness to build an adequate Army and Navy. Had we built much more strongly, we would have gained a respect that might have saved us from attack by Germany. The voice of experience says that governments at war get contemptuous of unarmed neutrals.

THE WAR

We finally joined in the last European war. We did it because some of our citizens were attacked on the high seas by the dictator of that time. But the dominant impulse was idealism to protect liberty in the world and bring the end of wars to mankind.

After a few weeks of muddling and resisting, we accepted the inexorable fact that no democracy can fight a modern war with the processes of democracy. They are made for peace. They are too slow in action; there is no time for debate and for meeting of minds. We became an effective dictatorship. We had to if we were to bring quick strength upon the front. We conscripted all our boys. By direct and indirect means, the Government took control of production, of prices, of labor. It rightly seized about 85 per cent of all war profits. The Government took over the railways. It directed credit. And by direct and indirect means it partially suppressed free speech and free press. It told the people what to eat and to wear.

As I had been called back from Europe to head the Food Administration, and to sit as a member of the President's War Council, I speak of what I know. We were in the war but 18 months. Every month we tightened the clamps of Fascism— we did not know the word then—tighter and tighter. Had we been required to go on another year with the war most of the voluntary regulation we installed would have gone by the board for full compulsion.

If that war had been a long war, its economic demobilization would have been even more difficult. But even as it was, had it not been for a great believer in free enterprise—Woodrow Wilson—it would not have been demobilized.

At the President's request, I personally drafted numerous cables from Paris, combating arguments that this or that war measure should be given extension or developed into what we now call compulsory economy. Many cried out that we must do this to prevent immediate collapse. In so short a period we had built up organizations of industries, of agriculture, labor, and finance which liked the noncompetitive system. They had privileges and subsidies. They had already grown vested habits and vested interests. They turned instantly into pressure groups, intent on saving all or part of these privileges. And they have never forgotten them, as witness the attempt to restore them in the N. R. A. and A. A. A.

And today we have so learned the need of dictatorship in war and have so accustomed ourselves to the idea that we have the legislation all worked out and prepared for introduction to the Congress. I recommend those who are skeptical to read the May bill and the War Department report on powers for the President. A further recommended course of reading is the war tax bill introduced by 50 Senators. There is little in the Nazi system except the mysticism that is not included in all this legislation.

The voice of experience calls a double alarm. In 1917, when we joined in the war, the sense of private enterprise was unimpaired. We had no Fascist taint of planned economy. We had no Socialist taint of Government operation of enterprise. We had no centralization of credit. We had no deficit. We had a debt of only one and a quarter billions. We would start another war with a weakened sense of private enterprise. We would start with a four and one-half billion dollar deficit in peace expenditures. We would start with over \$40,000,000,000 debt. We would have to rearrange the debt by some sort of repudiation or devaluation or capital levy to make room for another forty billion.

When we emerge from another world war, our industry and agriculture will be far more distorted and demoralized. Our taxes will be still more increased. Then we will face the inevitable depression, with all its unemployment and misery, which must follow every Great War. The pressures for continued Government regimentation of economic life in peacetime will have been multiplied. Yet we cannot increase, control and direct the economic activities of a people without compulsion. We cannot compel men without undermining their intellectual and spiritual progress. That hideous lesson stands out not only in theory but by practical example. It has been just such forces that have destroyed 12 democracies in Europe. If we go into another world war, liberty will be lost to America.

Surely the voice of experience calls to us that we are little likely to emerge again without great impairment, if not total loss, of our American system of liberty. What shall it profit a nation that loses its own soul?

Our boys fought a magnificent fight in that war. They showed glorious sacrifice and courage. Our people at home showed a vast sense of self-sacrifice and discipline. We know there is no diminution of our national fiber or softening of valor. The world knows we are not afraid to fight.

THE TREATY OF VERSAILLES

We then went to Europe to make the peace.

I have stated elsewhere that President Wilson went to Paris with the prayers of the common people of the whole world that these malign forces in Europe should be wiped away and that a new era should be brought to the world.

I was there, representing our Government in what amounted to a second great American intervention in Europe. Acting through an allied council, the job was to restore economic life and order in Europe, so that peace could be made and life could be restored. We reduced blockades, we opened harbors and canals. We restored telegraph and railway and water communication between new nations and their old enemies. We

set up advisers to guide new nations in the unfamiliar paths of governmental organization of finance and public order. We distributed food, raw materials, credit, ships, and railway equipment. We laid the foundations of reconstruction. We were inspired with the hope that this second intervention of America would contribute to build a new world. In the course of that job I was brought again into intimate contact with the heads of all the 26 governments and forced to observe and study the invisible forces of destruction and of revolution again at work.

Again I may repeat what I have said many times elsewhere. There were good men at the peace conference and there were high aspirations. But the malign forces of age-old hates, revenge, of imperialism, of nationalism, and of greed raised an ugly domination of that conference. Moreover, as the conference went on, the unsolvable problems of European boundaries and Europe's economic life contributed more and more to the demoralization of the peace.

President Wilson worked valiantly to combat these evil forces. He laid American idealism on the peace table. He cried out and argued for reason and justice. He knew that Europe must turn its face to the future and its back on the past if there was to be hope of real peace.

He secured the freedom of races that had seen centuries of bondage. He obtained a formal agreement to replacement of the balance of power and power politics by cooperative security, with conciliation and arbitration as its moral forces. In the absence of the United States this very agency soon turned into an instrument of oppression and a cover for expropriation of vast territories.

Our President refused to accept for America an inch of land or a dollar of indemnities, in which we had a right to participate. We wanted nothing but peace.

After all, Britain and France are highly imperialistic democracies. They had great losses to recoup for their people. They secured a total area larger than the United States east of the Mississippi. Italy received a total area about the size of Vermont

Under their irresistible sense of wrongs they demanded punishment and reparations by which the German and Austrian people would have been condemned to abject poverty for two generations. There was a certain contradiction in war and peace. During that war we professed we were fighting only the dictator over the enemy people. Then we punished the enemy people for the war.

However, the only point I wish to make is that the ideals of America are not fitted to solve these problems of Europe. Self-determination by many peoples is impossible because of boundaries or economic life. America cannot, by words of a contract, substitute the processes of justice for hate and fear. We destroyed the expedients of balance of power, of power politics, by which alone Europe secures a periodic peace. Indeed, that peace sowed those dragon teeth of more dictatorships. Worse, it defeated the advances of centuries toward liberty and light in many parts of Europe.

The voice of experience says we can make war in Europe, but we cannot make enduring peace.

THE AFTERMATHS IN EUROPE

Even so, for a time after the peace it looked as if a new era had come. The splendid triumph of democracy gave hope to the peoples of Europe that liberty of men could produce cooperation, good will, and the progress of mankind. To the banners of representative government came Germany, Austria, Serbia, Bulgaria, Poland, Rumania, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, and Finland.

Nor was it a difficult transition. These people already had the foundations of liberalism, with some degree of free speech, free press, the right of free assembly, freedom of worship, trial by jury, and recognition of the dignity of the individual man. These nations already had economic systems under which men could choose their own callings and had the rights of free enterprise.

Thus, after the war, they mostly rid themselves of the last

forms of feudalism. And for a few years after the peace, they blossomed forth as self-governing peoples.

But in 15 years came the downfall of most of the new and some of the older democracies and the rise of dictatorships or totalitarian governments, a dozen of them. The immediate cause was economic. How much of the economic pressure was due to war destruction or the treaties or to the Carthaginian attitudes of the victors, or the older inherent malign forces, or the shift of ideas in the industrial revolution is simply speculation. One thing was universal. That was the starry-eyed and the ideologists and the demagogues seeking to cure unemployment by government interference with the proper play of free enterprise, of agriculture, and labor. They impaired or destroyed the initiative and enterprise of their systems. Unemployment became chronic, relief and governmental spending made deficits chronic, government credit weakened or failed. Pressure groups of industry, agriculture, labor, and social reform added to the chaos by their demands for subsidies, privileges, and new ideologies. Men were elected on compromises and promises. Parliamentary bodies became mere quarrels.

Finally, these peoples, losing hope that democracy could solve their difficulties, willingly surrendered to dictatorship as the only way out. And over 250,000,000 people, once largely free, voluntarily voted all authority to dictatorship or totalitarian government and sacrificed not only the liberties they acquired after the war but most of those they had built for two centuries. In two more countries, Czechoslovakia and Spain, freedom was crushed by violence.

During all this time since the Great War the United States has tried to be helpful in rebuilding stability in Europe. As I have said, we asked for no reparations or possessions. We reduced the war debts to about 50 per cent. We twice participated in revision of reparations to give Germany a chance. Making the largest sacrifice ourselves, we carried through a moratorium upon debts between all governments, including German reparations. We proposed the Kellogg Pact.

In the wider field of general economic regeneration, we have proposed time and again fundamental remedies for the growing difficulties of Europe. In the 12 years after the war we secured or proposed half a dozen conferences for promotion of greater economic stability. Nothing came of them. We asked for the limitation of naval armaments, which imposed great tax burdens upon every toiler in the world. We secured full cooperation in Europe from Great Britain alone. In 1932 we proposed a simple method of reduction of land arms to accord with their own peace treaties. If it had been adopted, this war would not be possible today.

The voice of experience says we cannot create liberty and self-government in Europe. We cannot reconstruct Europe. The social regeneration of nations must come from within. It cannot come from without.

A WORLD WHERE NATIONAL INTEREST COMES FIRST

What have been the attitudes of Europe toward us during this period since the Great War?

Has Europe ever indicated that she would be willing to sacrifice one single small item that might be helpful to us?

After the armistice, when we need not have parted with a dollar, our government loaned huge amounts of our taxpayers' resources to aid Europe in reconstruction. The victors and the old enemy combined in power politics to bring pressure against us and finally to repudiate even the money we loaned for their own rebuilding. In the meantime, they have accumulated balances and assets in this country several times the amount of the payments.

When our agriculture wallowed in misery from its overexpansion in the war to furnish them food supplies, did they not, all of them, rush to other markets, impose quotas that favored nations which had given them no aid?

We have never complained. We do not now. We realize the nature of selfishness in all nations. We realize too well the age-old malign forces of Europe. We realize the poverty and

despair under which these people live. But the voice of experience calls to us never again to assume that nations do not put their own interests first.

THE WAY IN WHICH WARS END

There is another experience that Europe has demonstrated from the Great War and its aftermath which becomes important at this moment. We are again told that unless we join in, western civilization may be destroyed and we will be the next victim. Therefore, eventually, why not now? That is propaganda to condition the American mind for entry into this war.

Aside from the fact that Britain and France with their empires can defend themselves, if they stay on the defense, great wars do not end that way.

Great wars often enough end in peace before either side is the victor. When one side is the victor in modern wars it is because the other side has become exhausted. At that moment the victors are but one lap behind in the race of exhaustion.

Neither at the armistice in 1919 nor at the end of any other war were the victors or the vanquished ready for or desirous of starting another war. In other words not even the victor is going to pounce upon a powerful armed neutral. Especially they do not attack 130,000,000 people 3000 miles overseas, who have a capacity of 10,000,000 soldiers and 25,000 airplanes.

Moreover, there are other factors that enter at the end of any great war. The victors want indemnities and possessions. Indemnities can be paid only from the productivity of a people. Nations cannot be made to work by force. They have to be given hope. That means the national independence of the enemy must be preserved by the victor. World trade has to be restored. In other words, even victors have to return to the paths of peace if they wish to restore their own exhaustion.

Beyond all this, when all great wars end, all the peoples take out their sufferings upon their leaders, either by putting them out of office or by revolution. And therefore the whole setting changes.

The voice of experience says we should discard these forebodings about being the next victim.

THE AFTERMATHS TO THE UNITED STATES

What was the result, to us, of the Great War? We won a military victory. But what did it cost? The 350,000 killed and maimed brought lifelong loss and sorrow to hundreds of thousands of fathers and mothers. Youth made the supreme sacrifice that could have furnished genius and guidance to our people. War placed nearly half a million persons on the national pension list—and the day will come when the number will be many times that. It cost us a huge burden of taxation which will drain our standard of living for generations.

And there were other costs. To fight the war we inflated credit, prices, and ideas, which had to bump down to earth with immense losses to our farmers and unemployment to our workers. Out of the war expansion of industry we had years of maladjustment. Out of the war expansion of agriculture, we plowed up 60,000,000 acres of pasture, and the surplus from this cultivation has been demoralizing to agriculture down to this day. We could have made our own recovery long since, but the constant shocks from Europe have defeated us time and again. Ever since the war we have lived in a hectic economic world.

For 10 years after the war the inflations and reconstructions of the other parts of the world gave us a foreign market. The "new era" was born. Our country, mad with easy money, refused to listen to any words of caution. Finally the war aftermaths, eating at the vitals of world economy, threatened its collapse. And here again we committed a violent error.

Our Federal Reserve Board in 1927 yielded to the power politics of European banks. It tried to stave off this European collapse by inflation of credit. It was a most potent drink from the Mississippi bubble of inflation. We could have got over its headache by 1930, but then came the inexorable collapse of Europe's financial structure and a world-wide depression.

The headlines since have been unemployment, bankruptcy, misery, national relief measures, and deficits. With misery came the birth of our Utopias—planned economy, and all the others.

For the first time in the recent history of America we shall show decreased national wealth in this decade of the thirties. We have had about one-third of the American people existing below a decent standard of living. If the wealth we spent and taxes we paid were not in the equation, these people would not be in this plight.

The voice of experience warns us that whether we participate in this war today or not, we face a further quarter of a century of difficulty. If we do participate, we can expect another quarter of a century of impoverishment.

A FEW OTHER CONSIDERATIONS FROM EXPERIENCE

What is the menace today that calls us again to join in European war? We are told we must join in a "holy war" against ideologies that threaten the world.

But our citizens who advocate an American Don Quixote role of tilting at the windmills of lawless and obnoxious ideologies have certain elements of inconsistency. Their emotions have been concentrated on the ideologies of Nazism and its softer manifestations of Fascism. They studiously overlooked Communism until the Hitler Stalin pact.

During the whole of these twenty odd years since Communism has become ascendant in Russia, from that base it has been subsidized to undermine democracies everywhere. Yet none of these abolitionists of ideologies had suggested that we go to war with Russia.

If we are going to clean up the noxious ideologies of the world, we will not have succeeded until we have also cleaned up Russia, as well as Germany and some 12 other totalitarian nations.

This experience with Russia proves still another thing. It is not true that we cannot somehow live at peace in the same world with an obnoxious ideology.

And here again must we listen to the voice of experience. You cannot defeat an idea or an ideology with military force. These can be educated out of people only by their own experience. Did the Great War extirpate the idea that might makes right? Did it really implant the noble ideals of peace, of cooperation, and of human liberty?

The voice of experience says America cannot correct the world every time it goes wrong. We should destroy our physical and moral strength in a decade if we set ourselves to police the conduct and ideas of the world. And our service to mankind would end.

SERVICE TO MANKIND

But today Europe is in agony. Our every instinct cries out to help in some way.

What is the greatest service that America can perform for Europe and mankind in this situation? I may repeat:

First. We can strengthen our Army and Navy to a point where no soldier dares land on the Western Hemisphere, irrespective of who wins the war in Europe. The building of that strength is the only warning that counts. It guarantees the peace of one-half the globe.

Second. We can put our own house in order. We can demonstrate that self-governing, free people can solve the problems imposed by the industrial revolution. We can restore employment and end its sufferings. We can build up humane measures of security, of increasing standards of living for all the people. We can wipe out of our midst the disintegrating forces of corruption and coercion of men.

Third. We can thus make a demonstration on this continent that true liberalism is not dead. We can hold alight to a crumbling world the lamp of liberty as the guide to regeneration. We can prove that the hope of humanity lies not in killing or regimenting men but in preserving them and in enlarging their lives.

Fourth. We can from our strength again heal many wounds

of war. We can aid the starving, succor the distressed, and care for the innocent.

Fifth. We can aid those who sit at the peace table, not by entanglement but by counsel to mitigate malignance. We can, as President Wilson did in 1919, secure some justice, some freedom, some hope to the world.

We shall never be in position to contribute even this small portion to the salvation of mankind if we ever become a participant in this war.

America, too, has a duty wholly to her own people. From them is coming a stern demand that we must not again sacrifice our youth for a useless hope. I know whereof I speak. My daily mail is heavy with their concern. Our young men are ready to die on our own soil for our own country, but they are defiant against their sacrifice for others' quarrels. Their mothers and fathers, who have skimped and denied them that their sons might be even better equipped to serve their country than they have been able to, are filled with anxiety lest the hope of their life service be lost. Our sympathies for the democracies will be drawn upon heavily in the days to come. Our duty to our sons is to hold reason in power over emotion. It is to hold the long vision of America's future. It is to keep out of these wars.

Russian Misadventure

Article in *Collier's*

[April 27, 1940]

THE safety and defense of the United States in a world armed to the teeth do not wholly consist of being properly armed ourselves or of maintaining our neutrality in the present wars.

They depend upon maintaining the respect of other nations. They depend upon our giving vigorous moral support to decent standards of conduct between nations. They depend upon our freedom from the pitfalls of power politics. They depend upon our keeping free of propaganda and interference in our domestic affairs by foreign governments and foreign ideologies.

In other words, our safety and defense depend greatly upon the wisdom of our foreign policies.

In these lights I propose to analyze Mr. Roosevelt's recognition of the Communist government of Soviet Russia, and its consequences to the American people and to mankind.

The events of the past six months have further illuminated this policy and point to two major reasons for a re-examination now.

Errors in foreign policies often cannot be fully corrected. But because errors are made is no sign that nothing can be done about it. When we see that the consequences result in continued disintegration of decent standards in the world and at home, we should at least reassert our position on these standards.

The recognition of Russia is a test of statesmanship. With two thirds of the world at war, vast problems will arise daily,

the solution of which will determine our peace abroad and our peace at home. The capacity and judgment in the past should be examined before we elect leadership for the difficult years before us.

Recognition or no recognition of new governments and the exchange of ambassadors or ministers is one of the protections to international decency that nations have developed over centuries. These measures are not merely to provide afternoon teas for cookie pushers in Foreign Service or avenues for the red tape of ponderous verbiage in communications. These are measures designed to safeguard nations from grave consequences.

At once let me make it quite clear that in analyzing the recognition of Russia and its consequences I am not advocating war with Russia. Nor am I advocating that we in the remotest degree interfere with the internal affairs of Russia. That is the business of Russia alone.

When our neighbors choose to live a life of disrepute, we do not shoot them up. But we can hold up the moral and social standards in the community a little better if we do not associate with them. Or take part in their parties. Or invite them into our homes. Or present them to our children. Recognition of new governments is thus more than a re-establishment of legalistic or trade relations. It is a sign that we believe they are respectable members of the family of nations. It gives to them right of entry into our homes. It gives them a recommendation to our neighbors.

Further, let me say that I am not interested in Red baiting. I have no anxiety that the Communists will pull off a Communist revolution in the United States. That is not what happens. What does happen is that a people get annoyed and indignant over Communist sabotage of national life and poisoning of the wells of liberty. Then in a rage they go Fascist and put the Communists down by cruelty and violence. Or in milder form they go vigilante. Both of these reactions are the defeat of liberty. That is the Communist contribution to the abandonment of democracy in a number of nations outside Russia. Communism everywhere has paved the way for Fascism. And

daily we see the two systems approach the same form of sheer tyranny and despotism.

We may summarize some firsthand history.

For a number of years before the Great War I, as an American engineer, practiced my profession in Russia. In the building of large industrial works I came to know only too well the sufferings of a people under the Czarist despotism. I came to know the gentle character of the great mass of the Russian people. I knew their strivings toward better family and community life. I saw their rising aspirations of liberty. I saw their frustrations against the repression of an intolerable aristocracy.

Finally, in 1916, due to the internal demoralization of the Great War, the Czar was compelled to recall the parliament (the Duma) of the people to ward off rebellion. At that I rejoiced. In March, 1917, the courageous men of this parliament overthrew the Czarist government. These were not Communists—they were liberal minded patriots. They created a representative republic under Kerensky. I felt that even the dreadful losses of the Great War might have compensations in the glow of rising liberty that dawned across the bleak Russian steppes.

In November, 1917, however, the Communists, as the Bolshevik party, in cooperation with Czarist forces, overthrew the democratic government. A bloody curtain descended upon the Russian people. The hope of liberty in Russia had been assassinated. The four modern Horsemen of Hate, Terror, Atheism and Imperialism were started on the march in the world.

The Communist revolution was not a revolt against the Czarist regime. It was a massacre under the softer word "liquidation" of all the liberal men and liberal women in Russia. Nearly every member of those brave parliaments who raised the banner of liberty against the Czarist regime was executed without a semblance of justice or compassion. The remaining few still live in exile abroad.

Incidentally, this Communist government deserted the

United States in the Great War and gave support to our enemy.

We move on to 1919.

With the Armistice arose the question of the recognition of the Communist government of Russia by the United States. President Wilson requested from me a memorandum upon the matter. It contained these lines:

"... The Bolsheviks most certainly represent a minority ... as such they constitute a tyranny that is the negation of democracy . . . they have resorted to terror, bloodshed and murder to a degree long since abandoned even amongst reactionary tyrannies. . . . We cannot even remotely recognize this murderous tyranny . . . without transgressing on every national ideal of our own. . . ."

Woodrow Wilson, in fact, needed no such advice. In August, 1920, his views and those of the Democratic Party were ably reviewed by Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby—which I condense:

"... at the moment when the work of creating a popular representative government based upon universal suffrage was nearly completed, the Bolsheviks ... an inconsiderable minority of the people, by force and cunning seized the powers and machinery of government, and have continued to use them with savage oppression. . . ."

"... The responsible spokesmen . . . have declared that . . . the very existence of Bolshevism . . . depends . . . upon revolution in all the other great civilizations, including the United States.

"Moreover, it is within the knowledge of the government of the United States that . . . the Third Internationale ... is heavily subsidized by the Bolshevik government from the public revenues of Russia, has for its openly avowed aim the promotion of the Bolshevik revolution throughout the world.

". . . There can be no confidence ... if pledges are to be given . . . with a cynical repudiation . . . already in the mind of one of the parties.

"We cannot recognize ... a government which is determined and bound to conspire against our institutions."

IN THE NAME OF HUMANITY

And now we come to 1921, and the twelve years of Republican administrations.

A great famine descended upon South Russia. The lives of 20,000,000 people were threatened. This famine was in large part due to the undermining of national productivity by the Communist government. But the Communist leaders appealed to America in the name of humanity. They had expropriated hundreds of millions of American savings invested in Russia. They had repudiated their debt to our government. But we, being a democracy, listened only to the cry for compassion. We had no desire to punish the Russian people for the wickedness of their oppressors. It fell to me to organize and direct the distribution of more than \$75,000,000 worth of American food to those helpless people. We saved the lives of those millions.

And now, after all these years, opens a revealing incident. It appears, from disclosures before the Dies Committee, that during that famine, under a false front organization, "The Friends of Soviet Russia," absolutely controlled from Moscow, the Communists in the United States in competition with the American relief organizations raised one million dollars from the American public for relief of Russia. They now confess that they never sent a cent to Russia but used it for Communist propaganda in the United States. There is no better commentary on the morals or cruelty of the Soviet government.

During this period from 1919 to 1933 the Moscow government was busy everywhere in the effort to destroy democratic governments. These destructions were a large part of the rise of Nazism in Germany and of Fascism in Italy. In England Soviet officials were arrested and expelled for conspiracy against the government.

The Republican administrations for twelve years refused to give the Soviet government recognition despite constant propaganda on its part and that of its fellow travelers.

During this time we held to the ground, first, that the Communist government of Russia, with its foundations in cruelty, terror, destruction of liberty and religion, and murder, should not be given the dignity and respectability of recognition from free men. Such recognition would increase its destructive power against all free nations and all free men.

Second, that such recognition would open the floodgates of Russian subsidized Communist propaganda and conspiracy upon the American people.

And third, we knew from a thousand evidences that promises were valueless from a government that openly flaunted all the decencies of men.

While it was not our business, yet such recognition would further cement the hold of 2,000,000 Communists upon 150,000,000 suffering people in their own country.

Thus four Presidents and four Secretaries of State concurred in these views.

We move on to November 16, 1933

On that date President Roosevelt recognized Soviet Russia.

The same conditions still prevailed in Russia as when President Wilson denied recognition and they had been confirmed by fourteen years of bloody terror. They had been confirmed by the constant effort of Moscow to destroy democratic government everywhere.

Upon that recognition by President Roosevelt there was this explicit agreement:

". . . the government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [agree] to respect scrupulously ... to refrain from interfering in any manner in the internal affairs of the United States . . . to refrain and to restrain all persons . . . under its direct or indirect control . . . from any act . . . liable in any way whatsoever to injure the tranquility, prosperity, order or security . . . or any organization or propaganda ... in any part of the United States, its territories or possessions. . . . Not to permit the formation . . . of any organization or group . . . which has as an aim the overthrow . . . of the political or social order . . . of the United States . . . ?"

President Roosevelt in announcing this great step said:

"I trust that our nation henceforth may cooperate for their mutual benefit and for the preservation of the peace of the world."

SIX YEARS OF OUR "GOOD NEIGHBOR"

We move on to 1940 and inspect the consequences.

We have now had six years of these good neighbor relations with the Soviet government.

Overnight we were flooded with conspiracy to overthrow our institutions. The number of actual members of the Communist party in our country increased at once by 100 per cent. But these numbers were trivial. Of more importance is that under the sympathetic attitude of this recognition a score of camouflaged "fellow traveler" and "front" organizations grew apace, controlled by inner cells of Communists. A dozen of them have been exposed, which influenced ideas among millions of people who did not know their origins and control. I need not relate the whole horrid chapter.

As to the fidelity of the Communist government to its agreement, the unanimous report of the Dies Committee, based upon exhaustive research and testimony, says:

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

That is the one made by President Roosevelt in 1933. The report continues:

". . . The Communist party under instructions from the Corn intern (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."

Now let us look at the Communist government at work against nations of free men in its "co-operating . . . for the preservation of the peace of the world."

On August 22, 1939, the world was startled by an alliance of Fascist Hitler and Communist Stalin. This was no surprise to thinking people to whom the blood brotherhood was well known. It was embarrassing to a vast number of pseudo liberals who had tried to envisage Fascism as the sole living devil of civilization.

Nine days after this junction these governments simultaneously attacked independent Poland. They destroyed the freedom of a great people. Fourteen days later the independence of Latvia and Estonia was destroyed.

We move on again for 60 days. On November 30th last came the unprovoked attack by Russia upon little Finland. Here the might of 160,000,000 Russians was thrown against 3,500,000 peace loving and liberty loving Finns. Do I need to describe these scenes? Where before in all civilized time has the slaughter of women and children been applied in an attempt to force the surrender of courageous men?

Is all this "co-operation for the peace of the world?"

We may explore certain other consequences of this recognition of Soviet Russia directly upon American life.

As a sop for the recognition, an appeal was made to the cupidity of the American people. We were told in 1933 that upon this recognition Russia would buy a vast amount of American goods. A good part of American business was brought to support recognition by huge promises of new business.

What is the record? During the almost exactly six years from the day of Russian recognition down to the day Poland was attacked we sold a total of about \$200,000,000 worth of goods to 160,000,000 people in Russia. That is less than seven per cent of what we sold 10,000,000 people in Canada in the same period. It is a curious commentary that in the six years prior to the recognition we sold Russia almost \$500,000,000, or more than twice as much.

The copybooks one time said that good does not come out of evil.

Nor should I neglect to mention another item. Prior to

1934 we refused to allow the import of Russian gold. Since recognition we have bought directly and indirectly over \$300,000,000 in gold from Russia at \$35 per ounce. A large part of this gold is produced by the bleeding fingers of hundreds of thousands of farmers who have been condemned to Siberia for no reason but that they wanted to farm their own farms. That gold is produced by forced labor. It helps the Soviet government finance the destruction of small nations.

And another commentary on this whole bloody trade is that in the five months since Poland was attacked our sales of goods to Russia have increased 300 per cent. That represents a large addition of gasoline, copper, alloys, etc., to aid in the subjugation of the liberties of the Finns and the Poles or other peoples.

LABOR PAYS THE PRICE

But there are still more overriding consequences. One result of recognition of the Soviet government is its interference in American domestic life.

That recognition in 1933 was vigorously protested by such responsible leaders of American labor as William Green, John Frey, Matthew Woll and others as endangering the whole American labor movement. It was protested by thinking men and women everywhere.

Benjamin Stolberg, in a notable article a few months ago, gave an illuminating exposure of the subsequent Communist penetration of American labor unions under Moscow's direction, and the consequences:

"They organize whispering campaigns of unprintable character assassination against critics. They bring pressure to bear on every worker. . . . In unions which have employment departments they never send a known anti-Communist to a job. . . . They try their best to get him fired. . . . Their two principal techniques are organized confusion and organized terrorism. . . . The Communists have never hesitated either to break strikes or to precipitate irresponsible walkouts. . . . The Communists called almost two hundred unauthorized sit downs."

Similar evidence has been given by labor leader after labor leader struggling on one hand to maintain the fundamentals of free men against the Communists and on the other to maintain the rights of labor with employer.

The free speech and free press that are essential to liberty give the Communists the full right to expound a fantastic philosophy under which free speech would be suppressed. But they have not been content with peaceful exposition. They have repeatedly organized disturbances of the public order as a means of propaganda.

"Hunger marches" of well-fed men, stimulating riots, were a specialty of the Communist front "Unemployed Councils" in various parts of the country.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE "BONUS MARCH"

It is now established by their own confessions that it was the Communist front "Workmen's Ex-Service League" that organized the "Bonus March" of deluded veterans on Washington. After Congress had refused their proposals and the Administration had paid the fare home of all veterans who had come in good faith, the Communists provoked attacks upon the police in the streets of the national capital. At that time we identified hundreds of Communists among them who were not veterans at all.

The district authorities finally demanded troops to prevent the killing of men in these riots. After the troops took charge not one shot was fired, not one man injured.

The lie that a Republican administration had slaughtered innocent veterans of the American Army was made a part of the campaign in 1932.

These are only samples.

There has been much interference in our American political life. Not content to follow democratic processes by organizing their own open political party and seeking change of government through the ballot, they, their fellow travelers and their false-front organizations have been active within other political

parties. I do not for a moment suggest that the New Deal is Communist. But it has neither refused their aid nor properly exorcised them from New Deal support. It is unnecessary to recite the now publicly known labors of Earl Browder, Moscow and the Communist press to attain this end.

And not the least of their services were as distributors of sewer literature, lies, smears, slander and libel, with which they flooded the ignorant. They emerged into the role of organized poisoners of the minds of the American people.

If it were not for the backdrop of tragedy there might be grim humor in President Roosevelt's wishes and warm congratulations to the Soviet government on its 17th anniversary.

Of far deeper importance than all this is the corruption of the spirit of liberalism itself. The basic philosophy of our national life is liberalism in its historic sense. The first pillars of liberalism are intellectual and spiritual liberty. That is freedom of thought, speech, press and worship. Through representative government, equality of rights, government by law, not by men, we sought that minorities and individuals may live in security. Around this structure were built all the details of justice, of trial by jury, of regulation against oppression and exploitation.

Essential to intellectual and spiritual liberty is also economic freedom. That is the right of men to choose their own jobs, to undertake their own adventures, to receive and enjoy the reward of their own efforts, to save for their families and for their old age.

We stand for economic liberty, for free enterprise regulated to prevent abuse, not because it is a property system or a capitalist system or a profit system or a Chamber of Commerce slogan. We are for it because we know that it is inseparable from intellectual and spiritual freedom. It has been proved a thousand times that economic liberty cannot be suppressed without suppressing every other liberty. And the most monumental proof of all time is Communism and its great exemplar is Soviet Russia.

Liberalism calls for more than even intellectual, spiritual

and economic liberty and the security of these rights. It calls for respect for the dignity of men. It calls for the development of the individual character in men and women, free of fear and filled with hope. It calls for mercy, for compassion, for tolerance. It holds that the sum of individual accomplishments and character of men makes the sum of human progress.

Having stated these perhaps commonplaces of liberalism, does anything of this sort exist in Russia under Communism?

What have been the reflexes of this clash in fundamentals upon American liberalism? We have always possessed a large group of sympathetic, idealistic minds who are impatient with the slow and oft times discouraging processes of democracy in remedy of injustices. They sincerely welcome each new human hope.

From the outbreak of Communism in Russia, the ranks of American liberals were at once split. A considerable group gave sympathy and credulity to the Communist revolution, sincerely believing it was the new hope for Russia. Soon they were justifying every atrocity, every phase of this despotism. From the gradual drinking of this poison, men who believe themselves liberals fell into support of collectivism in some form. At once went up the cry of "Recognize Russia." It became a slogan whereby those who did not bow down were denounced as "reactionary."

In any event we have seen a strange hybrid that can be called "totalitarian liberalism." We have seen it in so-called "liberal" publications. We have seen it in some college professors. We have seen it in some misled youth. We have seen it in the halls of Congress. We have seen Stateism planted in the American government.

THE NEED AND THE REMEDY

This attitude of the mind—the belief that the expansion of government dictation creates liberty—appears to be the philosophy of these "totalitarian liberals."

And yet many such people became indignant if one suggests

they are not liberals. Some of them in the past few months have drawn back in horror from the picture now exposed. Our newspaper columns are full of explanations, and some forthright apologies.

Today the need among intellectuals in the United States is to conserve liberalism from this totalitarian aberration. For a demon has entered into the minds of many liberal men and women that, like the demon of the Gadarene swine, will plunge them and us over a precipice.

What does all this add up to?

Soviet Russia, since the New Deal formally granted recognition to Stalin's government, has been poisoning vigorously the intellectual and spiritual life of this country. Moscow has maintained in this country a vast propaganda machine, not to make us friendly to Russia, but to control and dominate the political and economic life of America. It seeks to foment race hatred among those of our own citizens whom they call the minorities—that is, the Negroes and the foreign-born. It seeks to stir up class hatred among the American people.

Soviet Russia through this machine seeks to influence the attitude of the United States in its relations to other countries that would involve us in power politics.

The facts that I have related become plainer every day. Yet we are holding in friendship the red hand that grabbed a part of Poland and forced a treaty that despoiled Finland.

The recognition of Soviet Russia was a gigantic political and moral mistake. It was not a mistake proved from change of circumstance. It was a mistake obvious from the beginning.

Would it not establish self-respect, would it not contribute to re-establish moral standards in a sorry world, if we took some action?

To withdraw technical recognition at this time of a world aflame might be misinterpreted as warlike. But the moral equities would be at least reasserted if we withdrew our ambassador and left the technical representation of a charge d'affaires. Why are we more tender of tyranny in Communist Russia than in Nazi Germany?

We criticize some of our youth because we say they are Red. We criticize certain labor unions because we say that they are dominated by Communists. We arrest certain Americans because they serve Soviet Russia in this country illegally. Yet we do not stop to think that it was our own government that set the mark of respectability on Soviet Russia and the things these people advocate.

The Nine Horsemen and America

Article in *Liberty Magazine*
[June, 1940]

THE Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse are on the march—War, Death, Famine, and Pestilence. Two thirds of the people in the world are at war. But coming before these old destroyers of mankind are five new Horsemen. The new cavalry are:

Imperialism, the destroyer of the independence of nations;
Intolerance, the destroyer of minorities;
State-ism, the destroyer of personal liberty;
Atheism, the destroyer of faith;
Hate, the destroyer of the unity of mankind.

These are the horsemen of the advance, preparing the way for War and Death. After War and Death sweep Famine and Pestilence.

And their camp follower is Revolution.

Imperialism has already trampled down the independence of Ethiopia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Albania, and Denmark. We have witnessed attacks upon China, Finland, and Norway, unable to defend themselves, and now the invasion of Holland and Belgium. And there seems to be more to come.

We have seen Intolerance destroy Jews, Christians, and racial minorities.

We have seen State-ism, expressed by the despotisms of Communism, Fascism, Nazism, and Socialism; destroy liberty in Russia, in Germany, in Italy, and in a half dozen others. We have seen its infiltration through the world—including the United States.

Atheism has greatly shattered religious worship in Russia and Germany, and weakened beliefs in a score of others.

Hate has grown fiercely since before the First World War began, and its ravages are not alone between races but between classes and religious faiths.

And all the nine Horsemen have new weapons of destruction. Imperialism has become more dreadful by threat of destruction from the air. Propaganda, the weapon of Intolerance, of Stateism, of Atheism, of Hate, is more potent through our rapidity of communication. It now moves through the air over all borders and seas. It comes disguised in the home tongue. Hate has increased its voltage through cruelty of attack upon civilian men, women, and children by food blockade and death by the air. War is more destructive by our chemistry and our machines. Famine is made more terrible by the growth of great cities. Pestilence strikes right and left through the close net of our communications.

Only the Western Hemisphere is free of the full violence of these Horsemen. But they affect us. Our emotions are aroused. The attacks upon helpless small nations raise the indignation of all decent men and women. Our economic life is dislocated. The shadow of war hangs over all our decisions. And from our emotions there are Americans who sincerely believe that we ourselves should go to war. They feel we should be willing to sacrifice our youth and our future to restore liberty against aggression, to assure the recognition of law and human rights.

Reason calls for us not to send our sons into this war. Reason dictates that if we join the military operations of this war it means the abdication of the remaining seat of liberty in the world. Reason insists the Western Hemisphere should give sanctuary for peace in her flight from all the rest of the world. Reason is final in its demand that we prepare ourselves so that we may defend the Western Hemisphere.

To those who feel that we are not doing our part if we stay out I may suggest that we look ahead to the end of this war and examine a possibly greater service to mankind. This war will end some time either in victory or exhaustion. And in that relation we may well explore the grim work of the Horsemen Famine, Pestilence, and Hate.

FAMINE AND PESTILENCE

Western Europe for a hundred years, even in peacetimes, has not produced sufficient food supplies for its own population. It has bought its food by the export of manufactured goods. But on top of this peacetime shortage of supplies, war at once diminishes the food production of every combatant nation. The imports of fodder are cut off or slackened, and the herds must be diminished. The drafting of manpower instantly diminishes the production of milk and of butter and of meat. The people eat into their animals, and when war ends their brood stock is depleted. Beyond this, planting of ground crops must be skimped. The harvesting is imperfect. And above all the nitrate fertilizers must be diverted to explosives.

It is true that each nation at modern war rations its population in hope of reducing its food consumption. Scarcity always raises prices and the food goes to those who have the most money. Rationing does secure more equality in distribution and control of prices. But it thrusts the hunger upon the civil population. Soldiers, munition workers, and government officials are always well-fed. Thus hunger in the people falls hardest upon the women and children. But rationing has little effect upon the total consumption. War experience has proved that armies consume about twice as much food as the same men do when they are at peace. That is partly due to the greater physical need. It is partly due to the inevitable waste and destruction of food in camp, or by invasion and at sea.

Beyond all this the food production of the countries free of actual war is also demoralized, for the normal markets are interfered with by blockades and difficulties of credit to war purchasers. Prices are erratic and the farmer is uncertain. Some countries are wholly isolated. Thus production diminishes among neutrals, especially at the beginnings of wars.

By necessity of directing food supplies through the whole of the last war I watched these forces unfold with their millions of tragedies.

The food situation in the present war is already more desperate than at the same stage in the World War. Then, except for Belgium, there was no rationing of civil populations until the second or third year. In the present war every combatant country was on bread and meat cards within ninety days. In 1914 Russia was full of food; for years it has been in a state of semi-famine. Moreover today every neutral country in Europe out of fear has already mobilized almost its full manpower. The Balkan states, Holland, Belgium, Scandinavia and Italy will therefore also diminish in food production. The harvest of the Balkan States this year will now be reduced. Denmark, now unable to import fodder, must kill many of her animals. Many of these smaller nations are already on rations. And in invaded countries there is already famine. It sweeps over Poland.

Out of all these forces, *if this war is long continued*, there is but one implacable end. That end is the greatest famine in history. And from lowered vitality by famine comes Pestilence.

There was a great famine at the end of the World War. The dramatic events of peacemaking obscured it. And as the people after the Armistice were mostly fed by American action there was no major tragedy to attract headlines.

During the twenty-four months after the Armistice in 1918 we sent something over eighty billion pounds of concentrated foodstuffs from America to Europe. That was more food than we have exported to Europe in the whole of the last ten years combined. And this food went not only to our Allies but to our former enemies. And of pestilence, an army of typhus came down from Russia on a front a thousand miles long. At its height a million cases raged with a death rate of a quarter of those stricken. Americans fought that battle and won.

Without all this service, famine, pestilence, and their end in Communism would have engulfed Europe. There would have been no peace of any sort.

After the Thirty Years' War a peace was made, and then it is said that one half of the population proceeded to die from famine and pestilence. There was no America then.

The conclusion of this observation is "Who will stop the famine after the present war?"

THE SIXTH HORSEMAN—HATE

And now let us examine the destroyer Hate. He will have something to do with the American people. In his modern visage he is probably the greatest of all destroyers.

Racial hates developed to an intensity and over more people in the World War than ever before. From the miseries which followed it came another unparalleled development. That was class hate. Both of them have played a great part in this cataclysm of today.

Hate becomes completely inflamed in modern war. Nowadays fighting quickly flashes from wars between soldiers to wars against civilians. It was not so long ago that wars were fought entirely between soldiers. They had elements of chivalry and sportsmanship. When such wars were over hates did not long remain in courageous men who fought against courageous men. But where war is made against helpless civilians an implacable hate comes. Do we need to be reminded of the seventy years of hate that survived in our country from Sherman's March to the Sea?

As this war goes on the blockade of food supplies, the attacks on civilians from the air, will take more toll from women and children. As action between armies becomes more violent the long lists of dead stream back from the front into the homes. From these wrongs and sufferings imperishable hates will sink into every household.

And do not let us think that we had not in some lesser degree built up hates in the United States during the last war although our losses had been much less bitter. We cannot forget the hideous attitudes toward loyal Americans of German descent.

Well do I remember that some days after the Armistice I announced that the food blockade against Germany should be removed at once. That was imperative for reasons of humanity and for the self-interest of the Allies that Bolshevism could be

stopped in starving Germany and that peace could be made. Despite these obvious reasons, the reaction in every part of the Allied world and the United States was one of indignant opposition and denunciation of any mercy. It took us months to secure so simple an act.

In the end from this furnace fire of hate statesmen are no longer free agents. The bitterness makes sane peace almost impossible. Those of us who observed the making of the Treaty of Versailles knew that the leaders were consciously or unconsciously dominated by the fires of hate still burning. They had to get their acts approved at home. The sufferings of their people had been too great for rational action.

And one of the consequences of those hates was a treaty which sowed the dragon's teeth of the present war.

In the present war the forces making for hate are even more violent. If this war continues long enough these hates will sit again at the peace table. Unless there is some allaying force, some entry of reason and compassion, there will be a Carthaginian peace.

The conclusion of this observation is "What powerful nation will still retain good will and reason?"

AND THE CAMP FOLLOWER REVOLUTION

Hate, this sixth horseman, continues to ride after so-called peace is made. Famine and Pestilence, together with the aftermaths, of war's destruction, malnutrition, unemployment and poverty, furnish the fuel of class hate. It is hungry people who revolt in violence. Civilians with filled stomachs do not face machine guns. Helpless, distraught, frustrated peoples accept the leadership of Hate, who mobilizes them into Revolution. The end is dictatorship and the advance Horsemen start on the march again.

AN AMERICAN ROLE

Now America has a role to perform. It can be a great role in our history.

There is no such thing as isolation for the United States from this war. The Monroe Doctrine itself is denial of that. And there can be no such thing as economic or intellectual or moral or spiritual isolation. There can be no isolation from world effort to allay misery, to save human life, to bring peace, disarmament, and reconstruction and renewed hope from this catastrophe. There can be isolation from military participation in this war. When I speak of joining in these wars I mean joining in the military side—sending our sons into it.

If we join in these wars we would start with the already great exhaustion of ten years of our depression. Then we will further exhaust our economic strength. And that exhaustion will be to a far greater degree than in the few months we participated in the last war. And when the war is over we must devote our remaining resources to support our wounded, our maimed, our orphaned and our destitute. We shall need every resource to rebuild our farmers and workers from our own misery and impoverishment. And our sympathies will be justly limited to suffering at home.

If we join in this war the last great remaining strength will have been exhausted. And hope of world recuperation will have been delayed while Revolution marches unimpeded over the earth.

If we join in this war we ourselves will develop all the hates that are inevitable from war. We shall have lost the voice of reason in the making of the peace.

And though we stay out, in our indignation at wrong and aggression we must not be led into blind hates against whole peoples. The great masses of the German people and the Russian people did not wish for the wars now going on. The vast majority of both these nations are gentle, decent people who prayed for peace even as did you and I.

And ours is a doubly difficult position. In our emotions we have a different scene from Europe fighting race against race. We have the heritage of every European race. Our war hates are not alone against the enemy. They cruelly divide our own people, not alone for the war but long after.

But if we remain out of war, we might, if we have the will to do so, use our unimpaired resources, our courage, and our moral strength to do mankind infinite service.

By that service we could allay the destruction of war, and the ravages of Famine and Pestilence. That service of compassion could go far to save civilization, and restore hope to men. Free of Hate we could exert an insistent voice of reason in the making of peace.

And if we are again called upon for service in reconstruction we have a right to demand that reason and hope sit at the peace table. Reason and hope for the world call for the restoration of those nations who have lost their freedom.

PART III
ADDRESSES TO SCIENTIFIC, RELIGIOUS AND
EDUCATIONAL GROUPS

The Imperative Need for Moral Re-Armament

*Address delivered to
Annual Meeting of the York Bible Class*

TORONTO, CANADA

[November 22, 1938]

PART I

I HAVE been invited to address you for a few moments on morals. It is the common ground of all religious faith.

And I am not going to discuss it as history, ethics, metaphysics or theology. I shall discuss it as a process of return to world sanity. There are some vital concepts and some simple needs that are imperative if civilization is now to find itself and go forward.

Not for a long time has humanity seen so confused a world. Nor has it for ages seen a world deeper in moral depression.

If we search underneath it all we see certain ferments. In this world the ideal of personal liberty had steadily become more ascendant and because of it we have had an astonishing advance in knowledge, in science, and invention. This advance has done several things to us.

Their rapid expansion brought a conflict with superstition and an upset in many moorings of belief. Science may have abolished the personal devil but invented more forms of devilment.

Science and technology have made us more interdependent, both individually and between nations. Co-operation is forced

on us if we would live. But man is still by instinct a predatory animal given to devilish aggression.

The discoveries of science have immensely increased productivity of material things. They have increased the standards of living and comfort. They have eliminated infinite drudgery. They have increased leisure. But that gives more time for devilment.

The work of science has eliminated much disease and suffering. It has increased the length of life. That, together with increase in productivity, has resulted in vastly increased populations. Also it increased the number of people engaged in devilment.

Man's dependable knowledge increases daily, yet men still move from emotion and belief in fairies. With the spread and speed of communication they move more violently and in larger groups. We no longer burn witches but we build bigger fires of intolerance and toss whole groups into them. With the new devices we make bigger and more terrible wars.

However, every atom of new knowledge strengthens the weapon of reason in driving the forces of fear and hate backward. At least it does so when we do not substitute emotion and slogans for reason.

With all this the world has gotten a great deal of trouble. It is obvious that while science is struggling to bring Heaven to earth some men are using its materials in the construction of Hell.

Certainly science is not to blame. Science has stood steady for truth and law. By the advancement of knowledge it has confirmed the certainty of Divine law.

Whatever progress was being made by free men in adapting the forces of science to systems of liberty was sadly disrupted by the Great War and its aftermaths. These privations and the pressures of populations have brought sharper frictions between nations for outlets in trade and possession of raw materials. There are internal conflicts in every country over the division of the productive pie. And in the face of privation and reduction of productivity from the war and depression these conflicts have risen to revolution.

From these dragons' teeth there have sprung new forces of destruction.

PART II

Now when we look around the world what do we see from all of this?

A score of democracies have sunk and armed dictatorships have risen in their place. They proclaim new ideologies of economic security to sanctify personal power. They live by terror and brutality. In Germany under Nazi control we see the most hideous persecution of the Jews since their expulsion from Spain in the middle Ages. Now we see the persecution of the Christian faiths as well.

Equally in Russia under Communistic control we see the persecution of religious faith and the destruction of moral standards on a nationwide scale.

Furthermore we see continued execution of political opponents by the thousands. And worse, the world is now learning the truth that the Russian Government, in its attempt to force state industrialization, pitilessly left millions of its own people to die of starvation when that government had gold with which to have bought them food.

A military autocracy in control of Japan is making a war of aggression upon China as horrible as that of Genghis Khan. For imperialistic and trade purposes the lives of millions of innocent people have already been sacrificed. Insensate barbarism has added the killing of women and children from the air with the latest of scientific inventions. Pestilence and famine will reap a harvest of other millions before it is all ended.

A bitter class war in Spain ruthlessly executes civilians on both sides. Again thousands of women and children have been bombed to death for no military purpose but to create terror.

Perhaps the world has gained something lately, for under the terror of the air popular emotions for war no longer sweep the common people.

But the nations in dumb fright are arming as never before

in history for some unknown conflict. The world is taut with fear. Truly the Four Horsemen of War, Famine, Pestilence and Death are marching. And we can today add one more, to be called Intolerant Ideologies. That, I am sad to say, is the picture of two thirds of the people of the world today.

PART III

Nor are the more peaceful democracies that comprise the remaining third of the people in the world untouched. The fumes from these witches' cauldrons of new ideologies are today drugging our democracies with illusions of economic security. They preach agnosticism. They sap the foundations of morals.

But our democracies have greater moral and social troubles than these imports. We have also all the troubles as well as the benefits from the advance in physical science and technology. We have invented a few social complications of our own. For instance, as we grew from the village shop to mass production we were slow to carry the moral relations between employer and employee from the shop to the factory.

Among our excellent inventions was the corporate form of doing business. We gave it legal personality but we gave it the morals of a machine tool. Only gradually have we got that concept under control.

We set up the admirable idea that people shall be rewarded according to their economic merit. We often forget there are other merits. And as we give reward to the economically successful we lag in opportunity for the economically less competent. We provide wonderful schools but we build cities with slums. And as we build up knowledge and communications we expand the art of intellectual dishonesty and the art of organizing ignorance.

PART IV

From all this and a thousand other causes we see a slackening of individual responsibility and personal conscience all over the world. We see the rise of frenzies based on hate and fear.

And it is useless to rail at the Five Horsemen. It is useless to rail at the advancement of science and invention.

Nor is it worth while to try to assess responsibility for the misbehavior of men. I could spend hours in tracing actions of evil men, of mistaken men, of wars, of treaties of peace that were not peace but vengeance, of hates, fears and emotions in people with all their harvest of ill to humanity. It is to no purpose to engage in the interminable dispute over who is to blame.

I could trace also the pathetic hope of the common people everywhere for peace. But peace today is a fearsome thing based on arms.

Nor do I propose on this occasion to discuss the questions of international relations or peace. I do propose to discuss a question which overrides it all. That is the foundations which must be restored if we are to have either sanity or salvation.

But I do not propose to discuss it with pessimism, for I have no despair. For this is today, I believe, not a recession of civilization. It is only a depression.

After all, the constructive progress of civilization in our democracies is not founded on power over matter. It is founded on the advance of truth, beauty, human brotherhood. It is founded upon respect for the dignity of individual men. And in the large view we have made great progress over two centuries or even over fifty years in the democracies despite temporary retrogression of the world. And I say temporary. For even in the two thirds of the world which have been trampled by the Five Horsemen they have at some time experienced the elements of human liberty. And once that has entered the human soul it will not die. That is if the light of hope be maintained somewhere in the world.

PART V

But what is the deficiency in all nations which produces all this conflict and confusion in the world? What is it in the face of all these increasing powers for human betterment that yet leaves us with all these disasters?

The answer to our default is clearly before us. That is the failure of men to maintain and develop moral standards and spiritual inspirations in pace with their increase in knowledge.

Indeed the world is waiting for some spiritual or ethical control of these material powers and it cannot wait for long. At the present time nothing so concerns the progress of mankind.

Moses announced this need early in human history when he said that men do not live by bread alone. But Moses did not have a glimmer of modern economy and the number of inhibitions that we have to add to his Ten Commandments.

But we need something far more than inhibitions, prohibitions, and laws. We cannot catch an economic force with a policeman. We cannot control hate and fear by treaties. We can govern by morals. Call it moral law if you will.

And it is from the ethical concept of human brotherhood alone that we can secure that co-operation which will control these material forces which the genius of science has created.

In the search for economic heaven some are searching for a formula to end all immoralities. Some think we must find from physical science a new and natural ethic to replace or reinvigorate the moral standards and the spirituality of men. They are searching for some mass action. They pine for discovery of some law of nature like the law of gravity.

Socrates had an idea something like that. But Christ gave the better answer.

Nor do the great men of science advocate some abstract ethic proved by mathematics. They assert everywhere that the answer lays in the individual human spirit.

If we are to find solution we must realize that all this scientific discovery, this power over nature, this advance in abstract knowledge have come from men's minds. These instruments of power are used and directed by individual men. It is from the minds of individual men that come the use for good or evil. And it is the ethical or moral standards in men which will determine whether they will be used for evil or for good.

It is in each individual that there lies the spark of the divinity itself. And it is this spiritual aspiration in action which creates the concepts of morals.

We hear much of social conscience and social justice these days. That is public conscience. I rejoice in their continued rise and understanding. Public conscience is however only the sum of personal conscience.

Certainly the most potent force in society is its ideals. But they are the sum of the spiritual aspirations of individual men. Without that mainspring they are without vitality.

There is a very practical conclusion from all this. We should worry less over public conscience and mass morals and worry more over individual conscience and individual morals. For therein is the only foundation of real moral progress. Public conscience and public ideals will not grow; they will wilt away unless there is the still small voice of personal conscience and personal ideals.

The churchmen on our continent should remember that it was the Church itself which brought these concepts of individual personality and individual conscience to this continent. Our forms of society and their government clothing sprang from these ideas. And today the churchmen should more fully realize that the cornerstone of our religious structure is the inviolability of the unalienable rights which are inherent in individual personality.

All other concepts of society today lead inevitably to agnosticism. For they are born of coercion. And coercion cannot long tolerate any freedom, even freedom of worship.

PART VI

There have been ages of moral confusion before now. You no doubt recollect Jeremiah, Isaiah, Socrates, John the Baptist, Martin Luther, John Calvin, and a hundred others. They were all authorities on the moral depressions of their times.

The world has survived these confusions and men have grown in soul and in safety. But how? Because of some men

who stood solid. They stood not because they knew the solutions to all these confusions, not because they even had the power to find solutions. They stood firm and they held the light of civilization until the furies passed, because they individually held certain positive principles of life, of morals, and spiritual values.

And today it is not alone the staunch individuals who must stand firm. We must hold these verities within some whole nations if the lamp of civilization is to be kept alight.

What are these verities?

Despite the growing complexity of civilization they stand out in simple concepts. They can be expressed as truth, justice, tolerance, mercy and respect for the dignity and personality of the individual man. They can be expressed as sportsmanship, fair play, self-respect and good taste. They can be more inspiringly expressed in the immortal words of Christ on the Mount. In these concepts alone is the answer to the world yearning for control of these growing powers over matter.

PART VII

In world dimensions does war, does conquest stand these tests? Does Fascism or Communism, or intolerance stand these tests?

Does it not all make clear that what this world needs today is to return to sanity, to moral and spiritual re-armament?

In this crisis it is the high mission of the Church throughout the world. It is also the mission of all thinking laymen. And today as never in history it is the common mission of the democratic peoples, for religious faith, morals and democracy are indissolubly allied in the fate of the world.

Saint Paul stated it all to the Ephesians nearly two thousand years ago.

"For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.

"Wherefore take unto you the whole armor of God, that ye

may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand.

"Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth and having on the breastplate of righteousness.

"And your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace.

"Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked.

"And take the helmet of salvation and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God."

Engineers and Public Affairs

*Address delivered to
Annual Alumni Banquet of Stevens Institute of Technology*

NEW YORK CITY

[*February 2, 1939*]

STEVENS holds a high place among all engineers. It was one of the pioneers in converting engineering from an art to a profession. That is building men not only in technology but in cultural understanding. In conversion from apprenticeship to collegiate training it endowed our engineers with ethical as well as technical standing. And it broadened them into a sense of responsibility to the community.

Men never lose their love of the trade or profession to which they have given years of training and years of their lives in service. No doubt I speak with prejudice, but it seems to me that holds more deeply for engineers than all others. With engineers there is the fascination of watching a figment of the imagination emerge through the aid of the sciences to a plan on paper. Then it moves to realization in stone or metal or energy. Then it brings jobs and homes to men. Then it adds to the necessities and comforts of homes. That is the engineer's high privilege among professions.

His great liability is that his works are out in the open where men can see them. He cannot bury his mistakes in the grave. He cannot deny he did it. He cannot change their names and hope people will forget. If his works do not work, he is damned. That is the phantasmagoria that haunts his nights and dogs his

days. He comes from the job at the end of the day resolved to calculate it again. He wakes in the night in a cold sweat and puts something on paper that looks silly in the morning. All day he shivers at the bugs which will inevitably appear to jolt its smooth consummation. And as years go by people forget what engineer did it, even if they ever knew. Usually, they credit it to some fellow who used other people's money to do it with. But the engineer himself looks back at the unending stream of goodness which flows from his successes with satisfactions that few other professions may know. And the verdict of his fellow professionals is the entire accolade he wants.

Doctor Davis suggests that the engineer also performs public functions. All he gets from that is philosophic satisfactions. Most people do not know it, but he is an economic force. He is the person who really corrects monopolies, redistributes national wealth and dismantles national demons. Especially does he serve in devitalizing national demons. As a people we have mostly rejected the personal devil, but we retain demonology by substituting national devils.

For instance, once kerosene oil was the national demon. No one could win an election unless he opposed the villainies that were in it. Then came the engineer with his electric lamp and retired that fraction of the oil demon as a public menace.

At one time the canals were the national demons sucking the blood from the toil of millions. Then came the engineer and made the railroads. In time the sick canals became the object of pity and owners mostly loaded them off on the government. That was the time when capitalists gladly joined the Socialists.

Then for thirty or forty years the railways served in this high capacity of the national demon. It was a sin to say kind words about them. Their defamation was the sure road to election. And the statesmen worked for years to put them under. But long before the statesmen had completed their jobs, the engineer had invented the gas engine and the pipe line. Now the railroads receive pity and solicitude from all. That includes the bondholders. And we may yet see the owners of railways converted to Socialism.

Then rose anthracite coal to a very temporary position as the national demon. Before this supposedly grinding monopoly had served for more than half a dozen elections, the engineer had produced a dozen substitutes, and that demon is now in complete anguish.

Then rose the electric power companies to the high place as the national demon. And they now occupy that hot spot. But many things are happening which should cause the demagogic mind to worry. He may need to hurry up and find a new demon. For instance, only twenty years ago we appeared to have 50 million potential kilowatts of hydroelectric power. According to the politician falling water is manna free from Heaven. He omits to say that somebody has to pay for reservoirs, dynamos and power lines. It is supposedly grabbed and sold to the people by wicked power corporations. But the engineer has come along and reduced the coal consumption needed to make mechanical power from about three and one half pounds per kilowatt hour to one half pound per kilowatt hour. He has thereby turned many hydroelectric powerhouses into rust. And thereby he retires most of the potential manna back to scenery. The scenery lovers can cease to worry, for the engineer has his eye on but few of their possessions any more.

The politician has not discovered this yet and still works away at getting elected upon the prospective joy to the electorate from hydroelectric power. I think if you look about you, you will find that the government is about the only person, who now builds hydroelectric plants. We build them by the impulses of Congress, not by the impulse for low-cost power. It is all good for a few elections yet. And we will waste a few more billions of taxpayers' money to make this manna into power at places where the engineers could make it cheaper with fuel.

Then there is the smaller unit Diesel engine eating into the vitals of the central steam plant. Some day the central power stations may be subject to pity and then the taxpayers will please both the Socialists and the owners by buying them.

I am not saying that these new industries may not need restraint from the government in their youth. I have expounded that necessity for years, more especially as the children of men are disposed to make undue profits from selling paper to the innocent as well as services to the needy. But the engineer is likely to bring the sinners to pity instead of hate before they get too old.

There are other national demons including Wall Street and the bankers. Their fearsome visage has today a distinct cast of sadness. The government is now hijacking their job. It is also on the way to take over their title as a national demon.

And we engineers sometimes have bright economic thoughts which the statesmen are slow to get. Many years ago we announced right out loud that the way to lift the standard of living was to eliminate waste and otherwise reduce the costs of production. We said thereby prices would come down and the people could buy more and employ more people on the job. We said that thereby hours could be shortened and wages increased. A few years later the economists also announced the discovery of this idea. But even with these reinforcements it is apparent that the lawmakers have not yet heard it. At least, they are busy increasing waste and putting costs up by a variety of devices. Thereby prices go up. And people buy less and that throws other people and even themselves out of jobs. Public orators then blame it on "technological" unemployment, with an accusing finger pointed at the engineer. By this route we may yet become a national demon.

In closing let me repeat a statement from a good engineer of just four hundred years ago: He referred to the mining engineers but his general tolerance is warranty for its application to all engineers. "Inasmuch as the chief callings are those of the moneylender, the soldier, the merchant, the farmer, and miner, I say, inasmuch as usury is odious, while the spoil cruelly captured from the possessions of the people innocent of wrong is wicked in the sight of God and man, and inasmuch as the calling of the miner excels in honor and dignity that of

the merchant trading for lucre, while it is not less noble though far more profitable than agriculture, who can fail to realize that mining is a calling of peculiar dignity?"

Those of you who have had experience in both mines and agriculture may amend this to read: "equally unprofitable with agriculture." But be that as it may he was proud of his profession, as are all engineers.

Your Inheritance of Liberty

*Commencement Address delivered
at Lincoln University*

HARROGATE, TENNESSEE

[June 4, 1939]

SOME years ago I marched up, as you will, to receive a diploma. Like many of you I had started from scratch.

But the joy of receiving my diploma was somewhat sidetracked by the sinking realization of a shortage of cash working capital and the necessity of finding an immediate job. Put into economic terms, I was earnestly wishing that some person with a profit motive would allow me to try to earn him a profit.

I did not immediately succeed in impressing any of the profit or loss takers with the high profit potentialities of my diploma. The white-collar possibilities having been eliminated, my first serious entrance into the economic world was by way of a pair of overalls.

But what may interest you is the fact that I found the inhabitants of an economic world of free enterprise were a cheery and helpful lot of folk, who took an enormous interest in helping young people to get a start and get along in life. And you will find that is the case today.

Here at Lincoln University all of you have fought your own way to higher education.

Almost all of you have to earn day by day the food you eat and the clothes you wear. This is the only country in the world where this is possible. And the fact that you are here, earning

your own living and your own education, is an inspiring thing in American life. No one needs think you want sympathy or commiseration. You have a right to pride and even a certain confidence over those whose path is made easy.

You will come from one of our smaller colleges. That is no handicap to you. America is realizing their contribution in building character and making leadership for our nation. It is with hope of encouraging their support that I have undertaken to address a number of such institutions.

A CONFUSED WORLD

You are about to enter a world more confused as to its ideas and its principles of life than has been the case for a long time.

Your president has requested that I speak upon one particular confusion. That is the protection of personal liberty in the changing economic and social pressures. And the preservation of liberty is an appropriate subject to a University dedicated to the memory of Abraham Lincoln.

I am going to assume that with your heritage of red blood there are some conditions you would like to find in the world. I assume you want to be free to speak your own minds, to hold to your own religion. I assume that you want to be free to plan your own lives. You want to be free to undertake your own adventures. You want the rewards of your own efforts. You want the joy of creative work and the battle of competition. You want to do something worth while to prove your own worth. You want the joy of championing justice to the weak and downtrodden. You want the right to tell every evil person where he can go. You want a government and a system that will keep the channels of opportunity open and equal. You willingly accept the one limitation on all such liberty—that you do not injure your neighbors.

That was the American Dream of human emancipation.

If that is the life you want, you will need to think straight and to fight for it.

Broadly you are in the cross rip currents from the contending

forces of three revolutions in ideas which have swept over the world in recent centuries.

The first was that revolution of intellectual, spiritual and personal freedom which finally flowered into the American system of liberty. Out of these freedoms of mind and spirit were born great scientific discoveries, great inventions.

The second revolution was from the tremendous industrial and economic changes which arose with these discoveries and inventions.

The third revolution which now invades the world is a swing back to ancient ideas of compulsion now being revived as new Utopias to end the miseries of the times.

There are other forces in motion but these are enough for a half hour's discussion—and even that but in summary.

THE REVOLUTION OF LIBERTY

The first revolution established your inheritance of liberties. The American system of liberty not alone comprises the intellectual, spiritual and personal liberties which are imbedded in the Constitution. It holds for respect for the dignity of the individual man and woman. It lives by faith in the decency of average human nature.

In building protections to these liberties our forefathers were fearful mostly of the dangers of political power. They built a government of unique checks and balances against personal power. In the youth of our national life these protections to liberty were ample except the delayed action on slavery. During this period of simpler life, economic wrong-doing could be largely dealt with under the Ten Commandments, with appropriate penalties.

THE REVOLUTION FROM SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERY

Fifty years after the establishment of personal liberty came the real application of science. It came in steam power, electricity, and the gas engine. And from this gigantic control of

physical power we have created the huge tools of civilization in production, transportation and communication. And we have steadily built these tools bigger and bigger. Even forty years ago our electrical generators were less than 2000 horsepower. Today we build single machines of 200,000 horsepower. With those small installations it required about 12 pounds of coal to make a unit of electrical power. Today we can make that unit with one half pound of coal. The wholesale price is only 10 per cent of what it was then.

Out of this bigness of tools in industry, we have had need to expand the organisms to supply capital and credit. No individual can buy a 200,000 horsepower generator. It requires the contribution of the savings and the capital from thousands of people. So we have expanded the corporations and all our complex financial machinery.

THE GAINS FROM THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

From the point of view of liberty we both gained and lost by this economic revolution.

With the use of these tools one man can produce ten times or even a thousand times more than one man could produce a hundred years ago.

For the first time in history we were at the threshold of triumph over hunger and want. We had so triumphed in the long climb of mankind toward plenty that we had reached Mount Pisgah, where we looked over the Promised Land of abolished poverty. The work hours of men have been reduced almost equally decade by decade from 84 a week to less than half that. Moreover rivers of sweat have been saved from the backs of men even when they work.

We gained personal freedom by this progress of invention. It has abolished a thousand personal slaveries. The automobile makes us infinitely freer to move about. It has stretched our vision. We see more people, more scenery, more friends, and more life. We are occasionally checked on the adventurous frontiers of freedom by the traffic cop.

The radio has extended the liberty of speech and the means of vituperation. The electric light has relieved us from the slavery of always cleaning oil lamps, scrubbing up candle drips, and everlastingly carrying one or the other of them about. It has freed us from the use of spectacles for a few years longer. By merely pushing a button we are freed from the goblins that lived in dark corners and under the bed. The doctors are now free to peer into the recesses of our insides.

And this vastly increased power over nature has brought us more than economic blessings. Our greater productivity has enabled us to pay for schools, parks, hospitals, pensions, public service, recreation, and a thousand other human services which were impossible before this economic revolution.

The assets of this revolution have vastly over balanced the liabilities but we must also examine the dangers it has brought us.

THE LIABILITIES FROM THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

About sixty years ago the economic revolution began to clash with the fundamentals of liberty.

We learned from bitter experience that these vast tools could be used for purposes of exploitation and oppression. They were sometimes so used. That defeated Liberty itself.

With our exuberance in the making of these great tools there grew in some spots the cynical notion of every man for his economic self and the devil for the hindmost.

Then we came slowly but certainly to the realization that we can no more have economic power without checks and balances than we can have political power without checks and balances. Equally they lead to tyranny.

The significant thing is that we began to abandon that concept of laissez-faire half a century ago. We abandoned it spiritually for its violation of liberty, and practically because we learned that it was the hindmost who threw bricks at the social edifice. We learned that the economic foremost are not always the best nor the hindmost the worst. We learned that the

impulse to production can only be maintained at a high pitch if there is a fair division of the product. We learned that fair division can only be obtained by certain restrictions on the strong and the dominant. We learned that social injustice is the destruction of justice itself.

To correct these evils we began some fifty years ago to experiment with governmental regulation to protect liberty from economic abuse and economic power. Our first major step was the antitrust laws. And we have multiplied these laws for regulation of business, of labor, and economic life every single year since.

Parallel with governmental action there has been real progress in business ethics and business conscience. It gets weak in spots.

And we will require new forms of ethics and government experiment in prevention of abuse so long as our system of liberty will last. For if men remain free of mind and spirit they will generate new scientific discoveries and new ideas. Enterprising citizens will always be inventing new varieties of wickedness.

Still another liability to liberty from this industrial revolution comes from a variety of instabilities that have arisen in this economic system itself. There are the periods of booms and their consequent depressions, with their widespread unemployment and farm losses. There is the possible loss of the job at any time. There are the accidents of family or personal disaster. There is the insecurity of old age. These insecurities all stifle the freedom of the individual spirit and haunt it with fear. The full blossom of liberty requires a reasonable confidence by the individual in his economic security.

And we have been ceaselessly striving and experimenting to increase this individual security.

We have developed a variety of methods to safeguard it. We have created institutions for savings against rainy days. We have developed mutual aid in unemployment, sickness, accident, and death through insurance. We have developed old age pensions. We have built vast hospitals to care for the unfortunate

fortunate. Over long years we have developed collective bargaining contracts for labor. And we have sought to mitigate the fluctuations of boom and slump, with all their trains of destruction and unemployment, by creation of credit structures. We have created relief for the unemployed and the farmers.

We have not successfully reached the causes of insecurity or safeguarded all eventualities and fears. If we are to sustain our system of liberty we will need experiment some more and with more intelligence. But one thing is certain. If we have complete security we shall do it at the cost of all liberty. We must have risk and adventure if we make progress.

THE THIRD REVOLUTION

Your forefathers sought to protect liberty from political power. Your fathers sought to protect it from economic power.

In the midst of these experiments with which we were bringing our economic achievements under control, there arrived a third revolution in the world. It has received great impulses from the miseries of the war and its depressions. People crying out against want and wrong lose faith. A system of liberty is adapted only to peace. It must be suspended in war. We needed peace in which to work out the methods of preserving liberty while holding the great values of the scientific and industrial revolution. While we are struggling with both problems—the problems of liberty itself and the problems of war dislocation—along come these vendors of other systems. They promise individual economic security. They promise happiness without the pains of pursuing it. And it certainly adds to confusion.

To clear what I am about to say I may repeat a commonplace. The operation of all this complex mechanism of economic life is based upon cooperation of men. There must be minute specialization in callings and professions. There must be minute division in articles produced and services given. And these specialized activities must cooperate and exchange with each other if we are to provide food, clothes, houses and comforts in

the modern world of teeming populations. Now this cooperation can be obtained in two ways.

The one is voluntary cooperation in economic life under government as an umpire to see that liberty is not transgressed.

The other is compulsory cooperation under the dictation of government.

These do not seem far apart when stated in words, but they are the whole distance between liberty and no liberty.

Voluntary cooperation proceeds through free men, planning their own lives, choosing their own callings, enjoying the fruits of their own labor, and exchanging them freely with other men. And let me repeat that when I use the term voluntary cooperation in economic life this includes its regulation by government and conscience to prevent exploitation and oppression of labor, consumers and investors. That is essential to protect liberty itself. Its compulsions are limited to men of 111 will and against bad practices.

The driving shaft of voluntary cooperation is the initiative and enterprise of free men, each striving to better his condition. And contrary to some quarters, the motive force behind this initiative and enterprise is not all for profits. Creative spirit, the desire for acclaim, and devotion to service for others all contribute to it.

There is no such thing as the economic man. Man is more emotional than logical. Sentiment often prevails over price.

Compulsory cooperation proceeds akin to military organization. The government plans, directs and commands. Its motive force is coercion of men of good will as well as evil. Its full growth is Socialism or Fascism, National Socialism or Communism. They all have one principle in common compulsory cooperation—and one method—coercion.

Compulsory cooperation in some form is as old as recorded history. We have seen it in slavery, serfdom, guilds, official monopolies, feudalism, and what not. It has lately assumed modern phrases and modern clothes. Today one half of the civilized and semi civilized world has reverted to this basis of life.

Our system of free enterprise was an expression of liberty. It will die with the death of liberty. While it has faults, it has proved to have three superlative values.

It is more productive than any other. It is possible to attain higher standards of living under it than any other. This is being proved before our eyes in Russia, Germany and half a dozen other countries with complete or half-breed compulsory systems.

But of far greater importance than that, these systems of compulsory cooperation cannot exist without suppression of personal liberty. They cannot stand free criticism. That eventually destroys free speech. They cannot stand free organizations. That defeats the church and religion, labor unions and a thousand forms of voluntary cooperation. They cannot have representative self-government. They must have centralization of political power. That means dictatorships. This is no academic statement. It is proved in all history. It is proved in a dozen democracies that have adopted some form of compulsory cooperation in the past 20 years.

The third great quality of our system is that it makes for progress. Human advancement in art, literature, science, industry, and government has thrived luxuriantly only when the mind and spirit of men have been free. It is in the climate of freedom that the great ideas and great scientific discoveries have blossomed. They are blighted and wilted in an atmosphere of coercion, compulsion and fear.

One sad fact emerges in comparing these systems. A system of liberty is the only system with humor. When you eliminate all our jokes on officials, on government or on the system under which we live, it becomes a dreary and jokeless world.

The economic system of liberty is no middle of the road between Communism on the left and Fascism on the right. It is the opposite of both, for it is the opposite of coercion.

Moreover, two economic systems, of voluntary cooperation and compulsory cooperation, cannot be mixed. Voluntary cooperation moves from a delicate mainspring. That mainspring

is the initiative, enterprise and confidence of men. The moment any part of compulsion or coercion is directed at free men their fears rise, their energies slacken, their productivity slows down, and the people suffer. Coercion feeds upon more coercion. Either out of desperation or design, governments apply more and more coercion once they have started. And they demand more and more power over men. Those were the antecedent steps in the enslavement of free men in those dozen nations in 20 years.

THE DANGER TO AMERICA

The great danger to America is not from violent invasion of these systems from abroad. The danger is not from open agitation of Socialism, Communism, or Fascism. The danger is the subtle growth of these compulsory ideas as a means of remedy to war dislocation and depression. The mixture into our system under the subverted phrase "Planned Economy" is already subtly stifling our productivity. And the real danger to America is that from stifling and crippling of voluntary cooperation our production fails. Then a compulsory system becomes inevitable if the people are to live.

CONCLUSION

These are indeed not all of the forces of confusion which have arisen in our midst.

But if we are to dissolve these confusions we have need of much clarifying thought.

It is true we need free speech, free press, free assembly, and all the other freedoms. But we need above all things minds free from ignorance. We need awakened imaginations. We need disciplined reason. Without them there will be no other freedoms.

Nor is cold logic or economic law the whole answer. Our intellectual and spiritual liberties were not founded upon power

over matter. They were founded upon endowments of freedom from the Creator and upon spiritual truth, tolerance, justice and faith. Upon the youth of America will depend their survival on this continent.

These are obtuse and difficult subjects. But they relate to the invisible forces which determine happiness or grief to every cottage. And by their understanding, their solution through statesmanship far above politics, can contentment and security come to all our people—not to the few.

And What Is Liberalism?

*Commencement Address
delivered at Earlham College*

RICHMOND, INDIANA

[June 12, 1939]

DURING the past year I have spoken at a number of smaller colleges. I have done so in the hope of widening attention to their needs. To that hope there are attached faith and especially charity. That concerns your endowment funds. From the difficulties of the time our liberal arts colleges all face unusual financial problems. Truly they merit generous support. They are building character. They are creating a constant stream of leadership in the nation. And the nation needs today every atom of moral and intellectual strength that we can summon.

In those addresses I spoke upon certain confusions of thought. In one case they were confusions and discouragement arising from the assertion that there were no new frontiers for youth. Later I spoke upon the confusion of thought arising from the clash of economic forces with intellectual and spiritual liberty. Today I shall deal with another confusion. There are plenty of them about.

The obvious purpose of education is to clarify thought and dispel ignorance. One mission you have besides earning a living and getting some joy out of life is to battle eternally against confused thinking. There is large and constant employment in this field for all of your spare time.

Today I shall comment on the confusion in our current use

of the terms reactionary, conservative, liberal, and radical. That particular confusion leads to confusion in public thinking and public action.

These terms when used honestly reflect an attitude of mind. They denote particular spots from right to left along the whole spectrum of action and thought. They apply to our views on government, on religion, on art, on literature, on business, or on about anything. We are eternally trying to fit all persons and ideas along this scale from the extreme left to the extreme right. Yet the same person may be reactionary on one subject, conservative on another, liberal on another, and radical on another. Most people are that way.

The confusion begins when we spell these words with capital letters. Then we use them as designations for isms or cults or groups or political species.

The public dangers arise from their distortion and misuse in politics. These terms were first used as names of political groups in Great Britain. We imported them from a political system foreign to our own. They do not fit well in America. For instance, in the British scale the Tories, or in modern terms the Reactionaries, stood frankly for government by birth. Even our primitive minds do not favor a monarchy in Washington. In any event confusion is compounded by the fact that the same people are conservative on one political subject and liberal on another, depending on who says what.

We have no definitely organized political groups under the names of Tories, Conservatives, Liberals, or Radicals. However, you can elect yourself to any one of these groups if you say it often enough and loud enough. We use these terms politically mostly for slogans and oratory. They are used for eulogy and defamation. If you do not like somebody you consign him to the complexion most hated by your listener. These terms are used as refuges from ignorance or intellectual dishonesty. They are set up as pigeonholes for men and groups to imply they are righteous, stingy, public-spirited, opposed to public interest, or generally sinful. They are dum dum words

to assassinate men and then to plant bitter onions on their graves.

And these words vary in popularity with the swing of public mind. No one openly confesses to belonging to either the reactionary or radical end of the spectrum. A few years ago it brought votes to be called a conservative. At another time it brought votes to be called a liberal. Many who climb on the band wagon of these titles are hitchhiking to get their feet into the public trough. By any true test today many so-called liberals are really reactionary. Many so-called conservatives are really radical. Even the Communists stoutly assert that they are liberals. Recently the New Deal seems to be toying with the term conservative.

A further confusion arises from those who look at this spectrum of thought end on, or those who take a worm's eye view. Especially do things get out of perspective if the eye becomes more emotional than objective. For instance, the liberal as viewed by a radical is not a liberal at all. He is a reactionary. Likewise the liberal looms up as a wild radical in the view of the reactionary. And there is another cause of confusion. The left wing is always more noisy and more vociferous than the right wing. So that, judged by sound, the proportions get distorted.

Moreover, in the popular use of these terms as political swear words they are given a high color of tainted money. The liberal mind is defined in the aspect of copious spending. Although the dictionary supports that particular connotation, yet it seems limited to spending one's own money. To the left wing the conservative is a person trying to hold on to his savings out of greed. To the right wing the radicals are those trying to divide other people's savings by raids on the taxpayer. According to the terms of the left, the reactionaries are money changers.

It would be a service to public thinking and intellectual honesty if the Bureau of Standards would get out a definition of these terms as applied to governmental action. The dictionaries are all out of date in view of new meanings that are being attached to old words by the politicians.

PURE LIBERALISM

However, to get a start at real definition let us begin with the term liberal because it was in that faith that this country started. That word sprang from the word liberty. It was the inscription on the naming banner of rebellion against all systems of compulsion.

We in America have developed our own system of liberty. In European terms, we have our own ideology. We have seldom tried to define it. We have lived and breathed it.

To safeguard their ideas of liberty and liberalism our forebears provided a framework of representative government. They insisted upon a government of laws and not of men. They set up a division of powers that would prevent personal government. They insisted upon an economic system of free enterprise regulated to prevent abuse. They imbedded the Bill of Rights in the Constitution itself.

But the American system of liberty includes more in its philosophy than free speech, free press, and free assembly. It means more than freedom from search, seizure, slavery, and trial by jury.

That philosophy comprises more than the insistence that intellectual and spiritual liberty can exist only if men are to plan their own lives and reap the reward of their own character and effort.

True American liberalism is more than all that. It is an attitude of mind. Liberalism holds for the dignity of the individual man and woman. It insists that liberty lives by faith in the decency of average human nature. It seeks to create free men. It seeks all freedom to men that does not transgress the liberty of others. It rejects tyranny, whether bureaucratic or economic. Its purpose is not to extend bureaucracy but to set bounds to it. It holds to freedom of enterprise but that exploitation or monopoly is economic tyranny. It holds against every form of coercion of men of good will. It seeks this freedom in the confident belief that without such freedom the

pursuit of other blessings is in vain. Real liberalism believes that truth, tolerance, mercy and human brotherhood are the roads to human understanding. It insists that all human advancement comes alone from free minds and free spirit. It keeps an open mind to any experiment that would promote those ends. It is born of liberty and cleaving to it makes the development of the highest form of human society. That is pure liberalism. There are many impurities about.

Political conservatism within the American system of Liberty is simply an attitude of mind in respect to the organization of liberalism. It is not opposed to the tenets of true liberalism. It wants to conserve them. It proposes to go more slowly in experiments which may affect the public welfare.

Reaction in the American system is undoubtedly the search for some sort of privilege, particularly an old and tried one.

Radicalism within the American system is general disgust with all that is, and its purpose is to overturn something in order to start new again. And it is a paradox that the radicals are ultimately reactionary, for they strive to revert to some age-old system of coercion of men, out of which men have fought for liberty.

THE ADULTERANTS OF LIBERALISM

We are always confusing thought by assuming that different social systems can be fitted on the same scale. As a matter of fact Fascism, Communism, and true Liberalism all have their own separate spectrums, each with a left wing and a right wing. These systems have no relation to each other. They are opposing ideologies.

Pure Liberalism is no middle ground between the reaction of Fascism and the radicalism of Communism. It is opposed to both. Liberalism is a system of freedom. These two other ideologies are systems of coercion.

Being conservative or liberal in the work of human destruction has little relation to being conservative or liberal in the task of building human freedom.

The difference may be stated: Shall coercion be limited to criminals and men of ill will who would encroach upon the freedom of others? Or shall centralized personal government undertake to plan the lives of upright men and coerce and compel them to comply?

There is no common ground between free men and coerced men, either in the middle or on the edges.

WHAT ARE YOU TO DO ABOUT IT?

If you accept my definitions you can amuse yourselves by surveying political proposals during the past twenty years in comparison with the words which men use. You will find the terms Liberal or Liberalism have been distorted and polluted. They have lost their true meaning. They have often been kidnapped by politicians and competitive ideologies. They have been perverted and soiled by men who really mean the opposite of what they propose.

However, there are certain tests that you can apply for yourselves in the confused words of today. They can be tested in the silence of your own thoughts.

MY RECOMMENDATION TO YOU

I recommend to you that:

If an open mind, free to search for the truth and apply it in government is liberal, then you should be liberal.

If belief in open opportunity and equal opportunity to exert your character and abilities is conservative, then you should be conservative.

If opposition to those things which abuse and limit equal opportunity, such as privilege, monopolies, exploitation, or oppression, whether in business or in government, is radical, then you should be a radical.

If an economic system of free enterprise regulated to prevent abuse is reactionary, then you should be a reactionary.

If opposition to dictated economic life, whether of the Socialist

Fascist, or Planned Economy pattern, is reactionary, then you should be a reactionary.

If belief in the virtues of self-reliance, thrift, government economy, a balanced budget, a stable currency, fidelity of government to its obligations is conservative, then you should be a conservative.

If holding to the Bill of Rights, with its safeguards in independence of the courts and the balance of power, is Tory, then you should be a Tory.

If demand that we have a government of laws and not of bureaucrats is conservative, then you should be a conservative.

If humane action to eliminate such abominations as slum squalor, child labor, and sweated labor, to give greater protection from unemployment and old age is radical, then you should be a radical.

If the use of all the powers of the government to relieve our ' people from hunger and cold in calamity is radical, then you should again be a radical.

If morals and intellectual honesty in public life are idealistic, then you should be an idealist.

And when you have been all these different things you will be one who wants to conserve liberty. For in this multitudinous hail of perverted words you are standing for free men. Paradoxical as it seems, these days that is true liberalism.

If you add to that a belief in the decency of Americans, a conception of spiritual prosperity, and a faith in the greatness of America, you will have lifted these beliefs into the realms of constructive idealism. You will be an American.

The Hoover Library on War, Revolution and Peace

Statement to the Trustees
[August 30, 1939]

SOON after the outbreak of the World War I happened to read some remarks by President Andrew D. White of Cornell on the difficulty he experienced in the study of the French Revolution because of the disappearance of contemporaneous documents and fugitive literature. The position I held at that time required regular visits to several belligerent countries. It seemed to me to offer a unique opportunity to collect and preserve such records. I therefore established centers for such collections in each country and enlisted the aid of others who believed in the importance of this work. After the Armistice I was able to have these records sent from the various countries to Stanford University.

On my return to the United States to participate in the war administration, I was able to expand further these collections on the American side and to secure material from the many agencies of the Allied governments.

Immediately after the Armistice I returned to Europe to become the executive head of the Supreme Economic Council. This body had to do with the economic rehabilitation of Europe in general and of the former enemy countries in particular. Our duty was to further the rehabilitation of railroads and canals, the opening of ports and the reduction of blockade, to supervise the proper utilization of coal in Central Europe, and to foster the restoration of trade relations generally. It included

the provisioning of 150,000,000 people in some twenty-three countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the establishment of refuges and special relief for 10,000,000 children. We furnished expert advisers on finance, railroads, and other public activities in some twelve new governments. For the administration of this work I recruited from the American Army about 1,500 officers (previously civilians) and established them in all parts of Europe.

All this brought a very much enlarged opportunity for collecting historical material. I was able to interest all these men in the job. I was also able to enlist the heads of governments, many of their Cabinet officers, and officials of some twenty-five countries in furnishing us with copies of their own records of the war and especially their interdepartmental and public documents bearing on economic and social as well as military questions. We also secured complete files of periodicals and newspapers issued in the belligerent countries during the war.

In order to organize this work effectively, I requested President Ray Lyman Wilbur to permit Professor Ephraim Douglass Adams of the Stanford University Department of History to come to Europe and take charge of the work. I placed under him some fifteen professors and students of history whom I had recruited out of the American Army, and Professor Adams assigned to them the detailed tasks involved in the different countries.

We established co-operation in Paris with the various delegations to the Peace Conference and secured from them their publications. Documents of the Supreme Council and of other Allied bodies were also acquired. We also established relations with the war propaganda agencies of the Allied and enemy governments, securing from them material which they had used during the war. These records, together with the entire files of the Commission for Relief in Belgium, and those of the various agencies which were established during the Armistice, including the Supreme Economic Council, the American Relief Administration, the Coal Mission, and the various railway, blockade and other technical commissions,

Were all dispatched to the University. I might mention here an incidental contribution of great importance, in that the United States Shipping Board and some of the private shipping agencies gave free transportation of this enormous amount of material to San Francisco.

Soon after the war I became impressed with the fact that the most important aspect of the century was perhaps not the war, as much as the consequences of the war, that is, the social, economic, and political currents which had sprung from it. The rise of democracy in Europe after the war and its collapse into Communism, Fascism, and National Socialism has contributed to make one of the greatest human crises in history. Therefore, instead of limiting the new Library to purely war material, I determined that the work of collecting should be continued and should be directed especially to securing records of these movements. In the building up of these collections the Library has had the cooperation of many governments and a great many individuals, and it now bids fair to possess one of the largest collections on Communism, Fascism, and National Socialism, outside of the countries in which these movements originated.

The assembling of the collections since the war has been carried on by the late Professor E. D. Adams and his successor as Chairman of Directors, Professor Ralph H. Lutz, by the late Professor Frank A. Golder, and the other Directors, and by the Librarian of the Hoover Library. This work has been greatly aided by the advice and cooperation of other members of the Stanford University faculty and by many other scholars and other friends in the United States and abroad. The Library has received many gifts which have added to the collections and has received cash funds amounting to several hundred thousand dollars for purchases and research. It has also received funds for endowment of something over \$500,000. It recently received gifts of \$600,000 to erect a building in which its great wealth of material may be made more easily available to students.

I am confident we have established an institution of primary

value to the American people. This period of worldwide experimentation in social, economic and political institutions will be of importance for a thousand years to come. The work of collection will not be complete until these social and economic currents have run their course and have reached again some common elements of stability.

NOTE: The Library contains some eight million items, being the largest collection upon the Great War and its consequences, and the political, economic, and social movements in the world.

A Boy's World

Dedication of the Madison Square Boys' Club

NEW YORK CITY

[April 29, 1940]

THIS is the dedication of the new Madison Square Boys' Club. This club is dedicated to the pavement boys of New York. This occasion also marks a tribute to Albert Hines for his 28 years of service to the less fortunate boys of New York. That is, they were less fortunate before they came into association with Mr. Hines but after that they are among the privileged boys of the world.

The \$450,000 cost of this club is the gift of the Hayden Foundation. That Foundation is the gift of almost his entire fortune by Charles Hayden for the service of boys and young men. This club with its accommodations for 3000 boys is part of the network of more than 300 clubs in American cities which are joined in the National Association of Boys' Clubs of which Mr. Hall is the inspiring President and I am chairman. That is the remote excuse for my being here tonight. And I could have no greater pride in this occasion if I had built the club myself.

And lest I forget it, let me remind you now that the club budget runs on despite the new building.

BOYS IN GENERAL

Therefore this is an occasion of boys. Most of what we say will apply to girls.

There are two jobs for boys. One is being a boy. The other is growing up to be a man. And beclouding these jobs are the interferences, the responsibilities, the helpfulness and the annoyances to him of his elders.

The department of being a boy is or should be one of unadulterated glee. That is the time of life when joy can rise to rapture. It never comes again, for long. Here is a whole new world to be discovered over again. All the corners must be explored over again and much of it taken apart. Here are adventures and conquests. Highly important things must be undertaken. And here also is the dynamic energy firmly determined to do something about it. And this energy has its own self-starter.

Moreover, beyond the world of realities this boy should have range in the land of Make-Believe if he is to expand his mind and soul. And his is also a land of competition and combat where he can prove his prowess and skill.

The department of growing up to be a man is filled with grief and trouble. It seriously interferes with the sheer joy of being a boy. There are problems of proper food and being made to eat it. There is keeping clean including behind the ears. There is constant checkup that his adventures do not trouble the police. There is moral and spiritual guidance—and there is going to school. There is the question of occupation and a job. And besides these irritating interferences in joy by elders, there are a lot of disciplines, directions, urgings, pleadings, and comforting of his woes. And over all these, elders owe him an affection and friendship.

Much of this is the concern of parents. But there are certain national obligations and certain public relations to it all.

NATIONAL OBLIGATIONS

The national obligations to boys spring from three great ideals which were part of the American Dream from the beginning.

The first was that men should be free.

The second was that this should be a country free of classes.

The third was that the welfare of those who were less fortunate was a concern of the community.

And that freedom includes a freedom for boys, with certain restrictions which I have hinted at.

By a classless America our forefathers meant far more than a sociological expression. There were to be no stratifications in life that handicapped the rise of any boy from the bottom to the top. The human particles should move freely in the social solution. The founding fathers had mostly in mind hereditary titles or a landed aristocracy. They prohibited titles in the Constitution and they went farther and prohibited the entailing of land to prevent it being kept perpetually in one family. This idea of a fluid classless country was unique in the world. It was the point at which our social structure departed from all others. It was a new foundation under individual liberty. And it is vital to the future of every boy.

Our forefathers believed that if this great ideal were held to, then every individual boy could rise as far as his ambition, character and ability could take him. They knew that these sparks of ability, character and ambition lie in the boys of the log cabin equally with the city home. By this opening of all the windows of hope they assured that skill and leadership for the nation would be refreshed from all the people instead of a privileged group. It would give to the nation the whole strength of the race. Every generation would bring new genius and new leadership for its own problems.

They knew that the sum of the achievements of all the striving, working, free individuals would make the highest total of national progress.

Soon after the founding of the Republic, it became evident that if education was to be reserved to those who had money to pay for it, classlessness and its equality of opportunity would fail. Then Americans built universal and free education, extending from the primary school to the University. They hoped this would be the final guarantee of personal liberty, of equal opportunity to every boy and girl. They hoped

that with this ladder they had guaranteed the progress of the nation by the full genius and character of the people in action.

But the industrial revolution with its intense specialization in callings, the building of great cities, and their slums, and the growth of the agricultural slums also have introduced some new obstructions and new barriers to this free rise of some part of our youngsters.

And this brings the third ideal into action. That is our responsibility to the less fortunate, that they may have their chance. Furthermore that misfortune shall not during their lifetime drop them by the roadside of poverty, discouragement or crime.

However, the failures in our ideals are marginal problems. Handicaps do not lie against more than 20 per cent of our youngsters. But even that failure mars the whole system. There is not always equal opportunity to those who cannot pay for highly specialized education. There is not equal opportunity for pavement boys.

The Boys' Club is dedicated to the broad purpose of giving the boy a fair chance in his job of growing up to be a man. Here there is restoration of equal opportunity with all the other boys. In fact here are certain advantages over many of them. For here there is systematic training in sports which build not only bodies and spunk but morals. Indeed in sportsmanship is the second greatest moral code of our race. Herein is cooperation with one's fellows, give-and-take recognition of others' rights and constructive joy.

And here is the machinery for his job of just being a boy. And here is also a correction which our educational system cannot well fill. That is the discovery of his occupational bent. And the encouragement to him to follow it, and train himself in skill with it and the interest in finding him a job at it.

Today new social ideas and new ideologies challenge our American Dream. These rivals say ours has wholly broken down. The Communist proposes class government by the workers. The Fascist proposes class government by elite selected by the government. Neither of them proposes men

shall be free. They denounce freedom as a weakness and corruption. They insist that our social foundations are exhausted. That, like Feudalism from which our fathers fled to America, liberty must now be abandoned.

Despite all their cant and their philosophies it grows clearer every day that the only hope of humanity lies in these American ideals. I believe most Americans still hold to them. If we do not, we are lost. Our job today is to restore their full working. And the Madison Square Boys' Club is an agency given to this ideal.

PART IV

ADDRESSES UPON WAR RELIEF

The Spirit of Poland

*Address delivered on
Pulaski Memorial Day*

NEW YORK

[*October 11 1939*]

THE spirit of a great race does not die from oppression. Poland is not dead. Poland will rise again. There is more to nations than their soil, their cities, their wealth, and even their governments. There is a soul in a great people. That soul is forged in the instincts of their race, their traditions, their heroic struggles, their heroic men, and their genius in art, music, and literature. It is steeled in their sufferings. They may be occupied by armies, they may be oppressed; they may be enslaved, they may be impoverished. But the soul of a great people cannot be crushed. From that their national life and their independence will rise again and again from the ashes of their homes.

The Polish people more than a thousand years ago settled on the plains between the two great military races of Germany and Russia. They have been overrun time and again. They have been partitioned time and again. But just as often they have fought for their freedom. And the indomitable spirit of the race has time and again led them out of oppression into independence.

I saw something of Poland even before the Great War. Then she was under the heel of Russia, Austria, and Germany. Her commerce and industry were restricted. Her people were exploited. A depressing poverty was her fate. It was the most

backward part of all Europe. She held her religious faith only by struggle. Freedom of speech, of press, or even language was repressed. Poles were not allowed in even trivial offices of government. They were driven by ruthless military organization of foreigners. Poland's only intellectual outlet was in art and literature and music. Into these she poured her genius generously to the whole world. Her exiled sons fought for the freedom of others. As did Pulaski and Kosciusko. Their service in our fight for independence has had a never-ending gratitude from our people.

Soon after the Armistice in 1918 I represented the American Government in such cooperation as we were able to give to the distinguished leaders of Poland in the erection of the new Polish state. I have had the honor of intimate association with Pilsudski, with Paderewski, and with their many other able leaders in the rebuilding of an independent government.

I knew as few Americans could know the gigantic task which faced those men and the Polish people twenty years ago. To the thousand tasks of suppressed progress imposed by the one hundred and fifty years of oppression were added four years of incessant trampling and destruction as the battleground between German and Russian armies.

On my return home from that mission in 1920 I had the honor to address a Polish gathering on the hopes of Poland. In describing that scene at the time of the Armistice, I said: The occupying armies of Russia, Germany and Austria had been dissolved into marauding bands. Here was a country of thirty millions of people in a state of total anarchy. It lay in the midst of a famine such that the children had ceased to play upon the streets. Thousands of people were dying daily from a raging typhus. Hundreds of thousands of homes had been destroyed. The people were living in the open fields. A part of the nation was in the terrible grip of new Bolshevik invasion. The population was incapable of paying taxes. They were without the means of preserving order or repelling invasion. Their transportation and communications, already backward, were largely destroyed, and had almost ceased to

function. The people themselves were disintegrated and divided by one hundred and fifty years of partition. They were without even the rudimentary experience on which to erect the routine of administrative government.

They had to undertake to build the whole structure of government with scarcely a man accustomed to its tasks.

Yet out of the genius of their own race they quickly erected the whole mechanism of government. An army of half a million was trained and drilled. The Bolsheviks were driven back to their own lines. A general election was undertaken under universal franchise. A parliament was set up. Local government was established. They made anew the basis of law and of justice. A free school system was created. Universities and colleges were opened. Railways and highways were quickly rebuilt. The mines were opened.

The typhus epidemic was stamped out. Food supplies were organized—and in half a year the children were again playing in the streets.

Again a little more than a year ago I revisited Poland at the invitation of the Polish Government and as the guest of the Polish people. I was glad to accept this invitation, as I had desired to witness the great advance in the Polish nation under these twenty years of freedom. Here after twenty years was a nation transformed, regenerated. Slowly perhaps in our terms, the standards of living were improving. New homes, factories, city buildings were raised in every city. Transportation and communication were advancing. The universities had trained the specialists for a nation. Education had become universal. The spirit of a people was daily finding expression in high accomplishment. And in these twenty years the Polish nation under freedom had outdistanced in progress all of the one hundred and fifty years of her previous oppression. That in itself is proof of the undying character and spirit of the Polish nation.

And again today Poland is plunged into the depths by the clash of the same forces. But Poland will not die.

Our immediate task is to do what we can to alleviate the lot

of the suffering and the homeless. For that a temporary organization has been created to do what it can. With them are leading Americans of Polish descent. That body merits your generous support.

We have the faith that some day a new Poland will rise again. We know the freedom and independence of no great people can be destroyed. Oppression is one of the forces which regenerates the oppressed and destroys the oppressor. No matter what may be signed on papers called peace, there can be no permanent stability and no permanent peace to either Germany or Russia so long as oppression of a great and independent race continues. We know that a people who have fought for a thousand years, who have lost and won again, will not die.

Relief of Finland

*Address delivered at
Madison Square Garden*

NEW YORK CITY

[December 20, 1939]

THE story of Finland is a simple story. But that story rises today to high heroism in the history of mankind. No matter what may happen the soul of such a people cannot be crushed.

Finland is a little country, carved from the bleak forests of the Far North, scarcely the size of Montana, with but four millions of people.

Yet Finland is a great nation. A nation is great not by its wealth or by its square miles. It is great by the character of its people. It is great by their industry, their education, their art, music—and their courage. It is great by their moral and spiritual standards. Greatness lies in their devotion to ideals of peace and liberty. All these measures of greatness can be expressed in one word—Finland.

For twelve hundred years the Finns have lived in their beloved northland. During these twelve hundred years they have been conquered and dominated time and again. But just as often their eternal courage and their determination for freedom have regained for them their independence. And even when overrun by other nations their rugged character has held to a great measure of the rights of free men.

Finland is not a rich country. Yet the Finns have won from the forests a standard of living for a whole people almost without poverty. But they have little reserve for emergency.

They are dependent upon imports for much of their food. Their exchange is largely the products of their forests.

Now they have been barbarously attacked. Their ships have been driven from the seas. They are making heroic defense against appalling hordes of savages. I have long dreaded the day of war and the use of bombing airplanes against women and children. Today we see their grim result in all its naked tragedy. Demonic rain of fire and iron from the skies has killed women and children. Its terrors have compelled the evacuation of most of the civilian population from the towns and cities. Hundreds of thousands of women and children have been driven from their homes in the middle of northern winter.

And now came the news that these hundreds of thousands of evacuated women and children and old men must be moved from the eastern side of Finland over to the western side in order that they may have more safety. Unless you have seen the moving of vast numbers of refugees over threatened railways and roads, your imagination cannot rise to the suffering that comes. Already some of them have begun to reach Sweden and Norway, and they are appealing to us for help.

At the moment there is no actual shortage of food in Finland. But the thousands of destitute need funds to buy it. They need shelter. They need bedding. The sea blockade and the destruction of their commerce will bring famine later on.

Today we ask the American people for help. We ask it that we may show the sympathy that lies within every American heart. We ask it that we may save human life and prevent suffering.

Just twenty-one years ago this month the people of Finland had thrown off the Bolshevik yoke and established themselves as a free Republic. A few days after they had proclaimed their freedom their delegation reached Paris, where I represented the American government in these matters. Three stoical men of these northland woods came to my office. In simple and direct terms they presented to me the plight of their people. It was a story of destroyed crops, of plundered and burned

granaries, of stagnated imports, people eating bread made from a mixture of the bark of trees, a heartbreaking death roll already amongst the weak and the children. They wanted food for a starving people. They knew the whole world was short of food and of ships to carry it.

Their earnestness was such that I replied at once that we would divert certain cargoes of food into their ports. I said it would begin to arrive in about ten days. I suggested that they could instruct their people to release all the reserves of food they had, to be eaten in the meantime. They wanted to know if I was sure that it would arrive. I assured them the ships were already on the sea for other purposes, but would be diverted at once. It is seldom that these men of the North ever show emotion. They broke then.

Often enough great emotional periods move into a relief of humor. Some few minutes after they had left they returned. They wanted to know how much it would cost. They said they were not sure that they had money enough. I explained that I did not know what the precise cost would be, but that if they could not pay, my authority from the American people was to supply it anyway. They said: "We will pay. Our people will work and pay." I explained that they could take their time to pay over years if they wished. But I added further that the American people as an act of goodwill had authorized me to provide for their children without cost. And thus there arose two relief operations in Finland. The supplying of breadstuff's during the next eight months until their harvests were restored. For that the Finns obligated themselves to pay some twenty-five millions. In settlement we greatly reduced the total. And despite their present tragedy, like the North men that they are, they paid every installment—one of them a week ago.

The other operation was the feeding of the Finnish children. That represented the generosity and the goodwill of the American people. We undertook the restoration of health to a million of famine debilitated children in Finland through the supply of food, shelter, and care. And for those millions no

charge was ever made. And that was done under the volunteer administration of Finnish women. And their efficiency and their devotion are not exceeded in any race in the world.

And may I say parenthetically that America undertook the rehabilitation of children in the same manner over twenty other nations, including Russia and Germany?

And the Finns have not forgotten. Sixteen months ago I was in Finland, the invited guest of the Finnish nation. Of the many incidents of that short visit one remains as an indelible imprint that cannot be erased by time. An elderly farmer came to the hotel, stopping me on the steps, to explain that he had come some 200 miles, that he had brought for me a present; that he had had a family of nine children; that they had all grown to manhood and womanhood, strong in mind and in body; that they owed it to the American people; that during that dreadful time the children had embroidered an American flour sack with woolen yarns of their own making. He wished for me to have it. That flour sack was embroidered with the American flag.

Just two weeks ago I received a message from old friends in Finland, wondering if it would be possible that America could come to their aid again. They asked if I would help. Their Prime Minister confirmed that wish. I inquired of the American Red Cross what activities they could undertake for the Finnish people. They informed me they would be glad to supply medicine and hospital supplies, that they could collect garments through their chapters, but that the responsibilities for the greater burden of general relief measures were beyond their field. I have therefore organized this appeal to the American people. We have enlisted in its administration and its sponsorship thousands of men and women of every political faith, every religion, and every race. It includes men and women of every rank in American life—labor, farmers, employers. It includes my old colleagues in European relief who are doing the daily toil of administration.

The Prime Minister of Finland has created a special commission of leading Finnish men and women to administer the

great problem of relief. We have already remitted the first hundred thousand dollars. We are co-operating with the Red Cross. Their beneficent service should be supported.

In a long experience I have never seen such a response of goodwill. The press of the United States took the major burden of opening this fund in their columns, and there have flowed into them literally hundreds of thousands of subscriptions. And there is among them a wealth of small subscriptions which evidence the sympathy of the United States. But do not think we are not anxious to have the large subscriptions. We are. And the bigger the better.

The magnificent action of the press has saved us the expense of elaborate organization. And may I add that other supporters have undertaken to pay all of any other expense of our national appeal? Therefore, 100 cents of every dollar goes to the Finns.

For reasons that reach to the whole future of human liberty, America must not join in this European war. That involves considerations which it is not our place here to debate. But the American people can give their help to the destitute. It can lighten their road of despair.

I fully realize the pressing needs of many of our own people. I am in other quarters asking for aid to the oppressed Polish people as well. I would not wish any contributions to this fund for Finland to lessen the support of all these other needs, both at home and abroad. But in this time of our sorrow and sympathy for the plight of Finland, America should also make some sacrifices for them. Let our hearts not be hardened. Let our hands not be withheld.

And one concluding word. The forces of primitive savagery have been unloosened upon the world. The Finns are the victims of it today. Every decent person in the world is praying to God tonight that these brave people shall yet be saved from this tide. And the world today witnesses one of those heroic stands for freedom of men that comes but few times in the centuries. It is a star illuminating the No Man's Land of civilization. Its glow will light the minds of men and give hope to liberty for centuries to come.

Extracts from Addresses on Finnish Relief

December 7, 1939:

AMERICA has a duty to do its part in the relief of the hideous suffering of the Finnish people. Our people should have an outlet in which to express their individual and practical sympathy. I have consented to organize a nationwide Finnish Relief Fund for this purpose.

I appeal to the American people for its support. Finland is not a rich country. The people have little reserve for emergency. They are making a heroic defense. Air attacks have compelled the evacuation of civilians from their towns and cities. Hundreds of thousands of women and children have been driven from their homes in the middle of northern winter. Many are already, and more will be, refugees outside of their own country. Many are destitute. Others are without adequate shelter, clothing, and food. This Fund is for the purpose of serving these broad needs.

The American Red Cross has appealed for funds to furnish medicines, hospital supplies, and many garments will be provided through their chapters. They should be supported. The two funds will cooperate fully.

I fully realize the present needs of many of our own people, and also the needs of the Polish people as well, the Committee of which I am a member. I would not wish any contributions to this Fund for Finland to lessen the support of all these needs.

But in this time of our sorrow and sympathy for the plight of Finland, America should also make sacrifices for them.

Owing to the urgency of the matter, I have asked an unusual service of the newspapers of the country. That they should sponsor the Fund in their localities. That they should accept and acknowledge contributions through their columns. I hope that the people in each locality will cooperate with and aid their paper.

A nationwide sponsorship is also being constituted for general conduct of the Fund. My former colleagues in Belgian Relief have volunteered to undertake the work of administration under the leadership of Mr. Edgar Rickard with an office at the Graybar Building, New York, N. Y. Emergency supplies can be obtained in Norway and Sweden pending shipment from the United States. By the aid of the press and of the voluntary service of these experienced men, we can move quickly and avoid any consequential overhead expenses.

I hope those who can afford it will contribute generously. Contributions no matter how small are the evidence of our sympathy.

February 20, 1940:

Some twelve different organizations have arisen which are appealing for various forms of relief for Finland. They have naturally come into being in response to appeals from Finland for aid in different fields. They are real expressions of material sympathy.

It is therefore desirable both to clarify the relief situation somewhat and to indicate a service that will in some cases simplify and in other cases assist charity organization in the United States.

First, as to the scope of the Finnish Relief Fund. This organization was established to help Finland in all emergencies that can be compassed by public charity. The immediate emergency is destitution and the care of refugees arising from the evacuation of several hundred thousand civilians, mostly women and children, from the towns and the fighting areas. New emergencies constantly arise. One is now coming from the

absorption of hospital space by the wounded from the front and the inability to find hospital quarters for the refugees. A statement by former Prime Minister Cajander, who is Chairman of the Finnish Government Commission controlling civilian questions, was issued to the press, stating that 90 per cent of its committee support is now coming from the Finnish Relief Fund, and he is asking for further aid.

The Finnish Relief Fund operation has a further effect beyond direct aid to the civil population. During this acute emergency we remit cash to the Cajander Committee by paying dollars to the credit of the Finnish Government agency in New York. The Finnish Government in turn hands over to the Cajander Committee corresponding amounts of Finnish currency. There is therefore a treble service from this Fund. First, it contributes to the direct aid of the civilian population. Second, it relieves the Finnish Government of part of the burdens of the civil population, and thus allows it to concentrate that much of their resources on the front. And third, it adds to the dollar exchange of the Finnish Government, which can be used by that government for purchases in the United States of any kind.

Special funds have been provided for the incidental expenses of the Finnish Relief Fund. Thus we are able to remit through the Government of Finland one hundred cents on the dollar of all public donations. The fund has proved to be a "People's Fund." Over 1,100,000 individuals have now contributed to the total of about \$1,900,000.

March 14, 1940:

I deeply appreciate your greeting.

This meeting was arranged some weeks ago to present the needs of the Finnish Relief Fund in its help to Finland. At that time America was giving tangible expression to our sympathy and our indignation by furnishing support to the 800,000 destitute old men, women and children drawn from the towns and cities in midwinter, by barbaric air attacks.

This is the first time in the civilized history of war that attack was made day by day on women and children to force their heroic men fighting on the front to subjection. That was a return to sheer barbarism. It was not the conduct of brave men. During the past three months this fund furnished 80 per cent of the foreign contributed resources of the Finnish Government Commission which had been given the duty to protect and save them.

With the making of peace the problem changes. Yesterday morning I received the following cable from the President of Finland.

We are deeply grateful to the Finnish Relief Fund for the humanitarian aid which we have received during the Finnish War for the relief of the distressed. I hope with all my heart that you will continue to alleviate the lot of those suffering on account of the war for the population of the ceded areas will be moving into the territory of the republic.

We have signed a compulsory peace yet we hope that our struggle for the right has gained us the sympathy of the civilized world and trust that we shall not be left to our own resources in the work of reconstruction.

This morning I received this telegram from former Premier Aimo Cajander, who is the head of the Finnish Government Commission charged with the responsibility for the destitute:

Having defended our independence Finland after persistent fight as an outpost of western civilization and ideals and justice has been compelled to conclude a hard peace. The activity of the Finnish Relief Fund becomes even more acute as the number of evacuated has increased and the misery great among the families of men killed by battle and air raids. The mortality is dreadful among the evacuated children. Until this situation is settled assistance is imperative more so than ever before. I address to you a pressing appeal for continued help.

No decent nation can refuse these appeals for help.

The scene in Finland today is one of smoky ruins. Thousands of destroyed homes and villages. Thousands of destitute men, women and children. Thousands of sick and wounded.

Now come thousands forced from their land and homes, which they have held for a thousand years. Their economic life is disorganized.

I replied to the President of Finland that my colleagues and I would present their appeal to the American people. That help is needed over the next ninety days. It is urgent. The question now is what are you and I going to do about it?

And there are questions not alone of human suffering. There are questions which affect the whole defense of freedom and liberty in the world.

The Finns have been subjected to an unspeakable aggression by Communists. With the knowledge that they faced probable doom they fought not alone for themselves but for all free men. They have become a symbol to the whole world. Not in centuries have we seen such a heroic stand of free men against such odds.

Here a star rose which lights the No Man's Land of civilization. Its glow will light the minds of men and women and give hope to liberty for a thousand years to come.

The Joint Distribution Committee Campaign of 1940

*Address delivered at
Campaign Dinner of the Jewish Welfare fund*

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

[February 11, 1940]

IT AFFORDS me a great deal of pleasure to assist in the inauguration of your campaign for Jewish Relief in a stricken world.

As some of you know, this is not by any means my first contact with the Joint Distribution Committee and those who comprise this self-sacrificing group. My memory goes back many years to the cooperation which I have enjoyed with the founders of this effort who are no longer in our midst. I refer to Felix Warburg, who was for many years the chairman of the J.D.C., and to my old friend Julius Rosenwald. These men began the work in which you are engaged, and their spirit still inspires it.

Twenty years ago we came out of the Great War. We were filled with hope that the world had learned a great lesson. We hoped that mankind would set its face to build a better and more secure civilization. We underestimated the malevolent forces of imperialism, of economic desperation, of hate, of atheism, of racialism and intolerance that had been loosened by the war. From these dragons' teeth have sprung the allied Communist and Nazi flood with their religious persecutions.

That persecution has not been limited to Jews alone—terrible as that had been—it has extended to hundreds of millions of Christians. And from these persecutions hundred of thousands were already refugees, homeless in the world.

Today we see two thirds of the people in the world again engaged in senseless destruction. But little of the world outside of the Western Hemisphere is free from the war or its terrors. And there lie with us certain manifest responsibilities if we could contribute to the saving of mankind from the loss of all hope.

It is my purpose to discuss only what we may do in the humanitarian field. For unless that great spiritual lamp is kept alight hopes of the future are dark indeed. America can and must exert itself to these purposes. And I may digress to the observation that unless we keep out of the war, unless we refuse to exhaust our economic and moral strength in war, we will be of little service in rebuilding of the world when this war will have exhausted itself.

These problems have become more tragic even than in the last war. More and more, war becomes a war of soldiers against civilians. The major strategies are directed to driving nations into submission by starvation, by terror, and by attack from the air. And still another and new attack upon civilians has emerged. That is the forcible eviction of peoples in blocks of millions from their homes. The stated purpose is to make racial groups fit into political boundaries. That is, to destroy minorities.

In addition to the destruction of Poland we now see the Polish people being dumped in millions into crowded areas where they are incapable of self-support, and Jewish people being concentrated into a narrow and bleak reservation. And from all these forces of persecution and eviction we find hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions more, of refugees from their homelands. They are not alone Jews—in fact, there are millions of Germans, Poles, Russians, Finns, Czechs, in refuge all over the world.

In these problems the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee

has a large part to perform. It is no exaggeration to say that the work of the J.D.C. over this last quarter of a century has placed it in the front rank of the great relief agencies of the world. You have already served in a thousand emergencies. You have experience. You have developed men who can lead. You have developed the technology of effective relief. And when emergencies have not been pressing during these years you have devoted yourselves to long-range constructive service to the Jewish people.

And it is particularly appropriate that I should refer to the nonsectarian attitude in which this Jewish organization so often wrought in times of emergencies. After the Great War when we were engaged in fighting famine in Europe, the J.D.C. not only did its own full part but it generously contributed to the funds for other groups. Where there were hundreds of thousands of Jews, there were also millions of Christians. I would recall that to the organizations which I administered at that time the J.D.C. generously contributed over \$8,000,000 for use among all groups.

That and your other services in hundreds of millions have not been wasted, despite the seeming destruction of it now going on. In the course of these twenty-five years of constructive help, during which the populations of eastern Europe were aided to become self-supporting, there were imbued in them a spirit of courage and resourcefulness which will be a reserve for recovery from this dreadful disaster. Their standards have been raised. They have trained themselves to self-support.

I would have you feel, therefore, as I do emphatically, that the hundreds of millions of dollars which the generous Jewish people have invested during the past quarter century, have not gone to waste. Millions of lives were saved, and, despite the destruction of institutions and the imprisonment and assassination of your workers, the essential structure remains and can be revived for further service.

Happily the leaders of the Joint Distribution Committee enjoy the confidence of the American public and of the enlightened

lightened governments of the world. They enjoy the good will of the other powerful sectarian and constructive relief agencies. This is well, for there are before us gigantic problems. While the J.D.C. is commonly conceived of for emergency relief, it has also been a long-range planning organization. In this field of human engineering it has rendered a large and notable service. It has colonized hundreds of thousands of people. In this planning we must begin to consider what will be done after this war.

Whatever else may result from the present war, I have no belief that we will not again have to meet the forces of economic desperation, of hate and intolerance. They will not be lessened, whatever the words of the new peace treaties may be. For these barbaric forces are not lessened by war. We shall have an impoverished world. More than ever before it will be a world of pressures of our crowded populations. We shall have millions of evicted people, of people seeking migration, seeking refuge where they can live in freedom and hope. Somewhere in the world a sanctuary must be found where these refugees of a dozen races may have a chance.

Already in search for this area the J.D.C. has taken a large part. That search has not been on behalf of Jews alone but for millions more of other races.

For one hundred and fifty years America was this refuge and this sanctuary. The leaders of the J.D.C. are agreed that America cannot open its doors in the face of our own unemployment and suffering. Sanctuary must be found elsewhere.

In these discussions, of which I have had some part, it has been felt that somewhere there must be opened a place in temperate climate wherein 10,000,000 white men, women and children can live and build a civilization. The tentative hope seems to be in the high lands of Central Africa. But before that hope can be held out the whole world needs be searched anew with a breadth of vision and expertness never before contemplated for such a human necessity. Sadly the war suspended these beneficent negotiations. Herein may lay the greatest service the J.D.C. has had to undertake. It is

perhaps a dream. But a world without dreams is a world without hope.

But whatever these great problems may be, we have an immediate call. That is aid to those who are today evicted, the homeless, the starving and the sick. In that task of compassion the J.D.C. has a great part and a great responsibility. I wish you Godspeed.

Relief for Poland

*Address delivered at the Madison Square Garden
Mass-Meeting for Polish Relief under the
auspices of the Polish National Council of New York*

[March 12, 1940]

My PART tonight is to discuss an immediate task. And I have an important announcement to make a little later on.

We are faced today with the necessity of immediate food supplies to millions of people in Poland. I am anxious at this critical time that the problems of this relief should be understood by you to whom it is so vital. In order that so gigantic a task should succeed certain foundations must be laid.

Whatever can be done by public charity must be done. But before the next year is over, relief on a huge scale must be found. Hundreds of thousands of tons of foodstuffs must be imported. It may cost as much as \$50,000,000. Charity can be of great aid for immediate action. But the backbone of financial strength for the long pull can be secured only by the cooperation of governments.

First: An organization must be set up which has the ability to buy or receive large amounts of foodstuffs from different countries. It must ship in full cargoes. It must have warehouses in Danzig, Warsaw, Krakow, and Lublin into which continuous supplies can be poured and from which distribution can be made.

Second: That organization must have agreement from the

British and French governments to pass its cargo ships through the blockade.

Third: It must have agreement with the German government that these ships will be free from submarine and other attack, and that facilities will be given for inland transportation and freedom from tariffs and taxes.

Fourth: There must be provision for financial support by the British and French governments and the exiled Polish government. It should have an appropriation of food supplies from our American surplus by the American government.

Fifth: In order to assure the Allied governments and all donors of funds that these foodstuffs shall be used solely for the civil populations and that there will be just distribution among the population of every race and faith in Poland, there must be supervision by an American staff of the distribution.

Sixth: There can be only one food shipping and distributing agency. That is required by the nature of the problem. That agency must receive and act for all the different charitable and governmental agencies.

The first great step of these negotiations with the Allied governments on one hand and the German government on the other has been under way for some months. That is, agreements providing for immunity of ships from attack and American supervision of distribution. I am happy to say that within the last twenty-four hours these steps have been advanced at least far enough to enable preliminary shipments to be made.

The second great step is of course government support in finance and supplies. We are in hopes that the American government will join in this great task. Members of the Congress have proposed that our government appropriate a part of our surplus of farm products to this great humane effort.

In the meantime whatever can be provided by charity will be a saving of human life and suffering.

CAN AMERICA AFFORD RELIEF TO FOREIGN SUFFERING?

There is one phase of the relief of suffering abroad to which I wish to refer tonight. Propaganda has been put in motion in

the country protesting against American aid to people outside our own borders. Some of it is most genuine anxiety that there shall be no deprivation of our own unemployed. Much of it is based on the proper thought that charity begins at home.

A considerable part of it, however, is organized Communistic and other subversive propaganda. So far as the Communistic propaganda is concerned, the kind of people who kill women and children by dropping bombs on them every day would naturally wish to starve them also.

I do wish, however, to answer the question on its merits to those who are sincerely anxious on this question. At the outset I may say that I have repeatedly stated that we do not want a single contribution or any action by our government that would deprive our fellow countrymen of a single need. Americans can never allow our fellow citizens to go hungry and cold.

There are many answers that might be given to the idea that we should give nothing to those dying of starvation or hardship in Europe. The most important answer is that we are sending commodities produced by our own labor and farmers, and that we in our country have a surplus of every single commodity or of every single thing that these people abroad are in need of. Or we could produce such a surplus any time it was called for. As a God-fearing nation or as a liberty loving nation we have no moral right to stand by with these large surpluses of food and see people starve wholesale who are helpless to help themselves.

Ours is not a country destitute of the materials out of which our people can live, as are these other countries. If all the needs of our people were met tomorrow we could still produce a surplus of the things that would save the lives of these people abroad. Such destitution as we have in America comes from faulty economic organization, from which flow large unemployment and difficulties to our farmers. That indeed must be remedied. The debate on how that can be done would take me quickly into politics, and there should be no politics in relief of human suffering, whether at home or abroad.

In the meantime we have effective agencies in every part of

the United States which can and will prevent hunger and cold to our people. These agencies are supported by the taxpayer and by scores of charitable agencies. There should be no restrictions on any legitimate expenditure to this end. We are indeed today spending nearly four billion dollars per annum for relief of destitution in the United States. The sums which we are talking about to save people abroad from actual death or starvation and suffering are infinitesimal compared to this four billion. I presume that all the need we are looking for the next six months could be covered with one-half of one per cent of that which we are spending on our own unemployment. America is still rich enough to stretch another one-half per cent. And I do believe that the American people earnestly wish that we as a Christian people and as a free people should not stand by with a surplus of food and see other people in the world die for the want of it.

I am connected with another fund and I have been proud in that fund that we have received subscriptions from over two million people in fewer amounts than five dollars. Moreover that fund has been vigorously supported by American labor from one end of the country to the other. The eternal expression of charity from workers towards workers has not been dimmed, for those who have the least know most of what suffering means. And it is in their giving that brings real sacrifice. It is from these workers that comes real sympathy for hardship.

Other critics have said we shall be violating neutrality if we enter into these projects. The immediate answer is that if we enter we do so with the approval by agreement of both sides in this Great War. But there is a greater answer. When the greatest Teacher of mankind discussed the action of the Samaritan he did not mention the question of neutrality. Neither in fact nor in spirit is the saving of human life in suffering a violation of neutrality. Failure to do so would be a violation to a civilization of decency in which our hopes must rest.

Index

- A. A. A., 147
"Abundant life," 16, 17, 44, 54
Abuse, 41, 199; prevention of, 76, 211; regulation of, 32, 33, 64
Adams, Ephraim Douglas, 216
Africa, 104, 244
Aggressions, 90, 141, 185
Aggressor, 98; determination of, Roosevelt on, 95, 96
Aggressor nations, 86, 87, 88, 93, 94, 98, 106, 112, 126
Agnosticism, 186, 189; *see also* Atheism; Religion
Agricola, 195
Agricultural Credit Banks, 62
Agriculture, 67; distressed, 32, 74; and engineering, 196; European, 151; postwar, 148, 152; relief of, 40, 65; and unemployment, 70; in war, 137, 147, 154; *see also* Farm; Farmers
Air attack, 88, 100, 119, 123, 130, 170, 232, 248; on civilians, 97, 130, 131, 133, 134, 185, 242; on Finland, 238; *see also* Women and children, war on
Aircraft, 105, 108; *see also* Armament; Defense, national; Planes
Air power, American, 94
Albania, 70
Allied Governments, records of, 215
Alphabet agencies, 28
Ambassador, to Russia, 170
America, change in foreign policies, 98; defense of liberty, 101; as European arbiter, 96, 112, 113, 151; future of, 114
America and Russia: Communist interference, 165, 166, 170; famine appeal, 162; recognition, 158 ff.; trade, 165
America and war: effect of war on, 122, 142, 153, 154, 170, 178; participation in, 88, 89, 90, 100, 116, 125, 128, 139, 153, 157, 173, 235; peace service, 115, 128, 150, 157; war-relief, 103, 156, 157, 179
America and world war, 117, 120, 136; Fascism in, 89, 127; propaganda of, 124
American Dream, 222
American government and Poland, 247
American relief, 175, 228; post-war, 233
American Relief Administration, 216
American System, 32, 80, 148, 199; pattern for, 81, 168; *see also* free enterprise
American War Council, 117, 146
Americanism, 30
Anthracite coal, 194
Anti-trust laws, 41, 202
Apocalypse, 172
Appropriations, lump sum, 28; *see also* Spending
Arbitration, 105; America and, 122
Aristocracy, 221; Russian, 160
Armament, 94, 95, 96, 97, 109, 138, 153, 185; and civilians, 132; offensive and defensive, 88, 97, 98; sale of, 95
Armament, 105; limitation of, 114; abandonment of, 137; Hoover administration, 117; Hoover proposals of, 136; naval, 152; world conferences on, 13, 136; *see also* Army and Navy; Defense, national
Armies, food consumption of, 174
Armistice Day (1929), speech on, 136
Army, American, 106, 216
Army and Navy, 94, 107, 156
Art, 2, 5; and literature, 209
Asia, 91, 104
Atheism, 160, 170, 172, 173, 241; *see also* Agnosticism
Agnosticism
Atlanta Constitution, 29
Atlantic and Pacific, 91, 96, 101
Attorney-General, New Deal, 12
Austria, 120, 150, 228
Automobiles, 73, 200

Babylon, 18
Balance of power, 22, 97, 106; American, 211; European, 89, 105, 113, 120, 138, 141, 149, 150; Roosevelt on, 126
Balfour note, 123
Balkan States, 175
Ballot, free, 6, 9, 29, 31, 35
Baltimore Sun, 15, 30, 106
Bank depositors' panic, 49
Bank deposits, 73
Bank reform, 35, 48, 62
Bankers, as demons, 195
Bankruptcy, 155
Banks: Agricultural Credit, 62; Home Loan, 62; European, 154
Barbarism, 134, 137

- Barkley, Senator, 9
 Battleships, 132; *see also* Armament; Army and Navy
 Beethoven, 145
 Belgium, 123, 175
 Belshazzar, Feast of, 18
 Benes, President, 87
 Berlin-Rome-Moscow axis, 44
 Bill of Rights, 211; *see also* Free speech and free press
 Blockade, food ship immunity, 134
 Blockades, food, 114, 130, 173, 174; and Belgian Relief Commission, 137; and Poland, 247; postwar, 148, 215; present war, 123, 176, 232; World War, 119
 Bolsheviks, 160, 161, 232; in Germany, 176; in Poland, 228, 229
 Bombing of civilians, *see* Air-attack
 Bonus March, 167
 Booms and slumps, 48, 202
 Boundaries, European, 89, 113, 149
 Boycotts, 96, 98, 135
 Boys' Clubs, National Association of, 219
 Bridges and elections, 31
 British, 90, 96, 100, 109, 110, 120, 121, 131, 140, 149, 152, 153; Communism, 162; food supply of, 132; Hoover in, 116, 117; inheritance from, 140; national debt, 47; and Poland, 247; political labels, 209; recovery of, 47, 72; sale of arms, 108
 Browder, Earl, 58, 168
 Budget, balanced, 14, 34, 35, 63, 71, 81; promise of, 25; peace-time, 65
 Budgets, edited, 66
 Bulgaria, 150
 Bullitt, Ambassador William, 106
 Bund, German, 107, 127
 Bureau of Standards, 210
 Bureaucracy, 28, 60, 76, 211
 Business, 8, 35, 41, 56, 76, 202, 209; attacks on, 52, 77; compared with British, 47; dictation to, 18, 43, 44, 75; regulation of, 61, 74, 76, 202
 Business, big, 32, 53, 79
 Business, small, 77
 Cabinet, Hoover in, 117
 Cajander, Aimo, Prime Minister of Finland, 239
 California, 112
 Calvin, John, 189
 Campaign, 1932, 12, 13; Congressional, 1938, 6
 Campaign funds, 11; Democratic, 12
 Canada, trade with, 165
 Canals, 193
 Capital, 53, 92; and credit, 73, 200
 Capitalistic system, 168
 Capitalists, 193
 Cavour, 145
 Censorship, 144
 Chamber of Commerce, 41, 168
 Charity, 246, 247; of labor, 249
 Charles I, 18, 28
Charlotte Observer, 30
 Checks and balances, 60, 199, 201
 Chicago, 10
 Child health, European, 233-234
 Child labor, 33, 55, 62, 73
 Children, American, 40; debt upon, 32; European, relief of, 216; evacuees, 239; Finnish, 233; postwar, 130; *see* Women and children, war on
 China, 100, 131, 172, 185
 Christian ethics, 4, 20
 Christianity, in Germany, 107; *see also* Agnosticism; Atheism; Religion
 Christians, 172; Jewish relief of, 243; persecution of, 185, 242
 Church, 189, 190; *see also* Religion
 Cities, bombing of, 100
 Civil Service, 8, 23; in Democratic platforms, 25; merit system, 5, 6, 19, 28; New Deal, 25, Republican, 62
 Civil Service Commission, 5
 Civilians, 88; air-attack on, 131, 132; *see also* Women and children; Finnish, 232, 236, 237; Polish, 247; protection of, 135; and rationing, 174; and revolutions, 177; starvation of, 97; war on, 119, 130, 133 ff., 170, 176, 185, 242
 Civilization, 103, 187, 190; recession in, 183
 Class conflict, 22, 59> 80
 Class-government, ideological, 222
 Class hate, 7, 17, 34, 35, 36, 77, 170, 177
 Classlessness, 221
 Coal Commission, 216
 Coercion, 156, 204, 205, 206, 211; economic, 41, 43, 56; and planned economy, 33; systems of, 212
 Colby, Bainbridge, 161
 Collective bargaining, *see* Labor
 Collectivism, 169; creeping, 22, 31, 35, 36; New Deal, 60
 Colleges, smaller, 198, 208
 Colonies, European, 140
 Commission for Relief in Belgium, files of, 216
 Committee members, New Deal, 5
 Communications, 186; Europeans, 148, 216; growth of, 142, 184
 Communism, 90, 107, 127, 155, 168, 172, 204, 205, 206, 212, 217, 241
 Communism: in America, 86, 99, 159; class government of, 222; and dictators, 121; and Finland, 240; and free speech, 167; and labor, 166; as liberals, 210; and morals, 190;

- postwar, 175; press of, 168; propaganda, 91, 247
 Communist front, New Deal support by, 60, 168
 Communist party, 164; in America, 167
 Communist Russia, 110, 161, 163, 185; *see also*
 Russia
 Comintern, 164
 Competition, 74, 198; for boys, 220; government,
 32, 35
 Conferences, World, 13, 92, 127, 136, 152
 Confidence, 32, 36, 56, 67; economic effect, 49,
 53, 74, 206; production, 78; restoration of, 36,
 54, 80
 Congress, 24, 26, 64, 98, 100, 167; Democratic
 (1930-32), 5; domination of, 36, 44; and foreign
 affairs, 94, 96; independence of, 23, 34, 50, 57,
 59, 65; "liberals" in, 169; mail of, 16; and
 Planned Economy, 32; and powerhouses, 194;
 see also Legislatures
 Congressional election, 1934, 8, 21; investigation,
 campaign funds, 12
 Congressmen, independent, 37, 57; and
 Constitution, 26
 Conscience: personal, 186; public, 14, 15, 189;
 social, *see* Social conscience
 Conservation, 62
 Conservative party, 21, 60
 Conservatives, 3, 18, 209, 210, 212
 Constitution, 50, 56, 199; and Bill of Rights, 211;
 and Congressmen, 26; New Deal disregarded,
 28, 221; and planned economy, 33; and
 Republicans, 48; Massachusetts, 52
 Construction, private, 53
 Constructive program: for government reform, 19,
 35; for foreign policies, 95, 127-8, 156, 171,
 177-8; for liberals, 213 ff.; for recovery, 56, 80;
 for Republican party, 35, 64, 66, 67; social, 55
 Consumers, 204
 Co-operation, 188, 203
 Copperheads, 17
 Cornell, 215
 Corporations, 61, 184, 186, 200; and campaign
 funds, 11, 12
 Corrupt Practices Act, 11, 19
 Corruption, political, 10, 50; in relief, 55, 63; *see*
 also Morals; Political
 Cotton, 46, 97, 136; cotton gin, 72
 Court of International Justice, 105
 Courts, 58; attempt on, 44, 46; independence, 50,
 59; refusal of, 12; *see also* Supreme Court
 Cracow, 246
 Creator, rights from, 207
 Credit, 35, 203; bank, 46; European, 131;
 government management of, 32, 43, 51, 76, 147;
 inflation of, 154; printing press, 44; in war, 143,
 145, 149, 154
 Credit, government (1932), 49, 62
 Criticism, 41, 205
 Currency: devaluation, 12, 18, 25, 52; Finnish,
 238; gold, 35, 63; managed, 43, 76; and trade,
 92; *see also* Devaluation; Monetary policies
 Czar, 120, 160
 Czechoslovakia, 87, 104, 150, 151, 172, 242

 Dante, 145
 Danzig, 246
 Davis, Harvey N., 193
 Death, Horseman of, 186
 Death-rate in war, 118, 119, 134
 Debate, 26, 64, 107
 Debt, national, 22, 32, 34, 43, 46, 47, 54, 59, 65,
 102, 147; accounting of, 14; future, 3; result of,
 52, 77; Roosevelt on, 18; and war, 113; on
 youth, 33
 Debt, national, British, 47
 Debt, public and private, 66
 Debts, war, *see* War debts
 Defamation, 39, 86, 168, 209
 Defense, national, 59, 94, 95, 101, 107, 132, 158;
 payment for, 94; *see also* Preparedness
 Defense, national, European, 96
 Defense weapons, 88
 Deficits, 43, 56, 155; effect of, 34, 77; European,
 151; obscuring of, 13, 14, 65; for relief, 70; and
 war, 147
 Demagogues, 4, 151, 194
 Demobilization, 102
 Democracies, 105; and communism, 86, 98, 155;
 and morals, 190
 Democracies, European, 70, 86 ff., 99, 100, 108,
 112, 125, 186; recovery, 22, 45, 47; wreck of,
 18, 23, 41, 75, 148, 151, 185, 205
 Democracy, 10, 27; and Communism, 159, 163;
 and debate, 27; and debt, 34, 151; postwar, 150,
 217; preservation of, 89, 125, 126; in war, 101,
 113, 144, 146
 Democratic Party, 29, 31, 62; progress under, 83;
 purge of, 6
 Demons, national, 193, 195
 Denmark, 172, 175
 Depression, 69, 203, 206; government aid in, 62;
 Hoover work in, 7, 62, 63, 102; New Deal, 46;
 recessions, 48; recovery from, 2, 43; Roosevelt
 on, 48; from war, 148, 154, 178; world, 47, 70,
 72
 Despotism, 85; brutality of, 93; Czarist, 160; out of
 poverty, 86
 Despots, 144

- Devaluation, 34, 44, 49, 52, 147; *see also*
 Currency; Monetary policies
- Dictation, Statist, 76; *see also* Government
 dictation
- Dictator, President as, 30, 67
- Dictators, European, 10, 41, 120, 126; postwar,
 114, 121, 125; quarantining of, 94, 106; war on,
 99
- Dictatorship: path to, 5; philosophy of, 4, 20; rise
 of, 93, 102, 151, 185; in war, 102, 113, 146, 147
- Dictatorships, 15, 101, 106, 140, 203; and Western
 Hemisphere, 109
- Dies Committee, 162, 164
- Diesel engines, 194
- Diffusion of goods, 42, 76
- Disarmament, 178; *see also* Armament limitation
- Dishonesty, intellectual, 209
- Doctors, 76
- Dollar, value of, 51
- Douglas, Stephen, 80
- Duma, 160
- Durable goods, 78
- Economic Conferences, 92, 127, 132
- Economic consequences of New Deal, 3, 22, 39; of
 Planned Economy, 32
- Economic co-operation, world, 95, 105, 115, 127,
 138; under Hoover, 117
- Economic: degeneration, 5; destruction after new
 war, 114; freedom, 67, 101, 168; law, 48, 188;
 life, confusion in, 59; middle class, 42, 50, 76;
 power, 60, 114, 201, 203; pressures, 92, 97, 103,
 105, 151; progress (social), 68; rewards, 168,
 196; Royalists, 10, 17; sanctions, 96, 97, 98;
 schools of thought, 65; security, *see* Security,
 economic; tyranny, 211
- Economic system, American, 40, 43; making over
 of, 75; and plenty, 71; Roosevelt, 43; in war,
 113-14
- Economic systems, contrasted, 41, 43, 76, 204,
 205; European, 41, 150; mixture of, 32 ff., 36,
 43, 47, 49, 57, 60, 150; totalitarian, 111
- Economists, 49, 195
- Economy, free, 89
- Economy, Government, 25, 67
- Economy, Planned, *see* Planned economy
- Education, 55, 141; Finnish, 197, 208, 219
- Edward I, 27
- Elections: Congressional, 53, 65; government
 control of, 44; interference in, 5, 31; politics in,
 29, 31; and relief, 8, 55; subsidies in, 59
- Electricity, 73, 200, 201; power, 53, 194
- Embargoes, 96, 98
- Emergency, 14, 27, 32
- Employers, 17, 36, 167, 186; and Labor Board, 52
- Endowment funds for colleges, 208
- Ends and means, 20, 50
- Enemies, feeding of, 130, 175, 177
- Engineers, address to, 192 ff.
- England, *see* British
- Enterprise, free, *see* Free enterprise
- Enterprise: new, 44, 53, 64, 74; private, 25, 147;
 reproductive, 66; *see* Free enterprise; Initiative
 and enterprise
- Estonia, 150, 165
- Ethiopia, 172
- Europe, 89, 113, 149; American service to, 173;
 culture of, 140; government credit, 151; Hoover
 experience, 11, 117, 160, 234; leaders of, 117,
 141, 216; postwar co-operation of, 152; racial
 problems, 140; shocks from, 154; *see also*
 Dictators; Armament; Relief; War
- Evacuation, 131, 242; Finnish, 239-40; *see also*
 Civilians; Refugees; Women and children
- Experiments, 65, 212
- Exploitation and oppression, 41, 74, 168, 201, 204,
 211
- Exports, to Russia, 166
- Faith, destruction of, 172; *see also* Confidence;
 Religion
- Famine, 172, 177, 186; Finland, 232; Poland, 228;
 postwar, 117, 119, 170, 175-6, 185, 243;
 Russian, 162, 185
- Famine-relief, Communist, 162
- Farley, Postmaster General, 11, 12
- Farmers, 55, 75, 76, 234; dictation to, 18, 41, 44;
 European relief, 248; foreign, 70; relief of, 35,
 55, 56, 57, 70, 81, 203; Russian, 166; tariff, 45;
 and war, 137, 145, 154, 174, 178
- Farms, 38, 56, 77, 202; markets, 57, 62, 174;
 prices, 3, 22, 46; *see also* Agriculture
- Fascism, 52, 54, 86, 107, 147, 155, 172, 204, 205,
 206, 217; in America, 89, 99; class government,
 222; Communism, 159; morals, 190; New Deal
 as, 43; in South America, 91; and vigilantes,
 159; in war, 102, 113, 146
- Fascists, 15, 127, 146
- Fear, 67, 184, 186; economic effect of, 49, 50, 74,
 79; world, 85, 93
- Federal Reserve System, 62, 154
- "Fellow-travelers," 162, 164, 167
- Feudalism, 17, 150, 204, 223
- Finance, war, 96, 147, 216
- Financial structure, European, 154
- Financial system, weakness in, 42, 43 Finland, 150,
 172, 231; appeal from, 234; attack on, 163, 179;
 child health, 233-4, independence of 233:

- postwar, 238; relief of, 69, 231, 242
 Finnish Government Commission, 238, 239
 Finnish Relief Fund, 236, 237, 238, 249
 Finns, 166
 Fodder, 174
 Food: enemy countries, 130, 175, 177; Finland, 232; Poland, 246; rationing, 174, 175; relief, World War, 117, 175; ships, immunity of, 134, 136; supplies, 87, 88, 97, 135, 152, 174; in war, 96, 130, 132, 149, 175; World War, 117, 137; *see also* Famine
 Food Administration, 117, 146
 Forefathers, 211, 221
 Foreign market, 154
 Foreign policies, 65, 104, 142, 158; change in, 97, 108; debate on, 114; anti-war, 127-8; New Deal, 94, 106, 123, 163 ff.; program for, 156; traditional, 95, 106
 Foreign relations and Communism, 170
 Fort Knox, 44
 Four Horsemen, 172, 186
 France, 96, 100, 108, 109, 110, 116-17, 120, 121, 131, 149, 157; alliances of, 90; food supply, 132; inheritance from, 140; New Deal in, 22, 45; and Russia, in; sympathy for, 140
 French: government and Poland, 247; kings, 18; Revolution, 142, 215
 Free enterprise, 32, 36, 41, 42, 43, 56, 63, 168, 197, 211; destruction, 22, 54; interference, 77, 151; New Deal on, 49; and recovery, 47, 48, 57; strength, 53; unemployment, 71; and war, 89, 102, 113, 114
 Free enterprise, American system, *see* Economic systems, mixed
 Free enterprise, European, 150
 Free Men, 29, 34, 99, 127, 212; *see also* Liberty
 Free speech, 41, 107, 127; and free press, 146, 150, 167; and assembly, 168, 206, 211, 228; and worship, 198
 Freedom, 20, 36, 67, 200, 207 (*see also* Liberty); American, 211, 221; European, 179; Finnish, 239
 Frey, John, 166
 "Friends of Soviet Russia," 162
 Frontiers, 73, 81, 208

 Gadarene swine, 141, 170
 Gangster governments, 111
 Genghis Khan, 185
 George, Senator Walter, 30 ff.
 George III, 18
 Georgia, 9
 German Empire, 116, 117, 120, 121, 146
 Germans: in America, 176; inheritance from, 140; refugees, 242; Sudeten, 87; and war, 178
 Germany: and World War, 131; democracy, 113, 150; food for, 130, 176; reparations, 151; and Wilson, 121
 Germany, Nazi, 15, 87, 100, 109, 110, 111, 117, 155, 162, 170, 172; economic life, 42, 205; parliament, 29; persecution in, 107, 185; and Poland, 227, 247; recognition of, 170; *see also* Nazism
 Glass, Senator, 13
 Goethe, 145
 Gold: buried, 44, 49; currency, 12, 35, 63; Russian, 166
 Golder, Frank A., 217
 Good-neighbor policy, 17, 45, 97, 164
 Government: in business, 35; centralized, 18, 33; departments, 16; dependence on, 35, 50; in depression, 62; dictation, 32, 41, 43, 44, 169, 204; employees, 5, 28; *see also* Civil Service; Political appointees; and labor war, 44 (*see also* Labor); of laws, 21, 52, 168, 211; representative, 21, 33, 39, 64, 161, 168, 211; social obligations of, 33; as umpire, 32, 76, 204; and unemployment, 76; *see also* Budget; Credit; Debt, national; Defense, national; Economic systems; Foreign policies; Loans; Local; Morals; New Deal; Personal; Political; Recovery; Spending
 Governor of Pennsylvania, 10
 Governors, 50, 51, 59, 64
 Grain, collapse of, 46
 Granary, ever normal, 45
 Great Britain, *see* Britain
 Greece, 150
 Greed, national, 19
 Green, William, 166
 Guilds, 204

 Hague Tribunal, 103
 Hatch, Senator, 9
 Hate, 16, 19, 105, 160, 170, 172, 176, 184, 241; in America, 4, 22, 59; European, 140, 149, 187; in war, 124, 144, 177, 178; *see also* Class hate
 Hayden Foundation, 219
 Hines, Albert, 219
 Hitler, Adolf, 18, 29, 141
 Hitler-Stalin pact, 155, 164
 Holland, 175
 Home Loan Banks, 62
 Homes, 40, 53, 78
 Honor, financial, 12; in government, 15, 16
 Hoover, Herbert: and banking reform, 62; in Cabinet, 117; and Congress, 24; engineer, 160; Europe, 116, 117, 160, 234;

- 234; foreign policies, 117; job-hunting, 197; and labor, 51; and Peace Treaty, 117, 121; on Russian recognition, 161; war experience of, 93, 116, 120, 128, 174; war sympathies of, 125
- Hoover, Herbert, Relief: depression, 7, 62, 63, 102; World War, 128, 174; postwar, 117, 233; Finnish, 234, 236; Polish, 229, 230
- Hoover War Library, 124, 215
- Hopkins, Harry, 7, 8, 9
- Hospitals, 201, 202; ships, 134; supplies, 234
- Hours of labor, *see* Labor, hours of
- Housing, 33, 36, 73, 79
- Hull, Secretary, 96
- Humanitarianism, 33, 55, 61, 64, 65; cost of, 55; and economics, 68; and New Deal, 63; in war, 128, 133; postwar, 100, 115, 135, 138
- Humor, 205
- Hungary, 150
- Hunger, 7, 63, 200; marches, 167; revolution from 177
- Hypocrisy, political, 17
- Idealism, American, 109, 149
- Ideals, 224
- Ideologies, 85, 86, 99, 111, 156, 212, 222; intolerant, 186; peace between, 86; penetration of, 98; wars of, 107, 109, 155
- Ideologists, 151
- Ignorance, 206
- Ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed, 32, 36, 63, 68
- Immigration, 62
- Immorality, political, 19; *see also* Morals
- Immunity of food ships, 134, 136, 247
- Imperialism, 85, 110, 140, 160, 170, 172, 241
- Income, national, 66, 72; British, 72
- Indemnities, 133, 153
- Independence, national, 91, 102, 114; European, 140; Finland, 233; Poland, 227
- Indiana, 10
- Individual, dignity of, 67, 150, 169, 187, 189, 190, 211; and morals, 188, 190
- Industrial conflict, 34; *see also* Labor: strikes
- Industrial plant, 72
- Industrial Revolution, 151, 156, 199, 222, 240
- Industry, shackles on, 56; war expansion, 145, 148, 154
- Inflation, 34, 49, 52, 56, 67, 154
- Inheritance taxes, 42
- Initiative and enterprise, 52, 56, 74, 77, 78, 81, 151, 204, 206; European, 151
- Insurance, 13, 51, 62, 202
- Interest rates, 76
- International law, 105
- International relations, 92, 105, 106, 127, 158
- Intervention, 89, 96, 97, 109; American, 112; *see also* Foreign policies; War Intolerance, 170, 172, 184
- Inventions, 33, 41, 59, 72, 73, 78; *see also* Science
- Investments, 76, 79, 204; European, 123, 152; in prosperity, 65, 66; Russian confiscation of, 162
- Irrigation, 62
- Isaiah, 189
- Isolation, 103, 104, 177; *see also* Foreign Policies; War
- Italy, 99, 101, 109, 110, 116, 121, 172; and America, 111; Fascist rise in, 162; standard of living in, 42; Italians, 87, 100; *see also* Fascism
- Jackson, Andrew, 5, 69
- Jackson Day Dinner, 60
- Japan, 86-7, 91, 100, 101, 185; *see also* Foreign policies
- Jeremiah, 189
- Jersey City, 10
- Jews, 172, 241; persecution of, 85, 107, 115, 127, 172, 185, 241
- Jobs, 27, 38, 64, 67, 72; for boys, 220, 222; new, 66, 73; for youth, 40; *see also* Free enterprise; Unemployment
- John the Baptist, 189
- Joint Distribution Committee, 241; *see also* Jews, relief of
- Judiciary, independence of, 18, 23, 33, 35; *see also* Courts; Supreme Court
- Jury, trial by, 150, 168, 211; *see also* Liberty
- Justice, 20, 67, 190, 198, 207; and conscience, 15; international, 150; postwar, 149; in war, 142; *see also* Social justice
- Kaiser Wilhelm, 141, 144; *see also* Germany
- Kansas City, 10
- Kellogg Pact, 105, 136, 151
- Kentucky, 9
- Kerosene oil, 193
- Kosciuszko, 228
- Ku Klux Klan, 23
- Labels, political, 64, 209
- Labor, 35, 55, 75, 167; Act, 36; Board (National Labor Relations), 11, 52; charity of, 234, 235, 249; collective bargaining, 52, 55, 62, 203; dictation to, 18, 43; European, 62, 151, exploitation of,

- 41, 204; hours of, 55, 62, 195, 200; pensions for, 36; regulation of, 202; Republican record, 62; Russia, 166; sweated, 33, 55, 73; in war, 147; Workmen's Compensation Acts, 62; *see also* Child labor
- Labor conflict, 34, 51, 77; strikes, sit-down, 17, 46, 166
- Labor-saving machinery, 72, 77
- Labor unions, 44, 166, 205; and Communism, 166, 171
- Laissez-faire, 201
- Land defense, 99; *see also* Armament
- Land Disarmament, World Conference on, 136
- Latvia, 150, 165
- Lawmakers, and economics, 195
- Laws, 22, 28, 76, 105; "must," 26; Government of, *see* Government
- Layman's budget, 14
- Leaders, European, 117, 141, 216
- Leadership, 221; in morals, 19, 190; New Deal, 29; smaller colleges, 198, 208
- League of Nations, 95, 96, 105, 106, 112, 121
- Left-wingers, 60, 210
- Legislature, 18, 24, 29; independence of, 151; *see also* Congress
- Legislatures, States, 59
- Leisure, increased, 184; *see also* Labor, hours of
- Lenins, 141
- Liberal, 209, 210, 211; American, 169-70; publications, 169; New Deal as, 3, 6, 11, 17, 21, 22, 27
- Liberalism, 19, 32, 76, 86, 156, 211, 212; and Communism, 168, 169; defined, 60; European, 150
- Liberty, 22, 31, 40, 49, 67, 74, 92, 139, 141, 198, 211, 221; American duty to, 102, 103, 108, 109, 113, 127, 156, 187; and debt, 34; defeat of, 23, 59, 201, 224; economic, 33, 41, 168, 204, 208; in Europe, 81, 127, 151, 152; Finnish defense of, 240; and liberalism, 18, 212; and Lincoln, 58; postwar, 148; in Russia, 160; safeguards of, 23, 36, 50, 54, 56, 59, 64; and science, 184; and totalitarianism, 99, 107, 111, 112, 172; in war, 89, 90, 101, 114, 120, 122, 173; world, 92; *see also* Free speech; Freedom; Free press
- Liberty, personal, 41, 55, 172, 183, 211; European loss of, 93, 150; and war, 89, 101, 113
- Library, Hoover, 124, 215
- Lincoln, Abraham, 26, 58, 59, 60, 61, 65, 68, 70, 75, 198; America of, 81; debates of, 80; gratitude for, 69; as New Dealer, 63; progress since, 62
- Lippmann, Walter, 15
- "Liquidation," Russian, 160; *see also* Communist; Russia
- Literature, 209
- Lithuania, 150
- Loans, government: to Europe, 152; recoverable, 14, 66, 67
- Lobby, local government, 10
- Local committees, in relief, 7
- Local government, 6, 18, 50; and corruption, 10, 11; and planned economy, 32; and relief, 62; *see also* Relief
- Longevity, and science, 184
- Lubin, 246
- Luther, Martin, 145, 189
- Lutz, Ralph H., 217
- Lynchburg Advance*, 30
- Machine Age, 75
- Machines, use of, 72, 77, 78, 80
- Macon Telegraph*, 30
- Mail, free, 16
- Malnutrition, 177
- Mandates, 25, 26, 28
- Maryland, 9
- Massachusetts, constitution of, 52
- Massacres, Russian, 160
- May bill, 147
- Meat, production of, 174
- Mechanics, 76
- Mediation Board, *see* Labor
- Memphis, 10
- Merit system, *see* Civil Service
- Mexico, 112
- Michelangelo, 145
- Middle Ages, 185
- Middle class, economic, *see* Economic middle class
- Militarism, 93, 114
- Military alliances, 106, 110, 111
- Military expenditures, 91; *see* National defense
- Milk and butter, 174
- Mineral reservations, 62
- Mining engineers, 195-96
- Minorities, 93; American, 23, 76, 168, 170; in Congress, 27; persecution of, 86, 93, 172, 242; racial, 141
- Monetary policies, New Deal, 43, 51, 55
- Money, 32; *see also* Currency
- Money-changers, 210
- Monopolies, 41, 43, 61, 77, 211; engineers on, 193
- Monroe Doctrine, 90, 95, 104, 178; *see also* National defense
- Moral stamina, 23, 208
- Moral standards, world, 127, 129, 158-59; American duty to, 103, 104, 105 Morals, 18, 39, 42, 141, 183, 186, 188, 189; in government, 3 ff., 33, 39, 48, 54, 57,

- 62, 64, 80; political, 4, 20, 22, 24, 28, 35; propaganda, 124; in relief, 7; in Russia, 185; in war, 133, 135, 141; *see also* Corruption
- Moratorium, 151; *see also* Germany
- Moscow, 44, 162, 163, 164, 166, 168, 170; *see also* Communism; Russia
- Moses, 188
- Munich, 88
- Munitions, 96, 97, 100, 108; workers, 130
- "Must" laws, 26
- Napoleon, 141, 142; President as, 30
- Nashville Banner*, 30
- National defense, *see* Defense, national
- National Guard, 51
- National Labor Relations Board, *see* Labor Board
- National planning, 17; *see also* Planned economy
- National wealth, and engineers, 193
- Nationalism, 140, 149; *see* Race hate
- Nations, small, 166
- Navy, 94; *see also* Army and Navy; Armament
- Nazism, 86, 99, 107, 147, 155, 172, 204, 217; in America, 18; and Communists, persecution under, 127, 185, 241; *see also* Germany, Nazi
- Neutrality, 96, 104, 105, 108; American, 114, 158; Law, 95, 128; and relief, 249; *see also* Foreign policies; War
- Neutrals, 117, 125, 135, 143, 153, 174, 176; and propaganda, 124, 136
- New Deal, 3, 16, 18, 64, 67; and communism, 60, 167, 168; as conservatives, 210; on debt, 66 (*see also* Debt, national); defamation by, 49; economic consequences of, 3, 21, 22, 32, 39, 48; economics of, 43, 56, 65, 66; as emergency, 32; Fascism, 43; foreign policies, 94, 106, 123, 125, 126, 158, 163; in France, 45; and humanitarianism, 62, 63; as Liberal, 3, 6, 11, 17, 21, 22, 27; monetary policies, 43, 51, 55; morals of, 5, 39; and propaganda, 16, 17; reforms, 33, 55, 61, 67, 73; relief, 47, 51; strikes, 46; totalitarian ideas of, 44, 60, 76; unemployment, 22; *see also* Budget; Civil Service; Credit; Debt; Defense, Economic systems; Foreign policy; Government; Labor; Liberty; Morals; Objectives; Old age; Personal government; Personal powers; Recovery; Roosevelt; Spending
- "New era," 154
- New Mexico, 10
- New Orleans States*, 30
- New York Times*, 13, 15, 29
- New York World Telegram*, 15, 16
- Newspapers, Democratic, 13, 15, 16, 29; *see also* Press
- Nitrates, 174
- Non-recognition doctrine, 105; *see also* Foreign policies
- Norfolk Dispatch*, 30
- Norway, 172, 232, 237
- N. R. A., 43, 147
- Objectives, 14, 16, 18, 20, 44; as alibi, 4, 26, 54, 55; economic, 51; true, 19, 39
- Officials, European, 117
- Officials, government, 75, 174; in elections, 10, 12; in propaganda, 12, 125; relief, 7; in war, 130
- Officials, state, 10
- Oil, 97, 197
- Oklahoma, 9
- Old age, 33, 202, pensions, 13, 35, 55, 62, 73; protection of, 40, 56, 68
- Old Guard, Republican, 24
- Opportunity, 186, 198; for boys, 221; new, 81
- Opposition, duty of, 63
- Paderewski, 228
- Panic, bank depositors', 49; economists on, 195
- Parks, 62, 201
- Parliament: Nazi, 29; Polish, 229
- Parties, political, 25, 63; Communists, 167
- Partisanship, 4, 5, 58, 94; in foreign policies, 71, 114
- Pasteur, 145
- Pasture, war-expansion of, 154
- Patronage system, 6, 19; *see also* Civil Service
- Peace, 64, 89, 92, 93, 103, 128, 141, 159, 187; American role in, 102, 157, 178; Conference, 1918, 149, 216; and economics, 92, 203; Hoover work for, 117; between ideologies, 86; processes of, 88, 95, 104, 105, 106, 108, 114, 115, 137, 138; and Republican party, 68; and Russian recognition, 163; Russo-Finnish, 239; Versailles, Treaty of, 85, 99, 100, 102, 104, 113, 117, 121, 148, 151, 152, 175, 177, 187; and youth, 129
- Peace Treaty (present war), 153, 177, 244
- Peasant labor, 62
- Pennsylvania, 10
- Pensions, 201; mothers', 62; veterans', 55, 119, 154; *see* Old age pensions
- Persecution, 85, 103, 105; by ideologies, 86, 93, 172, 242; of Jews, 107, 185; religious, 115, 127, 140
- Personal conscience, *see* Conscience
- Personal devil, 183
- Personal government, 21, 31, 33, 36
- Personal liberty, *see* Liberty, personal

- Personal power, 15, 22, 26, 28, 29, 43, 54, 59, 60, 86, 199; bureaucratic, 55; delegation of, 32; President's, 28, 36; for security, 185
 Pestilence, 117, 119, 173, 175, 177, 179, 185; horseman of, 172, 186
 Philadelphia, 10
 Pied Piper, 141
 Pilsudski, 228
 Pittsburgh, 10
 Planes, bombing, 131, 132, 136; *see also* Aircraft; Armament; Air attack
 Planned economy, 31, 33, 147, 155, 206; European, 41; *see also* Economic systems, mixture of
 Planners, conflicts in, 77
 Planning, Presidential, 27
 Platform, party: Democratic, 12, 25; Lincoln's, 62; *see also* Republican party
 Plenty, 42, 59
 Poland, 140, 150; attack on, 165, 166, 242; and Austria, 228; famine, 175; independence, 227; relief of, 69, 234, 236, 247; speech on, 227, 246
 Polish National Council, speech before, 246
 Political appointees, 28; in elections, 29, 31; *see also* Government; New Deal
 Political: bosses, 10; machines, 10, 24; Royalists, 10; *see also* Labels; Morals
 Politics: art of, 65; electric power, 194; in foreign affairs, 114; money in, 25; in relief, 7, 19, 63, 70
 Poor, tax-relief of, 61
 Population, 78, 184; pressures of, 89, 96, 99, 140-41
 Pork barrel, 10, 28
 Poverty, 36, 40, 46; abolished, 71, 200; under New Deal, 55; world, 85, 86, 99
 Power: centralized, 102; electric, 194, 200; growth of, 32; political, 60, 199, 201, 203, 205; thirst for, 10
 Power, economic, *see* Economic power
 Power, personal, *see* Personal power
 Power politics, 97, 121, 122, 132, 141, 150, 170; America in, 126, 128, 158; propaganda of, against America, 123, 152
 Power of the purse, 27, 28
 Praetorian Guard, 6, 7, 29, 31
 Prejudice, mass, 17
 Preparedness, 91, 94, 140, 142, 146; *see also* Defense, national
 President: appropriations for, 27; and Congress, 24, 57; election control of, 28; of Finland, 239-40; foreign policies, 95
 Presidential election, 8
 Presidents, and Russian recognition, 163 Press, 123, 234; Communist, 168; foreign, 126, 150; service for Finland, 237; *see also* Free speech and free press
 Press agents, government, 17, 75
 Pressure groups, 77, 80, 147, 151
 Prices, 46, 195; control of, 44, 76, 174; farm, 45; in war, 146
 Primaries, 9, 31
 Prime Minister, Finland, 234
 Prisoners, war, 137
 Private enterprise, *see* Enterprise, private; Free enterprise
 Problems, marginal, 80
 Production, 70, 78, 195, 205; control of, 76, 206; diffusion of, 42, 202; increase of, 71, 200; mass, 61, 186; in war, 145
 Productivity, 49, 56, 57, 64, 68, 71, 80, 81, 153; limitation of, 32, 44; and New Deal, 63; and science, 184; and social reform, 33
 Profit motive, 197, 204
 Profit system, 32, 41, 168
 Program Committee (Republican), 64
 Progress, human, 169, 212
 Progress, national, 54, 59, 61, 63, 76, 80, 139, 205, 221; social, 42; and thinking,
 Proletariat in America, 51; *see also* Class hate; Ill-fed
 Promised Land, 42
 Propaganda, 17, 18, 44, 170; Communist, 162, 163, 167, 170, 247; European, 93, 112, 124, 125, 158; ideological, 90, 91, 127; war, 108, 123, 124, 128, 135, 137, 143, 153, 216
 Propagandists, New Deal, 16
 Property rights, 58; *see also* Economic system; Free enterprise
 Prosperity, 37, 92; New Deal, 27, 65; planned, 46, 47, 53; world, 95, 115, 127
 Public buildings, 66
 Public conscience, *see* Conscience, public
 Public functions, of engineers, 192
 Public health, 36, 55, 62; *see also* Objectives; Social reforms
 Public opinion, 16, 44; control of, 44; neutrals, 136; in war, 105, 134, 135; *see also* Propaganda
 Public power, instruments of, 33
 Public thinking, confusion in, 209
 Public trust, 4
 Public works, 7, 53, 62, 66
 Publicity agents, 17, 75
 Pulaski Memorial Day, 227
 Pump priming, 10, 44, 54, 56, 76
 Purchasing power, 52, 195
 Purge, 16, 17, 28, 29, 60, 64

 Quarantining, 94, 106, 126
 Quotas, trade, 92, 152

- Races: American problem, 96, 112, 142, 178;
European, 113, 140; hate between, 170, 176,
241; persecutions, 115; *see also* Jews
- Radicalism, 210, 212
- Radio, 16, 124, 201
- Railways, 78, 146, 193; European, 149
- Rationing, 174, 175; *see also* Food supplies
- Reaction, 18, 19, 212
- Reactionaries, 17, 209, 210
- Reason, voice of, 139, 149, 178, 179, 184
- Recessions, 47, 48
- Recognition, Russia, *see* Russia
- Reconstruction: after-war, 122, 148, 152, 178, 215;
Finland, 239-40
- Reconstruction Finance Corporation, 62
- Recovery, 10, 22, 43, 54; in 1932, 24, 48; New
Deal failure, 32, 46, 49, 57, 65; democracies, 22,
45, 47; world, 45, 47, 72, 154
- Recreation, 201
- Red-baiting, 159
- Red Cross, 137, 234, 236
- Reform, 17, 33, 41, 80; banking, 35, 62; European,
151; New Deal, 33, 73; program for, 63;
Republican record, 62
- Refugees, 242, 244; Finnish, 232, 236, 237, 238;
Polish, 242; World War, 118, 129
- Regulation, 76, 168, 202, 204; agencies for, 41;
new industries, Republican origin, and
unemployment, 73
- Relief, 33, 65, 70, 155; American duty of, 69, 103,
236, 249; costs of, 7, 51, 70, 246; elections, 7, 8,
19, 31, 35, 63; of farmers, 35, 203; Hoover set-
up of, 6, 7, 116, 243; New Deal record, 7;
numbers on, 46; officials for, 51; program for,
19, 35; Republican record, 63
- Relief, foreign: of Finland, 231 ff., 236 ff., 237,
238; of Poland, 69, 236, 246, 247; of Russia,
162; *see also* Jews
- Relief: World War, 151, 175; Belgian, 116, 117;
enemy, 215 ff.
- Religion, 140, 141, 198, 205, 209; and
Communism, 163; Polish, 228; and Russia, 173,
185; *see also* Agnosticism; Atheism;
Christianity; Church; Freedom of worship
- Religious wars, 86
- Reorganization Bill, 23, 26, 27
- Reparations, 123, 151
- Representative government, *see* Government,
representative
- Reprisals, 97, 132, 135
- Republic, founding of, 221
- Republic, Russian, 160
- Republican party: missions of, 68; program for, 35;
purge of, 61
- Republican Program Committee, 64
- Republican record: banking reform, 62; Civil
Service, 62; conservation and public works, 7,
62; constitutionality, 50; depression work, 48,
62; economy, 67; in elections, 11; labor, 62;
Lincolnism, 61; national income, 66; old-age
pensions, 13; regulation, 41, 61; relief, 62;
Russia, 162; social reform, 13, 55, 62, 63; tariff,
62
- Repudiation, 34, 147, 152; of war debts, 122
- Resources, natural, 74, 81
- Revolutions, 75, 144, 161, 172; communist, 169;
economic causes, 184; French, 215; of bate,
177; from hunger, 177; in ideas, 199; from
World War, 117, 133, 149, 153; from present
war, 178, *see also* Industrial revolution
- Richmond Times-Dispatch*, 15
- Rickard, Edgar, 237
- Rights, unalienable, 189; *see also* Freedom; Free
speech and free press; Liberties
- Rivers and harbors, 62
- Rocky Mountains, 112
- Rodin, 145
- Rome, 6, 18, 44
- Roosevelt, President Franklin D.: on aggressors,
96; autographing campaign books, 11; and
Communists, 168; and Congress, 24, 26 ff., 57;
on currency, 12; on depressions, 48; economic
claims of, 39; on economic system, 43;
elections, 28, 29, 43; experiments, 65; on
foreign policy, 94, 106; and Hatch Bill, 9; and
liberalism, 18; on Lincoln, 58, 60; and
mandates, 25; on national debts, 18; personal
party of, 21; on planning, 27; political machine
of, 24; in power politics, 126; on prosperity, 47;
and recovery, 46; and Russian recognition, 163;
and Senator George, 30; and Supreme Court, 15,
23; *see also* New Deal; Personal government;
Personal power; Spending
- Roosevelt, Theodore, 61
- Rosenwald, Julius, 241
- Rubber-stamp Congress, 9, 26
- Ruins of free enterprise, 49
- Rumania, 150
- Russia, 91, 99, 100, 101, 107, 111, 116, 155, 163,
165, 170, 172, 205; cruelty of, 162; Czar of,
120; executions in, 85; famine in, 162; and
France, 90; gold of, 166; inheritance from 140;
interference in, 159; and liberalism, 169;
persecutions in, 185; Poland, 227; rationing in,
175; recognition of, 158, 161, 163; revolution,
160; standard of living, 42;

- starvation by, 183; and Wilson, 161; *see also* Communism
- Russian people: prewar, 160; and war, 178; refugees, 242
- Russo-German pact, 165
- Sanctions, economic, *see* Economic sanctions
- Saint Louis, 10
- Saint Paul, 190
- Samaritan, 249
- Sanctuary, for refugees, 244
- Santa Claus, 44
- Savings, 53, 62, 79, 210
- Scandinavia, 175; *see also* Norway, Sweden
- Scarcity, 42
- Schiller, 145
- Schools, 78, 186, 201
- Science, 73, 184, 188; and invention, 74, 81, 183, 187, 199, 202, 205; technology, 36, 186
- Scripps-Howard papers, 9
- Secession, 58
- Secretaries of State and Russian recognition, 163
- Securities, collapse of, 46
- Security, conservation of, 81, 136, 156
- Security: economic, 34, 36, 202; ideologies of, 185, 186; Roosevelt claim of, 39
- Security, national, 19
- Self-containment, 92
- Self-determination of nations, 122, 150
- Self-government, 9, 10, 20; European, 152, 205
- Senate, minority in, 27
- Senatorial Committee, 8; on elections, 9; military affairs, 106; relief, 8, 55
- Senators, Democratic, 16
- Serbia, 150
- Serfdom, 204
- Sermon on the Mount, 190
- Sherman's March to the Sea, 176
- Shipping, 137; *see also* Food ships
- Shylock, 122
- Siberia, 166
- Silver, 44
- Slavery, 58, 75, 199, 204, 2211
- Slogans, 21, 34, 44, 47, 64, 76, 209
- Slums, 186, 222
- Slumps, 48
- Smearing, 39, 86, 168, 209
- Social conscience, 14, 189
- Social justice, 14, 34, 51, 189, 202
- Social reforms, 62, 73; New Deal, 33, 45, 67, 73; Republican, 13, 55, 61, 62, 63
- Social Security, 17, 34, 51; Act, 13
- Socialism, 18, 43, 54, 99, 107, 147, 172, 203
- Socialists, 15, 193, 194
- Socrates, 188, 189
- Soldiers, wars between, 176
- Somme, Battle of, 118
- South, economic program for, 9
- South America, 91, 104
- South Carolina, 9
- Soviet Russia, *see* Russia
- Spain, 100, 131, 151, 185
- Special privilege, 41, 61, 147
- Specialization, 203
- Speculation, 52, 145
- Spending: control of, 27, 35; coercion by, 43; for income, 66; liberals, 210; military, 94; presidential, 36
- Spending: government, 10, 25, 54, 59, 65, 67, 80, 147; effect of, 34, 52, 75, 77; in elections, 36; European, 151; *see also* Budget; Government; New Deal
- Spoils system, 5, 35, 55; *see also* Civil Service; Political appointees
- Sportsmanship, 190, 222
- Stalin, 18, 29, 141, 154, 165, 170
- Standard of living, 39, 42, 56, 132, 205; American, 40, 54, 96, 94, 119; Finnish, 231; increase in, 56, 73, 156; lower third, 155; under New Deal, 55; Polish, 229; postwar, 154; Republican, 63; totalitarian, 87, 127; world, 138
- Stanford University, 124, 215
- Starry-eyed, 57, 151
- Starvation, 49, 136, 242, 247; Finnish, 233; morals of, 97; Russian, 107, 185; as weapon, 119, 132, 133
- States: pensions, 62; regulation by, 61; rights, 50, 58; *see also* Governors; Governments, local
- Statism, 76, 77, 170, 172 (*see also* Planned economy; Economic systems, mixed); in America, 80, 169
- Stolberg, Benjamin, 166
- Strikes, *see* Labor conflict
- Submarines, 105, 119, 134, 247; war, 130, 132, 137
- Submarginal land, 137; *see also* Agriculture
- Subsidies: government, 9, 10, 43, 147; credit, 32; elections, 59; housing, 79
- Subversive activities, 162, 164, 170
- Supreme Court, 23, 36, 46; packing of, 15, 25, 27
- Supreme Economic Council, 117, 215, 216; *see* Food; Relief Surplus food, 154, 247; *see also* Relief
- Sweden, 232, 237
- Tariffs, 44, 62, 77
- Taxation, 34, 154; on poor, 13
- Taxes, 28, 42, 52, 54, 56, 61, 62, 64, 66,

- 67, 70, 148, 177; for armaments, 132, 152
 Taxing power, 76
 Taxpayer, 9, 14, 18, 44, 60, 194, 210
 Technology, 42, 72, 183, 186, 192, 195
 Ten Commandments, 188, 199
 Tennessee, 10
 Territories, no; treaty, 150
 Terror, 160
 Thinking, national, change in, 80
 Third Internationale, 161
 Thirty Years' War, 175
 Thrift, 53, 64, 79
 Tolerance, 67, 143, 169, 190, 207, 212
 Tolstoy, 145
 Tories, 17, 209
 Totalitarian governments, 15, 87, 125, 151, 156;
 weakness in, 100, 127; *see also* Dictatorships;
 Communism; Fascism; Nazism
 Totalitarian Liberalism, 169; penetration, 91
 Totalitarianism, 71, 86
 Tower of Babel, 43, 45, 46
 Trade, 90, id, 140, 184, 215; Russo-American, 165;
 totalitarian, 91; world, 87, 153
 Transportation and communication, 200
 Treasury, statements of, 14 Treaties, naval, 137
 Treaty: of 1915, 110; of Recognition, 164; of
 Versailles, *see* Peace Treaty
 Treaty-making, 177
 Truth, 16, 20, 124, 143, 190, 212
 Tweed, Boss, 18
 Typhus, 175, 228
 Tyranny, bureaucratic, 211
- Umpire, government as, 32, 76, 204
 Unemployed, 3, 19, 22, 30, 46, 70, 71, 81, 145; and
 foreign relief, 235, 248
 "Unemployed Councils," 167
 Unemployment, 7, 32, 40, 69, 202, 248; British,
 47; causes of, 74; European, 151; experiments
 on, 65; insurance, 73; New Deal, 22; and
 politics, 70; postwar, 142, 148, 154, 155, 178;
 relief, 54, 55, 63, 71, 203; technological, 195;
 youth, 79; *see also* Depression; Relief
 Union, state of, 58, 75
 United States Shipping Board, 217
 Unity, national, 51, 60, 61, 80
 Utopia, 93, 141, 155, 199
 Verdi, 145
 Vested interests, 147
 Veterans, 7, 55, 119, 154, 167, 178
 Vigilantes, 159
 Voltaire, 145
- Wages, 76, 79; wage groups, 77
 Wall Street, 53, 195
 Wallace, Secretary, market policy of, 45
 War, 68, 101, 124, 133, 153, 170, 184; and
 America, 88, 89, 107-8, 112, 116, 127, 128, 139,
 173, 178, 235, 242; horsemen of, 172 ff., 186;
 causes of, 85, 97, 106, 115, 122, 127; effects of,
 71, 72, 90, 102, 155, 203; prevention of, 8, 104,
 105, 138; realities of, 116, 118, 129
 War, World, 43, 116; American participation, 112,
 113, 144, 146, 148, 154; and Civil Service, 6;
 costs of, 119, 154; demobilization of, 102;
 famine after, 175; Hoover work in, 129 (*see also*
 Relief); origin of, 120; propaganda in, 123, 124,
 142; rationing in, 174-75; records of, 214, 215;
 results of, 3, 141, 241
 War bases, in western hemisphere, 91
 War Council, American, 117
 War debts, 122, 123; Finnish, 151, 233; Russian,
 162
 War Department, 147
 War experience, Hoover, 116, 117, 143
 War legislation, 147
 War Library, Hoover, 124, 215
 War loans, 145
 War talk, 85, 93
 Warburg, Felix, 241
 Wars, 86; ideological, 86, *in*; religious, 99
 Warsaw, 246
 Waste, 195
 Wealth, national, 155
 Webster, Daniel, 96
 Welfare, community, 221
 West Point, 44
 Western hemisphere, 87, 90, 96, 108, 109; defense
 of, 97, 98, 101, 107, 120, 156; and peace, 69,
 173, 242; penetration of, 91
 White, President Andrew D., 215
 White House, 17
 Whitney, Eli, 72
 Wilbur, Ray Lyman, 216
 Williams, Aubrey, 7, 8
 Wilson, President, 117, 144, 147, 148, 149; and Civil
 Service, 5; demobilization, 102; and Germany,
 121; at peace table, 157; and peace treaty, 120,
 121; and Russia, 161, 163
 Women, Finnish, 234; and children, 237
 Women, hours of, 62
 Women and children, and rationing, 174; Starving
 of, 97; war on, 100, 114, 119, 123, 128, 130,
 131, 133, 134, 136, 137, 165, 176, 185, 238;
 working, 55
 Workers, 17, 51, *see also* Labor

- Workmen's Ex-Service League, 167
World Conferences, 92, 127; economic, 152;
 disarmament, 136, 137
Worship, free, 41, 168
Woll, Matthew, 166
W.P.A., 50, 66; in elections, 8, 9
- Yes-yes men, 26 ft., 30, 57
- Youth, 12, 33, 36, 56, 207; American, 40, 198;
 Communists, 170; and debts, 56, 60, 62; and
 jobs, 40, 197; frontiers for, 73, 208; progress of,
 68; and relief, 7; sacrifice of, 102, 114, 157,
 173; and totalitarianism, 169; and
 unemployment, 79; and war, 128, 129, 154
Ypres, 118