

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



127 207

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

THE REFERENCE SHELF

is published to make available when needed good debates, collections of articles, briefs, bibliographies and study outlines on timely subjects for public discussion. Each number is devoted to a single subject. To make the material available at the time of greatest need, publication is irregular. Each volume contains seven or more separate issues, about 2000 pages in all, and now covers a year in time. Single numbers, 90c unless otherwise noted.

The Reference Shelf is listed in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, Education Index, Industrial Arts Index, and Cumulative Book Index.

Future Issues To Be Announced.

Volume XVI. \$6

- | No. | No. |
|-----|--|
| 1 | Representative American Speeches: 1941-1942 A C Baird \$1.25 |

Volume XV. \$6

- | No. | No. |
|---|--|
| 1. Representative American Speeches: 1940-1941. A C Baird \$1.25 | 6. Wages and Prices. R E. Summers \$1.25 |
| 2. Universal Military Service. R E. Summers and H B Summers \$1.25 | 7. The Closed Shop. J. E. Johnsen. \$1.25 |
| 3. Federal Regulation of Labor Unions. J. V. Garland \$1.25 | 8. Wartime Censorship of Press and Radio. R E Summers \$1.25 |
| 4. Federal Price Control. J E. Johnsen \$1.25 | 9. Permanent Price Control Policy. J. E. Johnsen \$1.25. |
| 5. The "Eight Points" of Post-War World Reorganization. (Supplement to International Federation of Democracies Vol 14, No 8) J E Johnsen. 90c | 10. A Federal Sales Tax. E. R. Nichols \$1.25 |

Volume XIV. \$5.40

- | No. | No. |
|---|--|
| 1. Representative American Speeches: 1939-1940. A. C Baird \$1.50. | 6. Compulsory Military Training. J E Johnsen \$1.25 |
| 2. Interstate Trade Barriers. J. E. Johnsen \$1.25 | 7. The Monroe Doctrine and the Growth of Western Hemisphere Solidarity. R K. Showman and L S Judson \$1.25 |
| 3. Increasing Federal Power. H B. Summers and R. E. Summers \$1.25 | 8. International Federation of Democracies. J. E. Johnsen. \$1.25. |
| 4. Planned Economy (Supplement to Increasing Federal Power) H B. Summers and R E Summers 90c. | 9. Debate Index. Supplement. J E Johnsen 75c |
| | 10. Federal Aid for Education. J. E. Johnsen \$1.25. |

Volume XIII. \$6

- | No. | No. |
|--|--|
| 1. Capital Punishment. J. E. Johnsen. \$1.25 | 3. Representative American Speeches: 1938-1939. A C Baird. \$1.25. |
| 2. The Railroad Problem. H B. Summers and R. E. Summers. \$1.25. | 4. Europe: Versailles to Warsaw. R S. Kain. \$1.25. |

T H E R E F E R E N C E S H E L F

Vol. 16

No. 1

REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN
SPEECHES: 1941-1942

Selected by

A. CRAIG BAIRD

Department of Speech, State University of Iowa



THE H. W. WILSON COMPANY
NEW YORK

1942

PREFATORY NOTE

REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN SPEECHES 1941-42 is the fifth in the annual series. Although after 1900 in the United States public speaking seemed to have lost the primacy it had in the mid-nineteenth century, a new stimulus to the art of oral communication developed with the remarkable spread of the radio. This annual record attempts to provide a record of that oral output as far as it originates in the United States.

These volumes include speeches preeminent in their influence upon current American history and those that illustrate representative speaking types, such as political debates or sermons. No one volume can do full justice to these aims. It is hoped, however, that the series of five, beginning with the speeches of 1937-38, may provide a fairly complete anthology of the contemporary speakers. The Cumulative Author Index accompanying this volume enables the reader easily to survey these recent talks, formal addresses, legislative debates, or radio colloquies.

These speakers and speeches, in addition to their value as models of speaking (to be studied and even memorized), reveal the typical American ideals and modes of thinking during the period. The Tables of Contents, accompanying the various volumes, have classified the addresses with respect to their typical themes of war, peace, education, labor, religion, and socio-economic adjustments. The Index to each volume is designed to facilitate this examination of "ideas."

The present volume, rendering a special service in presenting some of the outstanding speeches since the Pearl Harbor attack, may appropriately be labelled "War Speeches." The book is thus one of the avenues by which American readers may perceive more clearly their duties as citizens or as enlisted men in this World War II.

THE REFERENCE SHELF

The series may best be understood if the Introduction to each volume and the brief notes prefixed to each address are read.

A C. B

July 1942

CONTENTS

PREFATORY NOTE . . .	3
INTRODUCTION . . .	10
AMERICA AT WAR	
War Address Franklin Delano Roosevelt	15
Address to Congress Winston Churchill . . .	19
America Accepts the Challenge Franklin Delano Roosevelt	30
On the War Resolution Against Japan Virgil Chapman	40
AMERICA'S WAR AIMS	
The Price of Free World Victory Henry Wallace	45
The Warfare of Free Souls A A Berle, Jr	56
The Democratic Issue Wilbur Howell	64
PROPAGANDA, FREE SPEECH, AND THE WAR	
Propaganda, Good and Bad Archibald MacLeish, Harold D Lasswell, and Richard P McKeon	75
How To Use Civil Liberty in Wartime Robert E Cushman	91
What Does Freedom of Speech Mean to Us Today? John M Coffee	96
Leadership and the Spoken Word Lionel Crocker	100
CIVILIAN MORALE AND THE WAR	
"If We're Good Enough We Can Take It" Elmer Davis .	111
Morale Building in Our Schools and Colleges. John W. Studebaker .	119

The Sixth Column	Richard C Patterson, Jr	135
Another "Shot Heard Round the World"	Franklyn B Snyder	142

THE HOME FRONT

MacArthur Day Address	Donald M Nelson	151
Equality of Sacrifice	Leon Henderson	161
Labor and the War	Paul V McNutt	169

THE MILITARY FRONT

Corregidor	Francis B Sayre	179
Will Air Power Win This War?	Alexander P de Seversky	186

EDUCATION AND THE WAR

Wisdom Before Information	Robert I Gannon	191
Preserving the Roots of Liberty	H W Prentis, Jr	201
Frontiers for Youth	George D Stoddard	218
How Can Our Schools Meet the War Emergency?	Stringfellow Barr	230

RELIGION AND THE WAR

God's Mysterious Educator	Henry Sloane Coffin	235
---------------------------	---------------------	-----

AMERICA AND POST-WAR LEADERSHIP

Eight Common Principles for a Better World	Franklin D Roosevelt	247
Isolationism and the League of Nations	Wendell Willkie	251
The American Plan To Prevent War	Nicholas Murray Butler	259
"Who Says It Can't Be Done?"	D F Fleming	265
Post-War World Leadership	Sumner Welles	270

CONTENTS

7

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

279

INDEX

289

CUMULATIVE AUTHOR INDEX, 1937-38 TO 1941-42

295

■

REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN SPEECHES

INTRODUCTION

"SPEAKING FOR VICTORY"

This is a collection of war speeches. Speech-making in the United States, after December 7, 1941, became almost unanimously a series of addresses aimed to secure victory and the consequences of victory for the United States and the United Nations. Whether these talks emanated from the White House, the Executive departments or agencies, the national Senate or House, from pulpit, educational rostrum, entertainment platform, or radio studio, whether from high school debater or President Roosevelt, the theme was the same. "How can we save democracy?" "How can we beat the Axis machine?" "Out of this catastrophe how can we salvage our Western civilization?"

The united voices from these pages, then, attempt to provide the American public of 1942 with information about the war, with convincing and persuasive arguments in support of war policies, and with inspiration to strengthen our will to win. These aims of the speeches are thus to create unbroken unity of purpose, mood and effort, or "civilian morale." Morale, we are agreed, based upon enlightened and determined national will, is the basic factor in deciding the outcome.

More specifically, these speakers deal with the background of the war, its causes, and the American aims in fighting it. These addresses, furthermore, analyze and offer solutions concerning the problems of (a) *the limits of free speech* in wartime and the proper methods of distributing facts and resisting Axis

propaganda, (b) *the home front* (rationing of rubber, gasoline and what not, inflation, price ceilings, agricultural controls, wage ceilings, taxation, war financing, prevention of strikes, and the utilization of the total-man-and-woman-power), (c) *civilian morale and information*, (d) *the prosecution of the war itself*, including the lowering of the draft age, the place of the army, navy and airforce in the campaigns, our military strategy in the Far East and in Europe ("second front"), (e) *education in schools and colleges* in their adjustments to the needs of the war, (f) *philosophy and religion* in their moral and spiritual support of our battle for the "four freedoms", (g) and, finally, *post-war political leadership*, including the possible adherence of the United States to a League of Nations, World Government, Union with Great Britain, Union with Latin America, or a Triple Entente with Great Britain and Russia

The twenty-odd speeches of this edition discuss at length or touch upon most of these major issues. Other problems will become more insistent (*e.g.*, prohibition, lowering the draft age to eighteen years), but those listed above are recurrent and need continued re-examination during the conflict.

Underlying these discourses is the assumption that democracy, as of 1942, faces annihilation by the Axis "pincers" and that the principles of freedom are to be defended to the last American. These principles, reflected both in the present volume and its four predecessors,¹ proclaim the dignity of the individual American (and of all peoples), the solidarity of the citizens, popular vote, free assembly, and freedom of religious worship, constitutional guarantees (Bill of Rights), representative government, economic security and well-being for the less favored members of our citizenry.

A further assumption of these speeches is that Americans, despite their "political illiteracy," are competent to form sensible judgments and to crystallize their opinions into heroic resolves.

¹ See especially the Introduction to *Representative American Speeches 1940-41*

and action. Firm faith in the people and in the American processes, cumbersome and disappointing though these processes are on occasion, is implicit in the addresses.

These talks, then, in the hands of sympathetic students in schools, colleges and in adult centers, should open vistas of information and inspiration. The Office of War Information, under Elmer Davis, has as its purpose the clarifying of the thinking of Americans on the war through the distribution of information. Other agencies, for example, the Office of the Coordinator of Inter American Affairs, United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Office of Price Administration, War Production Board, are also interested in this program of public information in wartime. The study of these speeches should facilitate this Federal program of civilian education on war policies and aims.

WARTIME DISCUSSION AND DEMOCRACY

Public opinion, if it is to be solidly established on reasoned facts, should develop out of public discussion. The processes of democracy and those of discussion—of getting facts, analyzing a problem, formulating goals, weighing solutions, and setting up a course of action in line with preferred solutions—are identical. Informal discussions, public forums, "town meetings of the air," should continue to stimulate and educate Americans as they move through this gravest crisis. Such philosophy and such specific procedure the United States Office of Education, for example, has repeatedly voiced. Accordingly, the students of this book will join with their colleagues, young or old, in reflective thinking on the issues. The reading of these addresses should be followed by group discussion of the ideas. Obviously such discussion should conduct itself within the framework of American ideas of government and civilization. It should be constructive—as all genuine discussion is. This war, like World War I, must be won by words as well as by military weapons.

STANDARDS OF SPEAKING

The question recurs each time one of these volumes is compiled. What makes a speaker and speech "representative"? For discussion of these criteria, I refer to the Introduction of the previous volumes. I can only iterate here that *speeches are best judged if they are classified according to the occasion*. The question then becomes, who are "representative" political or legislative speakers? The representative preachers? Lecturers? Radio commentators? This principle explains why these volumes have attempted to include Chicago Round Table discussions which, after all, are hardly "speeches."

A second principle is that a representative speech is compounded of speaker, speech, audience, and occasion. A critic strikes a balance between these factors. The question arises, why include so-and-so, whose enunciation is bad? So-and-so, whose voice is thin? So-and-so, whose speaking personality is demagogic? So-and-so, who talks well but who in print is pretty dull? The answer is that various factors make up the criteria. Thought, organization, supporting details, language, audience adaptation, speaking personality, voice, enunciation, bodily action.

A third principle is that the good speech is immediately effective. Dr. Loren D. Reid, of Syracuse University, writing of Charles James Fox, the great British debater,² cites Thomas De Quincy as condemning Fox because the latter was "so powerful for instant effect, so impotent for posterity." The very weakness about which De Quincy worries is the strength of the orator. He is somebody speaking who is "powerful for instant effect." If he wields larger historical influence, so much the better. The speeches that, on paper, may seem commonplace were in delivery anything but dull or second-rate. We include these speeches not primarily for their literary excellence but for their oral features. Thus Roosevelt, Wallace, and most of the others in this

² Charles James Fox. Privatel published, Iowa City, Iowa, 1932

volume have met in speaking situations the impact of the times and have had some measure of national influence. It is hoped also that the speeches of these authors will survive for posterity.

CHURCHILL'S ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

In general, only speeches delivered by Americans have been included. An important exception in the present volume is Winston Churchill's address to Congress on December 26, 1941. Thus the editor will continue to adhere to the principle of selecting only speeches delivered in America—but will include some composed and presented by others than Americans.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

To the speakers who so generously permitted the reprinting and in most cases provided the texts, the author expresses his deep appreciation. The editor is also grateful to his colleagues in speech and to his graduate students in seminars in the History of Criticism of American Public Speaking, who gave counsel and inspiration. To the librarians at the State University of Iowa, including Lillie Cilley, Sarah Scott Edwards, Mary Brown Humphrey, Sylvia Noffsinger, and Altha Burnett Redman, the editor is also much indebted.

A CRAIG BAIRD

July 11, 1942

AMERICA AT WAR

WAR ADDRESS¹

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT²

President Roosevelt, at a joint session of the Congress of the United States, on December 8, 1941, delivered this brief, pointed message requesting a declaration of war against Japan. Twenty-four years before, on April 2, 1917, President Woodrow Wilson had similarly addressed Congress.

For days the President and Secretary of State Cordell Hull had negotiated with Nippon in an effort to keep the peace. Suddenly came the Sunday morning attack on Pearl Harbor, Honolulu, and the President appeared before the Congress hardly more than twenty-four hours later.

The joint session took place in the House chamber. In addition to the Senators and Representatives were members of the Supreme Court and a crowded gallery. The address was broadcast to the listening world.

The applause that greeted the President, fatigued from the twenty-four hour strain, by the audience, on its feet, was prolonged and increasingly tumultuous, with mingled shouts, cheers, and rebel yells. Speaker Samuel Rayburn at length stilled the demonstration and introduced the President: "Senators and Representatives of the Seventy-seventh Congress, I have the distinguished honor of presenting the President of the United States."

The President spoke slowly, solemnly, distinctly. To each word he gave important emphasis. His vocal pace slackened as he described the attack upon the Hawaiian Islands.

A great ovation followed the address of some six minutes. Hand-clapping, cheering and shouting welled up and died away only after the President had withdrawn. From all sections of the floor came repeated shouts: "Vote———Vote!"

¹ Text is from *Congressional Record*, v 87, no 219, p 9750, December 8, 1942 (daily edition), proceedings and debates of the 77th Congress, first session.

² For biographical note see Appendix.

The Senate withdrew and quickly passed the resolution. Only Senator Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan, long a critic of the President's foreign policy, spoke. He said, "The only answer we can give Japan is You have unsheathed your sword—and by it you shall die."

In the House some sixty brief speeches were given. Typical of these was that delivered by Representative Virgil Chapman, of Kentucky, included below.

The Senate vote was 82 to 0, that of the House, 388 to 1. The single negative vote was cast by Representative Jeannette Rankin, of Montana.

The President signed the resolution at 4 10 P M. On December 11 this nation declared war on Germany and Italy.

Since the Portsmouth Treaty of 1905, when President Theodore Roosevelt helped negotiate the Russian-Japanese treaty of peace after the defeat of Russia, Japanese-American relations were increasingly strained. In 1911 the "Gentleman's Agreement" was made, aimed to prevent Japanese immigration into the United States, in 1915 Japan made twenty-one demands on China, but the United States interfered, in 1924 Congress passed, over President Coolidge's veto, the Asiatic Exclusion Act, in 1931 Japan invaded Manchuria and Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson protested and tried in vain to rally Great Britain against this seizure, in 1933 Japan quit the League of Nations, in 1936, she denounced the naval limitation agreement with the United States and Great Britain, in 1936 Nippon began her seizure of China, in 1939 the United States renounced her treaty of commerce with Japan, in 1940, the Japs allied themselves with Germany and Italy, in 1941 Japan, with the consent of German-dominated Vichy France, moved into Indo-China. America then imposed economic sanctions against the aggressors. Thus the American position was one of resistance to Japanese expansion, to the closing of the open door trade opportunities in China, and to the threat against American territory and interests in the Far East.

In November, 1941, Secretary of State Cordell Hull and Roosevelt stated the American position as in effect asking Japan to get out of China, and to renounce her alliance with the Axis. Specifically the President inquired concerning the meaning of the marked increase of Japanese men and supplies in Indo-China. In general the Japs refused concessions and prepared to carry out their "immutable" policy of "Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere" (*e.g.* "Asia for the Japanese"). As the crisis developed, Special Envoy Saburo Kurusu flew by clipper across the Pacific and was negotiating with Secretary Hull in Washington.

when the attack upon Pearl Harbor came. It was generally assumed that these latest Japanese discussions were merely a cloak behind which the military surprise blows were prepared.

The dramatic and tragic inception of the war stunned the American public. Singular national unanimity greeted the congressional action of December 8th. Overnight the "America First" and similar groups disbanded. The nation set about the colossal job of winning the war.

To the Congress of the United States

Yesterday, December 7, 1941—a date which will live in infamy—the United States of America was suddenly and deliberately attacked by naval and air forces of the Empire of Japan.

The United States was at peace with that nation and, at the solicitation of Japan, was still in conversation with its government and its emperor looking toward the maintenance of peace in the Pacific.

Indeed, one hour after Japanese air squadrons had commenced bombing in Oahu, the Japanese ambassador to the United States and his colleague delivered to the Secretary of State a formal reply to a recent American message.

While this reply stated that it seemed useless to continue the existing diplomatic negotiations, it contained no threat or hint of war or armed attack.

It will be recorded that the distance of Hawaii from Japan makes it obvious that the attack was deliberately planned many days or even weeks ago.

During the intervening time, the Japanese government has deliberately sought to deceive the United States by false statements and expressions of hope for continued peace.

The attack yesterday on the Hawaiian Islands has caused severe damage to American naval and military forces. Very many American lives have been lost.

In addition, American ships have been reported torpedoed on the high seas between San Francisco and Honolulu.

Yesterday the Japanese government also launched an attack against Malaya.

Last night Japanese forces attacked Hong Kong

Last night Japanese forces attacked Guam

Last night Japanese forces attacked the Philippine Islands

Last night the Japanese attacked Wake Island

This morning the Japanese attacked Midway Island

Japan has, therefore, undertaken a surprise offensive extending throughout the Pacific area. The facts of yesterday speak for themselves. The people of the United States have already formed their opinions and well understand the implications to the very life and safety of our nation.

As commander in chief of the army and navy I have directed that all measures be taken for our defense.

Always will we remember the character of the onslaught against us.

No matter how long it may take us to overcome this premeditated invasion, the American people in their righteous might will win through to absolute victory.

I believe I interpret the will of the Congress and of the people when I assert that we will not only defend ourselves to the uttermost but will make very certain that this form of treachery shall never endanger us again.

Hostilities exist. There is no blinking at the fact that our people, our territory and our interests are in grave danger.

With confidence in our armed forces—with the unbounding determination of our people—we will gain the inevitable triumph—so help us, God.

I ask that the Congress declare that since the unprovoked and dastardly attack by Japan on Sunday, December 7, a state of war has existed between the United States and the Japanese Empire

ADDRESS TO CONGRESS³

WINSTON CHURCHILL⁴

On Monday, December 22, 1941, came the startling announcement from Washington, D C that "Prime Minister of Great Britain, Winston Churchill, is with Mr Roosevelt in the White House" For the first time in history a wartime Prime Minister of Great Britain visited the United States The previous meeting of these two spokesmen, in August, 1941, was in the North Atlantic, and produced the eight-point Atlantic Charter, a nebulous document, significant chiefly for the post-war world⁵ The present conference was first of all practical and concrete—to plan "the defeat of Hitlerism throughout the world" It took place as Hong Kong was falling, as Manila was being bombed, as the great Japanese campaign was getting under way to conquer the entire East Indies region

Four days later, the day after Christmas at the White House, the Prime Minister, again the first one to participate on such an occasion, addressed the joint session of Congress, held in the Senate chamber Present also were President Roosevelt, his cabinet, the Justices of the Supreme Court, Chiefs of diplomatic missions, and almost a thousand in the galleries Vice-President Wallace presided

Tears were in Churchill's eyes as the audience cheered him Then he adjusted his thick, hornrimmed glasses and began reading Laughter and applause continually interrupted him

Opinion differed concerning the oratorical effectiveness of the speaker According to some observers Churchill, confined to his manuscript, did not give full play to the eloquence for which he was famed On the other hand Senator Reynolds, for example, stated that it was a "wonderful speech, one of the finest" he had ever heard *Time* (January 5, 1942, p 12) stated that "the galleries wondered whether ever before had such a moving and eloquent speech been made on the Senate floor" Both the visible audience and the millions of radio listeners were in substantial agreement that the visiting English leader had risen

³ Reprinted by permission from *The New York Times*, December 27, 1941 Compare this text, a recording of the speech as delivered, with that printed in the *Congressional Record*, v 87, no 232, p 10386 8, December 26, 1941 (daily edition), proceedings and debates of the Seventh-seventh Congress, first session The "applause," inserted below, is from the *Congressional Record*

⁴ For biographical note see Appendix See also Dorothy Thompson's "Let's Face the Facts," *Representative American Speeches 1940-41*, p 137-48 See also Walter Lippmann's "Churchill," *Congressional Record*, v 87, no 232, p 10377-8, December 26, 1941 (daily edition)

⁵ See "Eight Common Principles for a better world," p 247

to the occasion with an oration not inferior to most of those delivered by him after September, 1939. In fact, a worthy successor to Fox, Pitt, Sheridan, or Burke was the British speaker that day from the dais in the American Congress.

Here again was Churchill's blunt, Anglo-Saxon phrasing ("Not all the tidings will be evil"), reminiscent of his language of May 13, 1940 ("I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat"), his humor (for example, in the first three paragraphs), his directness ("I am a child of the House of Commons"), his sentimental sidelights ("I wish indeed that my mother, whose memory I cherish across the vale of years, could have been here to see"), his vindication of himself and his fellow Englishmen; his trust in the people, his historical allusions and Biblical style, his tactful praise of the United States (*e g* "Olympian fortitude"), his "galling scorn" for his enemies and his prophecy of their destruction, his use of parallelism and similar sentence variations that provide dignity and true oratorical movement, his unexpected imagery ("cast away the scabbard"), his freedom from the usual oratorical platitudes ("good tidings from the blue water"), his concreteness ("Aleppo to Cyprus"), his direct questions; his use of refrain ("here we are together"), his awe-inspiring conclusion. The entire speech is rich in its associations with Anglo-Saxon political and cultural philosophy, in its logical pattern, in its almost perfect articulation of occasion, speaker, audience, and speech. Churchill, in the minds of most critics of speaking, is the ablest parliamentary or deliberative orator of the day, either in England or America.

Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the United States, I feel gratefully honored that you should have thus invited me to enter the United States Senate chamber and address the Representatives of both branches of Congress.

The fact that my American forebears have for so many generations played their part in the life of the United States and that here I am, an Englishman, welcomed in your midst makes this experience one of the most moving and thrilling in my life, which is already long and has not been entirely uneventful. [Laughter]

I wish indeed that my mother, whose memory I cherish across the vale of years, could have been here to see me. By the way, I cannot help reflecting that if my father had been

American and my mother British, instead of the other way around, I might have got here on my own [Laughter and applause]

In that case, this would not have been the first time you would have heard my voice. In that case I would not have needed any invitation, but if I had it is hardly likely that it would have been unanimous [Laughter] So, perhaps, things are better as they are. I may confess, however, that I do not feel quite like a fish out of water in a legislative assembly where English is spoken.

I am a child of the House of Commons. I was brought up in my father's house to believe in democracy, trust the people, that was his message. I used to see him cheered at meetings and in the streets by crowds of working men way back in those aristocratic Victorian days when Disraeli said "The world was for the few and for the very few." Therefore, I have been in full harmony with the tides which have flowed on both sides of the Atlantic against privileges and monopoly and I have steered confidently towards the Gettysburg ideal of government of the people, by the people, for the people [Applause]

I owe my advancement entirely to the House of Commons, whose servant I am. In my country, as in yours, public men are proud to be the servants of the State and would be ashamed to be its masters. On any day, if they thought the people wanted it, the House of Commons, could, by a simple vote, remove me from my office. But I am not worrying about it at all [Laughter]

As a matter of fact, I am sure they will approve very highly of my journey here, for which I obtained the King's permission, in order to meet the President of the United States, and to arrange with him for all that mapping of our military plans and for all those intimate meetings of the high officers

of both countries, which are indispensable for the successful prosecution of the war

I should like to say, first of all, how much I have been impressed and encouraged by the breadth of view and sense of proportion which I have found in all quarters over here to which I have had access. Anyone who did not understand the size and solidarity of the foundation of the United States might easily have expected to find an excited, disturbed, self-centered atmosphere, with all minds fixed upon the novel, startling and painful episodes of sudden war as it hit America.

After all, the United States has been attacked and set upon by three most powerfully armed dictator States, the greatest military power in Europe, the greatest military power in Asia—Japan, Germany and Italy have all declared and are making war upon you, and the quarrel is opened, which can only end in their overthrow or yours.

But, here in Washington in these memorable days, I have found an Olympian fortitude which, far from being based upon complacency, is only the mask of an inflexible purpose and the proof of a sure, well-grounded confidence in the final outcome. [Applause]

We in Britain had the same feeling in our darkest days. We, too, were sure that in the end all would be well. You do not, I am certain, underrate the severity of the ordeal to which you and we have still to be subjected. The forces ranged against us are enormous. They are bitter. They are ruthless. The wicked men and their factions, who have launched their peoples on the path of war and conquest, know that they will be called to terrible account if they cannot beat down by force of arms the peoples they have assailed.

They will stop at nothing. They have a vast accumulation of war weapons of all kinds. They have highly trained and disciplined armies, navies and air services. They have plans and designs which have long been contrived and matured. They will stop at nothing that violence and treachery can suggest.

It is quite true that on our side our resources in man power and materials are far greater than theirs. But only a portion of your resources are as yet mobilized and developed, and we both of us have much to learn in the cruel art of war.

We have, therefore, without doubt, a time of tribulation before us. In this same time some ground will be lost which it will be hard and costly to regain. Many disappointments and unpleasant surprises await us. Many of them will afflict us before the full marshaling of our latent and total power can be accomplished.

For the best part of twenty years the youth of Britain and America have been taught that war was evil, which is true, and that it would never come again, which has been proved false. For the best part of twenty years the youth of Germany, of Japan and Italy have been taught that aggressive war is the noblest duty of the citizen and that it should be begun as soon as the necessary weapons and organization have been made. We have performed the duties and tasks of peace. They have plotted and planned for war. This naturally has placed us, in Britain, and now places you, in the United States, at a disadvantage which only time, courage and untiring exertion can correct.

We have indeed to be thankful that so much time has been granted to us. If Germany had tried to invade the British Isles after the French collapse in June, 1940, and if Japan had declared war on the British Empire and the United States at about the same date, no one can say what disasters and agonies might not have been our lot. But now at the end of December, 1941, our transformation from easy-going peace to total war efficiency has made very great progress.

The broad flow of munitions in Great Britain has already begun. Immense strides have been made in the conversion of American industry to military purposes, and now that the United States is at war, it is possible for orders to be given every day

which in a year or eighteen months hence will produce results in war power beyond anything which has been seen or foreseen in the dictator States

Provided that every effort is made, that nothing is kept back, that the whole manpower, brain power, virility, valor and civic virtue of the English-speaking world, with all its galaxy of loyal, friendly or associated communities and states, provided that it is bent unremittingly to the simple but supreme task, I think it would be reasonable to hope that the end of 1942 will see us quite definitely in a better position than we are now. And that the year 1943 will enable us to assume the initiative upon an ample scale [Applause]. Some people may be startled or momentarily depressed when, like your President, I speak of a long and a hard war.

Our peoples would rather know the truth, somber though it be. And after all, when we are doing the noblest work in the world, not only defending our hearths and homes but the cause of freedom in every land, the question of whether deliverance comes in 1942 or 1943 or 1944 falls into its proper place in the grand proportions in human history [Applause].

Sure I am that this day now we are the masters of our fate, that the task which has been set us is not above our strength, that its pangs and toils are not beyond our endurance. As long as we have faith in our cause and unconquerable will-power, salvation will not be denied us.

In the words of the Psalmist: "He shall not be afraid of evil tidings, his heart is fixed, trusting in the Lord."

Not all the tidings will be evil. On the contrary, mighty strokes of war have already been dealt against the enemy—the glorious defense of their native soil by the Russian armies and people. Wounds have been inflicted upon the Nazi tyranny and system which have bitten deep and will fester and inflame not only in the Nazi body but in the Nazi mind [Applause].

The boastful Mussolini has crumpled already. He is now but a lackey and a serf, the merest utensil of his master's will.

He has inflicted great suffering and wrong upon his own industrious people. He has been stripped of all his African empire, Abyssinia has been liberated. Our armies of the East, which were so weak and ill-equipped at the moment of French desertion, now control all the regions from Teheran to Bengazı and from Aleppo and Cyprus to the sources of the Nile.

For many months we devoted ourselves to preparing to take the offensive in Libya. The very considerable battle which has been proceeding there for the last six weeks in the desert has been most fiercely fought on both sides. Owing to the difficulties of supply upon the desert flank we were never able to bring numerically equal forces to bear upon the enemy. Therefore we had to rely upon a superiority in the numbers and qualities of tanks and aircraft, British and American.

For the first time, aided by these—for the first time we have fought the enemy with equal weapons. For the first time we have made the Hun feel the sharp edge of those tools with which he has enslaved Europe. The armed forces of the enemy in Cyrenaica amounted to about 150,000 men, of whom a third were Germans. General Auchinleck set out to destroy totally that armed force, and I have every reason to believe that his aim will be fully accomplished. [Applause]

I am so glad to be able to place before you, members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, at this moment when you are entering the war, the proof that, with proper weapons and proper organization, we are able to beat the life out of the savage Nazi. [Applause] What Hitlerism is suffering in Libya is only a sample and a foretaste of what we have got to give him and his accomplices wherever this war should lead us in every quarter of the globe.

There are good tidings also from blue water. The lifeline of supplies which joins our two nations across the ocean, without which all would fail—that lifeline is flowing steadily and freely in spite of all that the enemy can do. It is a fact that the British Empire, which many thought eighteen months

ago was broken and ruined, is now incomparably stronger and is growing stronger with every month [Applause]

Lastly, if you will forgive me for saying it, to me the best tidings of all, the United States, united as never before, has drawn the sword for freedom and cast away the scabbard. [Applause]

All these tremendous steps have led the subjugated peoples of Europe to lift up their heads again in hope. They have put aside forever the shameful temptation of resigning themselves to the conqueror's will. Hope has returned to the hearts of scores of millions of men and women, and with that hope there burns a flame of anger against the brutal, corrupt invader. And still more fiercely burn the fires of hatred and contempt for the filthy Quislings whom he has suborned.

In a dozen famous ancient states, now prostrate under the Nazi yoke, the masses of the people—all classes and creeds—await the hour of liberation when they, too, will once again be able to play their part and strike their blows like men. That hour will strike and its solemn peal will proclaim that night is past and that the dawn has come.

The onslaught upon us, so long and so secretly planned by Japan, has presented both our countries with grievous problems for which we could not fully be prepared. If people ask me, as they have a right to ask me in England, "Why is it that you have not got an ample equipment of modern aircraft and army weapons of all kinds in Malaya and in the East Indies?" I can only point to the victory General Auchinleck has gained in the Libyan campaign. Had we diverted and dispersed our gradually growing resources between Libya and Malaya, we should have been found wanting in both theaters.

If the United States has been found at a disadvantage at various points in the Pacific Ocean, we know well that that is to no small extent because of the aid which you have been giving to us in munitions for the defense of the British Isles,

and for the Libyan campaign, and above all, because of your help in the Battle of the Atlantic, upon which all depends and which has in consequence been successfully and prosperously maintained

Of course, it would have been much better, I freely admit, if we had had enough resources of all kinds to be at full strength at all threatened points, but considering how slowly and reluctantly we brought ourselves to large-scale preparations, and how long these preparations take, we had no right to expect to be in such a fortunate position

The choice of how to dispose of our hitherto limited resources had to be made by Britain in time of war and by the United States in time of peace. And I believe that history will pronounce that upon the whole, and it is upon the whole that these matters must be judged, that the choice made was right.

Now that we are together, now that we are linked in a righteous comradeship of arms, now that our two considerable nations, each in perfect unity, have joined all their life energies in a common resolve, a new scene opens upon which a steady light will glow and brighten

Many people have been astonished that Japan should, in a single day, have plunged into war against the United States and the British Empire. We all wonder why, if this dark design, with its laborious and intricate preparations, had been so long filling their secret minds, they did not choose our moment of weakness eighteen months ago

Viewed quite dispassionately, in spite of the losses we have suffered and the further punishment we shall have to take, it certainly appears an irrational act. It is, of course, only prudent to assume that they have made very careful calculations, and think they see their way through

Nevertheless, there may be another explanation. We know that for many years past the policy of Japan has been dominated by secret societies of subalterns and junior officers of

the army and navy who have enforced their will upon successive Japanese cabinets and parliaments by the assassination of any Japanese statesman who opposed or who did not sufficiently further their aggressive policies. It may be that these societies, dazzled and dizzy with their own schemes of aggression and the prospect of early victory, have forced their country against its better judgment into war. They have certainly embarked upon a very considerable undertaking.

After the outrages they have committed upon us at Pearl Harbor, in the Pacific islands, in the Philippines, in Malaya and the Dutch East Indies they must know that the stakes for which they have decided to play are mortal. When we look at the resources of the United States and the British Empire, compared to those of Japan, when we remember those of China, which have so long valiantly withstood invasion and tyranny, and when also we observe the Russian menace which hangs over Japan, it becomes still more difficult to reconcile Japanese action with prudence or even with sanity.

What kind of a people do they think we are? Is it possible that they do not realize that we shall never cease to persevere against them until they have been taught a lesson which they and the world will never forget? [Prolonged applause]

Members of the Senate and members of the House of Representatives, I will turn for one moment more from the turmoil and convulsions of the present to the broader spaces of the future.

Here we are together facing a group of mighty foes who seek our ruin. Here we are together defending all that to free men is dear.

Twice in a single generation the catastrophe of world war has fallen upon us. Twice in our life time has the long arm of fate reached out across the oceans to bring the United States into the forefront of the battle. If we had kept together after

the last war, if we had taken common measures for our safety, this renewal of the curse need never have fallen upon us

Do we not owe it to ourselves, to our children, to tormented mankind, to make sure that these catastrophes do not engulf us for the third time? It has been proved that pestilences may break out in the Old World which carry their destructive ravages into the New World from which, once they are afoot, the New World cannot escape

Duty and prudence alike command, first, that the germ centers of hatred and revenge should be constantly and vigilantly curbed and treated in good time and that an adequate organization should be set up to make sure that the pestilence can be controlled at its earliest beginning before it spreads and rages throughout the entire earth [Applause]

Five or six years ago it would have been easy without shedding a drop of blood for the United States and Great Britain to have insisted on the fulfillment of the disarmament clauses of the treaties which Germany signed after the Great War

And that also would have been the opportunity for assuring to the Germans those materials, those raw materials, which we declared in the Atlantic Charter should not be denied to any nation, victor or vanquished

The chance has passed It is gone Prodigious hammer strokes have been needed to bring us together today

If you will allow me to use other language I will say that he must indeed have a blind soul who cannot see that some great purpose and design is being worked out here below, of which we have the honor to be the faithful servants

It is not given to us to peer into the mysteries of the future Still I avow my hope and faith, sure and inviolate, that in the days to come the British and American people will for their own safety and for the good of all walk together in majesty, in justice and in peace [Prolonged applause]

as a rumor but to challenge it, to turn to some authoritative group in private life and in the government for information.

MR MACLEISH I'm going to hire you in the Office of Facts and Figures to print that information. That is good, valid information.

MR MCKEON Those are excellent rules, but I should like to add some others. In addition to questions of fact and information, such as MacLeish emphasized, and the techniques of rules that you have been emphasizing, my own emphasis would be upon the aims and objectives. I think there is some danger that we should think of this war in terms of instruments of production and of warfare, whereas the problem in addition is one of insight into the issues involved.

MR MACLEISH Forgive me, McKeon, but don't we have to keep coming back to what we are actually talking about here, which is the role of government?

There is a great mass of information in a war which comes not from the government but from the people. It is the people, the citizens, the responsible members of the community as a whole, who develop those inward values.

My notion is that the duty of the government is, and I come back to Lasswell's phrase, to provide a basis for judgment, and when it goes beyond that, it goes beyond the prime scope of its duty. There may be occasions where it goes beyond it because the line is hard to draw, but fundamentally the things you are talking about, I think, are the duties of citizens and of citizens' groups, and there is no one in Washington who doesn't hope that citizens and citizens' groups will perform those duties.

MR MCKEON I think that is an excellent transition. We have talked about facts, as I understand it, under three general heads. We have talked about military and diplomatic facts, about facts that bear upon economic questions and production, and about facts that bear on the opinion front.

restrictions on using American troops overseas, the calling together of labor chiefs; the upping of arms schedules, the expansion of war expenditures, the establishment of tight censorship, and a long list of similar activities that adjusted the United States with remarkable speed to the job of making good the statement that "We are going to win the war" *

My Fellow Americans The sudden criminal attacks perpetrated by the Japanese in the Pacific provide the climax of a decade of international immorality

Powerful and resourceful gangsters have banded together to make war upon the whole human race Their challenge has now been flung at the United States of America The Japanese have treacherously violated the long-standing peace between us Many American soldiers and sailors have been killed by enemy action American ships have been sunk, American airplanes have been destroyed

The Congress and the people of the United States have accepted that challenge

Together with other free peoples, we are now fighting to maintain our right to live among our world neighbors in freedom in common decency, without fear of assault

I have prepared the full record of our past relations with Japan, and it will be submitted to the Congress It begins with the visit of Commodore Perry to Japan eighty-eight years ago It ends with the visit of two Japanese emissaries to the Secretary of State last Sunday, an hour after Japanese forces had loosed their bombs and machine guns against our flag, our forces and our citizens

I can say with utmost confidence that no Americans today or a thousand years hence need feel anything but pride in our patience and in our efforts through all the years toward achieving a peace in the Pacific which would be fair and honorable to

* For comments on Roosevelt's speaking see *Representative American Speeches 1937-38*, p. 11, 101, *1938-39*, p. 25, 36, 97, *1939-40*, p. 21, 26, 76, 117, *1940-41*, p. 19, 57, 125, 185.

every nation, large or small. And no honest person, today or a thousand years hence, will be able to suppress a sense of indignation and horror at the treachery committed by the military dictators of Japan, under the very shadow of the flag of peace borne by their special envoys in our midst.

The course that Japan has followed for the past ten years in Asia has paralleled the course of Hitler and Mussolini in Europe and in Africa. Today it has become far more than a parallel. It is collaboration—actual collaboration—so well calculated that all the continents of the world, and all the oceans, are now considered by the Axis strategists as one gigantic battlefield.

In 1931, ten years ago, Japan invaded Manchukuo—without warning.

In 1935, Italy invaded Ethiopia—without warning.

In 1938, Hitler occupied Austria—without warning.

In 1939, Hitler invaded Czechoslovakia—without warning.

Later in 1939, Hitler invaded Poland—without warning.

In 1940, Hitler invaded Norway, Denmark, The Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg—without warning.

In 1940, Italy attacked France and later Greece—without warning.

And this year, in 1941, the Axis powers attacked Yugoslavia and Greece and they dominated the Balkans—without warning.

In 1941 also, Hitler invaded Russia—without warning.

And now Japan has attacked Malaya and Thailand—and the United States—without warning.

It is all of one pattern.

We are now in this war. We are all in it—all the way. Every single man, woman and child is a partner in the most tremendous undertaking of our American history. We must share together the bad news and the good news, the defeats and the victories—the changing fortunes of war.

So far the news has all been bad. We have suffered a serious setback in Hawaii. Our forces in the Philippines,

which include the brave people of that commonwealth, are taking punishment, but are defending themselves vigorously. The reports from Guam and Wake and Midway islands are still confused, but we must be prepared for the announcement that all these three outposts have been seized.

The casualty lists of these first few days will undoubtedly be large. I deeply feel the anxiety of all families of the men in our armed forces and the relatives of people in cities which have been bombed. I can only give them my solemn promise that they will get news just as quickly as possible.

This government will put its trust in the stamina of the American people, and will give the facts to the public as soon as two conditions have been fulfilled: first, that the information has been definitely and officially confirmed, and, second, that the release of the information at the time it is received will not prove valuable to the enemy directly or indirectly.

Most earnestly I urge my countrymen to reject all rumors. These ugly little hints of complete disaster fly thick and fast in wartime. They have to be examined and appraised.

As an example, I can tell you frankly that until further surveys are made, I have not sufficient information to state the exact damage which has been done to our naval vessels at Pearl Harbor. Admittedly the damage is serious. But no one can say how serious, until we know how much of this damage can be repaired and how quickly the necessary repairs can be made.

I cite as another example a statement made on Sunday night that a Japanese carrier had been located and sunk off the Canal Zone. And when you hear statements that are attributed to what they call "an authoritative source," you can be reasonably sure that under these war circumstances the "authoritative source" was not any person in authority.

Many rumors and reports which we now hear originate with enemy sources. For instance, today the Japanese are claiming that as a result of their one action against Hawaii they have

gained naval supremacy in the Pacific. This is an old trick of propaganda which has been used innumerable times by the Nazis. The purposes of such fantastic claims are, of course, to spread fear and confusion among us, and to goad us into revealing military information which our enemies are desperately anxious to obtain.

Our government will not be caught in this obvious trap—and neither will the people of the United States.

It must be remembered by each and every one of us that our free and rapid communication these days must be greatly restricted in wartime. It is not possible to receive full, and speedy, and accurate reports from distant areas of combat. This is particularly true where naval operations are concerned. For in these days of the marvels of the radio it is often impossible for the commanders of various units to report their activities by radio at all for the very simple reason that this information would become available to the enemy and would disclose their position and their plan of defense or attack.

Of necessity there will be delays in officially confirming or denying reports of operations but we will not hide facts from the country if we know the facts and if the enemy will not be aided by their disclosure.

To all newspapers and radio stations—all those who reach the eyes and ears of the American people—I say this. You have a most grave responsibility to the nation now and for the duration of this war.

If you feel that your government is not disclosing enough of the truth you have every right to say so. But—in the absence of all the facts, as revealed by official sources—you have no right in the ethics of patriotism to deal out unconfirmed reports in such a way as to have people believe they are gospel truth.

Every citizen, in every walk of life, shares this same responsibility. The lives of our soldiers and sailors—the whole future of this nation—depend upon the manner in which each and every one of us fulfills his obligation to our country.

Now, a word about the recent past—and the future. A year and a half has elapsed since the fall of France, when the whole world first realized the mechanized might which the Axis nations had been building for so many years. America has used that year and a half to great advantage. Knowing that the attack might reach us in all too short a time, we immediately began greatly to increase our industrial strength and our capacity to meet the demands of modern warfare.

Precious months were gained by sending vast quantities of our war material to the nations of the world still able to resist Axis aggression. Our policy rested on the fundamental truth that the defense of any country resisting Hitler or Japan was in the long run the defense of our own country. That policy has been justified. It has given us time, invaluable time, to build our American assembly lines of production.

Assembly lines are in operation. Others are being rushed to completion. A steady stream of tanks and planes, of guns and ships, of shells and equipment—that is what these eighteen months have given us.

But it is all only a beginning of what has to be done. We must be set to face a long war against crafty and powerful bandits. The attack on Pearl Harbor can be repeated at any one of many points in both oceans and along both our coast lines and against all the rest of the hemisphere.

It will not only be a long war, it will be a hard war. That is the basis on which we now lay all our plans. That is the yardstick by which we measure what we shall need and demand: money, materials, doubled and quadrupled production—ever increasing. The production must be not only for our own army and navy and air forces. It must reinforce the other armies and navies and air forces fighting the Nazis and the war lords of Japan throughout the Americas and the world.

I have been working today on the subject of production. Your government has decided on two broad policies.

The first is to speed up all existing production by working on a seven-day-week basis in every war industry, including the production of essential raw materials

The second policy, now being put into form, is to rush additions to the capacity of production by building more new plants, by adding to old plants, and by using the many smaller plants for war needs

Over the hard road of the past months, we have at times met obstacles and difficulties, divisions and disputes, indifference and callousness. That is now all past—and, I am sure, forgotten.

The fact is that the country now has an organization in Washington built around men and women who are recognized experts in their own fields. I think the country knows that the people who are actually responsible in each and every one of these many fields are pulling together with a teamwork that has never before been excelled.

On the road ahead there lies hard work—gruelling work—day and night, every hour and every minute.

I was about to add that ahead there lies sacrifice for all of us.

But it is not correct to use that word. The United States does not consider it a sacrifice to do all one can, to give one's best to our nation, when the nation is fighting for its existence and its future life.

It is not a sacrifice for any man, old or young, to be in the army or the navy of the United States. Rather it is a privilege.

It is not a sacrifice for the industrialist or the wage earner, the farmer or the shopkeeper, the trainman or the doctor, to pay more taxes, to buy more bonds, to forego extra profits, to work longer or harder at the task for which he is best fitted. Rather it is a privilege.

It is not a sacrifice to do without many things to which we are accustomed if the national defense calls for doing without.

A review this morning leads me to the conclusion that at present we shall not have to curtail the normal articles of food

There is enough food for all of us and enough left over to send to those who are fighting on the same side with us

There will be a clear and definite shortage of metals of many kinds for civilian use, for the very reason that in our increased program we shall need for war purposes more than half of that portion of the principal metals which during the past year have gone into articles for civilian use. We shall have to give up many things entirely.

I am sure that the people in every part of the nation are prepared in their individual living to win this war. I am sure they will cheerfully help to pay a large part of its financial cost while it goes on. I am sure they will cheerfully give up those material things they are asked to give up.

I am sure that they will retain all those great spiritual things without which we cannot win through.

I repeat that the United States can accept no result save victory, final and complete. Not only must the shame of Japanese treachery be wiped out, but the sources of international brutality, wherever they exist, must be absolutely and finally broken.

In my message to the Congress yesterday I said that we "will make very certain that this form of treachery shall never endanger us again." In order to achieve that certainty, we must begin the great task that is before us by abandoning once and for all the illusion that we can ever again isolate ourselves from the rest of humanity.

In these last few years—and, most violently, in the last few days—we have learned a terrible lesson.

It is our obligation to our dead—it is our sacred obligation to their children and our children—that we must never forget what we have learned.

And what we all have learned is this:

There is no such thing as security for any nation—or any individual—in a world ruled by the principles of gangsterism.

There is no such thing as impregnable defense against powerful aggressors who sneak up in the dark and strike without warning

We have learned that our ocean-girt hemisphere is not immune from severe attack—that we cannot measure our safety in terms of miles on any map

We may acknowledge that our enemies have performed a brilliant feat of deception, perfectly timed and executed with great skill. It was a thoroughly dishonorable deed, but we must face the fact that modern warfare as conducted in the Nazi manner is a dirty business. We don't like it—we didn't want to get in it—but we are in it and we're going to fight it with everything we've got

I do not think any American has any doubt of our ability to administer proper punishment to the perpetrators of these crimes

Your government knows that for weeks Germany has been telling Japan that if Japan did not attack the United States, Japan would not share in dividing the spoils with Germany when peace came. She was promised by Germany that if she came in she would receive the complete and perpetual control of the whole of the Pacific area—and that means not only the Far East, not only all of the islands in the Pacific, but also a stranglehold on the west coast of North, Central and South America

We also know that Germany and Japan are conducting their military and naval operations in accordance with a joint plan. That plan considers all peoples and nations which are not helping the Axis powers as common enemies of each and every one of the Axis powers

That is their simple and obvious grand strategy. That is why the American people must realize that it can be matched only with similar grand strategy. We must realize for example that Japanese successes against the United States in the Pacific are helpful to German operations in Libya, that any German

success against the Caucasus is inevitably an assistance to Japan in her operations against the Dutch East Indies, that a German attack against Algiers or Morocco opens the way to a German attack against South America

On the other side of the picture, we must learn to know that guerilla warfare against the Germans in Serbia helps us, that a successful Russian offensive against the Germans helps us, and that British successes on land or sea in any part of the world strengthen our hands

Remember always that Germany and Italy, regardless of any formal declaration of war, consider themselves at war with the United States at this moment just as much as they consider themselves at war with Britain and Russia. And Germany puts all the other republics of the Americas into the category of enemies. The people of the hemisphere can be honored by that.

The true goal we seek is far above and beyond the ugly field of battle. When we resort to force, as now we must, we are determined that this force shall be directed toward ultimate good as well as against immediate evil. We Americans are not destroyers—we are builders.

We are now in the midst of a war, not for conquest, not for vengeance, but a world in which this nation, and all that this nation represents, will be safe for our children. We expect to eliminate the danger from Japan, but it would serve us ill if we accomplished that and found that the rest of the world was dominated by Hitler and Mussolini.

We are going to win the war and we are going to win the peace that follows.

And in the dark hours of this day—and through dark days that may be yet to come—we will know that the vast majority of the members of the human race are on our side. Many of them are fighting with us. All of them are praying for us. For, in representing our cause, we represent theirs as well—our hope and their hope for liberty under God.

ON THE WAR RESOLUTION AGAINST JAPAN⁹

VIRGIL CHAPMAN¹⁰

For the setting of this speech see the introductory note to President Roosevelt's "War Address" The address is inserted here as typical of the many short extemporaneous-impromptu talks given in the House on December 8, 1941, just before the passage of the war resolution

Mr Speaker, through the centuries idealists have dreamed, saints have prayed, and poets have sung that there would come an endless epoch of universal peace, as described by Tennyson

When the war drum throbs no longer,
And the battle flags are furled,
In the parliament of man,
The federation of the world

That is a beautiful dream, a sublime ideal, but there has been little, if any, change in human nature as the human race has staggered through centuries of recorded and unrecorded time Until such attributes as avarice, covetousness, greed, envy, jealousy, selfishness, malice, cruelty, inordinate ambition, and lust for glory, power, and wealth are purged from the hearts of people composing the nations of the earth, overnight a covenant may become a rope of sand and a treaty a mere scrap of paper

After hundreds of years of struggling and battling, suffering and sacrificing, for liberty, democracy, and justice, after 2,000 years of the march of Christianity and teaching of the doctrine of the Prince of Peace, "On earth peace, good will toward men," the things we hold most dear, our priceless liberties, our most cherished institutions, our soil, our citizens, are the object

⁹ *Congressional Record*, v 87, no 219, p 9780-1, December 8, 1941 (daily edition), proceedings and debates of the 77th Congress, first session

¹⁰ For biographical note see Appendix

of direct attack by the most brutal, treacherous, ruthless military power that has ever cursed the earth, Adolf Hitler and his bloody alliance with Italy and Japan

When the tocsin of war was sounded in Europe, many of us thought at first that perhaps it was only another of those European brawls which have occurred, as the eloquent Col W C P Breckinridge said of fires, "with constantly recurring periodicity" We did not have sufficient imagination to visualize that the slimy sewer rat Hitler could menace the peace and safety of civilization, conquer continental Europe, and threaten ominously the subjugation or destruction of the remainder of the world When he made promises of friendship tonight and tomorrow at dawn moved his iron legions, his panzer units and armored tanks, into countries that were following the quiet pursuits of peace, with bombs and torpedoes attacked unsuspecting peoples, destroyed cathedrals and museums of art that represented a thousand years of accumulated culture, slaughtered old men, women, and children, I quickly realized that no nation could be safe and no people could be permanently free until Hitler and his Italian and Japanese military marionettes are rendered utterly impotent and their power is totally destroyed

The danger to institutions that are the precious heritage of English-speaking peoples in Britain and America was vividly illustrated when, on the same night, Westminster Abbey, the symbol of faith, and the House of Commons, the symbol of representative government, were badly damaged by Hitler's bombs Not only are our institutions menaced by this militant coalition of ruthlessness and murder, but at dawn yesterday, on the holy Sabbath, while our wise and peace-loving Secretary of State was striving to preserve peaceful relations with Japan, while their diplomatic representatives were still holding out delusions of hope that peace might be preserved, the Navy and air force of Japan made an unprovoked, premeditated, treacherous, destructive attack on the land and the armed forces of our country

In this critical hour, as the representatives of an outraged people, duty requires that we accept the challenge, assert our inherent, God-given right and duty of self-defense, recognize the state of war imposed on us by Japan, and pledge all the resources of America to the winning of the conflict. There can be no alternative. Let it be "War to the knife, and the knife to the hilt."

In this crisis we must have unity of thought, unity of sentiment, unity of spirit, unity of purpose, unity of action. This is no time for arguments between reactionary and progressive Republicans, between conservative Democrats and New Deal liberals. No, there is no time now for differences between Republicans and Democrats. There is no place in this Republic for any "isms" except pure, unadulterated, undefiled, and unterrified Americanism.

Now has come the time for action,
Lay aside all thought of faction,
Call the roll

Let us be imbued with more of the spirit that characterized Admiral Farragut, who, a few years after the War between the States, while cruising in the Dardanelles near to the palace of the Sultan of Turkey, sent word to the Sultan that he would like to visit him. The Sultan sent back the message:

I will receive no one unless he be a prince of the blood royal

That stirred the fighting blood of the old Tennessee admiral, who sent this reply:

Tell the Sultan that I have on board my flagship 600 American citizens. Every one of them is a prince of the blood royal in his own land. We expect to visit him in force immediately.

Needless to say, they received a royal welcome from his Sultanic Majesty. That spirit should permeate the American people until this war ends in complete victory for the forces of

light over the forces of darkness, for liberty and democracy over despotism and totalitarianism. There is no room for any form of disloyalty anywhere under the protecting folds of Old Glory. As General Dix said more than eighty years ago, "If anyone attempts to haul down the American flag, shoot him on the spot." In the language immortalized by one of my illustrious predecessors in the House, the beloved Joe C S Blackburn, for years the Prince Rupert of debate in this and the other body

He who dallies is a dastard, he who doubts is damned

AMERICA'S WAR AIMS

THE PRICE OF FREE WORLD VICTORY¹

HENRY WALLACE²

Vice President Wallace delivered this address at a dinner of the Free World Association at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, on May 8, 1942. It was broadcast by the Columbia Broadcasting System.

The immediate reception of the speech by the press and public was only perfunctory. Then gathering recognition of the address developed. The Free World Association printed it, and sales quickly mounted. Norman Cousins in the *Saturday Review of Literature*³ observed that it "has already been acclaimed in various quarters as the most significant American statement on war since we became an active member of the United Nations." Raymond Clapper and many another critic pronounced it an unusual utterance and worthy of American leadership in this war.

More specifically, this speech voiced the character of this conflict as a "people's war," and a "fight between a slave world and a free world." Wallace visualized the "freedom-loving people on the march" and, like Woodrow Wilson, ascribed to his country the principle and program of helping the "people in their millennial and revolutionary march toward manifesting here on earth the dignity that is in every human soul." The twenty-eight United Nations arrayed against the Axis found in this conflict common aims and a real solidarity. Wallace interpreted this unity in terms of the people's long-time struggle for freedom and well-being, and the Vice President doubtless stirred their hope of their release from governments and policies that would crush them, and held out to them their participation in a "New Order" of equalitarianism.

The high ethical note of the address, Biblical in its beginning and ending, passed from generalizations to "four duties" of the people's revolution. It is almost as if two speeches were combined. The speaker made his address practical by outlining the definite steps to be followed.

¹ By permission of and through the courtesy of Vice President Henry Wallace. Text is reproduced from *Congressional Record*, v 88, no 90, p. A 1823-4, May 11, 1942 (daily edition).

² For biographical note see Appendix.

³ *Saturday Review of Literature* 25 3-4+ June 13 1942

by the "people," especially by the Americans in the steel or aviation plants, the soldiers, sailors, and aviators about to embark for other continents

Nevertheless, this address is primarily an oration, with its broad generalizations that need no proof to his millions of listeners and readers, and its emotional spirit. Is the speech guilty of "broad assertions," of "pledges advanced that cannot be carried out," of "disregard of the world of realities"? Critics so charged.⁴ On the contrary, the speech is a worthy utterance not to be gauged by the severe rules of evidence. The speaker here is consistent with his earlier political and religious philosophy.⁵ Among the Washington leaders of 1942 Wallace in this speech had such insight into the problems and rights of humanity that he might well be reckoned with for the possible role as Chief Executive of this nation.

We, who in a formal or an informal way represent most of the free peoples of the world, are met here tonight in the interests of the millions in all the nations who have freedom in their souls. To my mind this meeting has just one purpose—to let those millions in other countries know that here in the United States are 130 million men, women and children who are in this war to the finish. Our American people are utterly resolved to go on until they can strike the relentless blows that will assure a complete victory, and with it win a new day for the lovers of freedom, everywhere on this earth.

This is a fight between a slave world and a free world. Just as the United States in 1862 could not remain half slave and half free, so in 1942 the world must make its decision for a complete victory one way or the other.

As we begin the final stages of this fight to the death between the free world and the slave world, it is worth while to refresh our minds about the march of freedom for the common man. The idea of freedom—the freedom that we in the United States know and love so well—is derived from the Bible with

⁴ See *Congressional Record*, v 88, no 111, p A 2367, June 11, 1942 (daily edition). "That Wallace Speech," article from *Chicago Daily News* of June 5, 1942.

⁵ See Henry Wallace's *Statesmanship and Religion*, Round Table Press, New York, 1934.

its extraordinary emphasis on the dignity of the individual Democracy is the only true political expression of Christianity

The prophets of the Old Testament were the first to preach social justice But that which was sensed by the prophets many centuries before Christ was not given complete and powerful political expression until our nation was formed as a Federal Union a century and a half ago Even then, the march of the common people had just begun Most of them did not yet know how to read and write There were no public schools to which all children could go Men and women cannot be really free until they have plenty to eat, and time and ability to read and think and talk things over Down the years, the people of the United States have moved steadily forward in the practice of democracy Through universal education, they now can read and write and form opinions of their own They have learned, and are still learning, the art of production—that is, how to make a living They have learned, and are still learning, the art of self-government

If we were to measure freedom by standards of nutrition, education and self-government, we might rank the United States and certain nations of Western Europe very high But this would not be fair to other nations where education has become widespread only in the last 20 years In many nations, a generation ago, 9 out of 10 of the people could not read or write Russia, for example, was changed from an illiterate to a literate nation within one generation and, in the process, Russia's appreciation of freedom was enormously enhanced In China, the increase during the past 30 years in the ability of the people to read and write has become matched by their increased interest in real liberty

Everywhere, reading and writing are accompanied by industrial progress, and industrial progress sooner or later inevitably brings a strong labor movement From a long-time and fundamental point of view, there are no backward peoples which are lacking in mechanical sense Russians, Chinese, and

the Indians both of India and the Americas all learn to read and write and operate machines just as well as your children and my children. Everywhere the common people are on the march. Thousands of them are learning to read and write, learning to think together, learning to use tools. These people are learning to think and work together in labor movements, some of which may be extreme or impractical at first, but which eventually will settle down to serve effectively the interest of the common man.

When the freedom-loving people march—when the farmers have an opportunity to buy land at reasonable prices and to sell the produce of their land through their own organizations, when workers have the opportunity to form unions and bargain through them collectively, and when the children of all the people have an opportunity to attend schools which teach them truths of the real world in which they live—when these opportunities are open to everyone, then the world moves straight ahead.

But in countries where the ability to read and write has been recently acquired or where the people have had no long experience in governing themselves on the basis of their own thinking, it is easy for demagogues to arise and prostitute the mind of the common man to their own base ends. Such a demagogue may get financial help from some person of wealth who is unaware of what the end result will be. With this backing, the demagogue may dominate the minds of the people, and, from whatever degree of freedom they have, lead them backward into slavery. Herr Thyssen, the wealthy German steel man, little realized what he was doing when he gave Hitler enough money to enable him to play on the minds of the German people. The demagogue is the curse of the modern world, and of all the demagogues, the worst are those financed by well-meaning wealthy men who sincerely believe that their wealth is likely to be safer if they can hire men with political "it" to change the sign posts and lure the people back into slavery of the most

degraded kind. Unfortunately for the wealthy men who finance movements of this sort, as well as for the people themselves, the successful demagogue is a powerful genie who, when once let out of his bottle, refuses to obey anyone's command. As long as his spell holds, he defies God Himself, and Satan is turned loose upon the world.

Through the leaders of the Nazi revolution, Satan now is trying to lead the common man of the whole world back into slavery and darkness. For the stark truth is that the violence preached by the Nazis is the devil's own religion of darkness. So also is the doctrine that one race or one class is by heredity superior and that all other races or classes are supposed to be slaves. The belief in one Satan-inspired Fuehrer, with his Quislings, his Laval, and his Mussolini—his "gauleiters" in every nation in the world—is the last and ultimate darkness. Is there any hell hotter than that of being a Quisling, unless it is that of being a Laval or a Mussolini?

In a twisted sense, there is something almost great in the figure of the Supreme Devil operating through a human form, in a Hitler who has the daring to spit straight into the eye of God and man. But the Nazi system has a heroic position for only one leader. By definition only one person is allowed to retain full sovereignty over his own soul. All the rest are stooges—they are stooges who have been mentally and politically degraded, and who feel that they can get square with the world only by mentally and politically degrading other people. These stooges are really psychopathic cases. Satan has turned loose upon us the insane.

The march of freedom of the past 150 years has been a long-drawn-out people's revolution. In this Great Revolution of the people, there were the American Revolution of 1775, the French Revolution of 1792, the Latin-American Revolutions of the Bolivarian era, the German Revolution of 1848, and the Russian Revolution of 1918. Each spoke for the common man in terms of blood on the battlefield. Some went to excess. But

the significant thing is that the people groped their way to the light. More of them learned to think and work together.

The people's revolution aims at peace and not at violence, but if the rights of the common man are attacked, it unleashes the ferocity of a she-bear who has lost a cub. When the Nazi psychologists tell their master Hitler that we in the United States may be able to produce hundreds of thousands of planes, but that we have no will to fight, they are only fooling themselves and him. The truth is that when the rights of the American people are transgressed, as those rights have been transgressed, the American people will fight with a relentless fury which will drive the ancient Teutonic gods back cowering into their caves. The Gotterdamering has come for Odin and his crew.

The people are on the march toward even fuller freedom than the most fortunate peoples of the earth have hitherto enjoyed. No Nazi counter-revolution will stop it. The common man will smoke the Hitler stooges out into the open in the United States, in Latin America, and in India. He will destroy their influence. No Lavals, no Mussolinis will be tolerated in a Free World.

The people in their millennial and revolutionary march toward manifesting here on earth the dignity that is in every human soul, hold as their credo the Four Freedoms enunciated by President Roosevelt in his message to Congress on January 6, 1941. These four freedoms are the very core of the revolution for which the United States have taken their stand. We who live in the United States may think there is nothing very revolutionary about freedom of religion, freedom of expression, and freedom from the fear of secret police. But when we begin to think about the significance of freedom from want for the average man, then we know that the revolution of the past 150 years has not been completed, either here in the United States or in any other nation in the world. We know that this revolu-

tion cannot stop until freedom from want has actually been attained

And now, as we move forward toward realizing the Four Freedoms of this people's revolution, I would like to speak about four duties. It is my belief that every freedom, every right, every privilege has its price, its corresponding duty without which it cannot be enjoyed. The four duties of the people's revolution, as I see them today, are these

- 1 The duty to produce to the limit
- 2 The duty to transport as rapidly as possible to the field of battle
- 3 The duty to fight with all that is in us
- 4 The duty to build a peace—just, charitable and enduring

The fourth duty is that which inspires the other three

We failed in our job after World War No. 1. We did not know how to go about it to build an enduring world-wide peace. We did not have the nerve to follow through and prevent Germany from rearming. We did not insist that she "learn war no more." We did not build a peace treaty on the fundamental doctrine of the people's revolution. We did not strive whole-heartedly to create a world where there could be freedom from want for all the peoples. But by our very errors we learned much, and after this war we shall be in position to utilize our knowledge in building a world which is economically, politically and, I hope, spiritually sound.

Modern science, which is a by-product and an essential part of the people's revolution, has made it technologically possible to see that all of the people of the world get enough to eat. Half in fun and half seriously, I said the other day to Madame Litvinoff "The object of this war is to make sure that everybody in the world has the privilege of drinking a quart of milk a day." She replied "Yes, even half a pint." The peace must mean a better standard of living for the common man, not merely in the United States and England, but also in India, Russia,

China and Latin America—not merely in the United Nations, but also in Germany and Italy and Japan

Some have spoken of the "American Century" I say that the century on which we are entering—the century which will come out of this war—can be and must be the century of the common man Perhaps it will be America's opportunity to suggest the freedoms and duties by which the common man must live Everywhere the common man must learn to build his own industries with his own hands in a practical fashion Everywhere the common man must learn to increase his productivity so that he and his children can eventually pay to the world community all that they have received No nation will have the God-given right to exploit other nations Older nations will have the privilege to help younger nations get started on the path to industrialization, but there must be neither military nor economic imperialism The methods of the nineteenth century will not work in the people's century which is now about to begin India, China, and Latin America have a tremendous stake in the people's century As their masses learn to read and write, and as they become productive mechanics, their standard of living will double and treble Modern science, when devoted wholeheartedly to the general welfare, has in it potentialities of which we do not yet dream

And modern science must be released from German slavery International cartels that serve American greed and the German will to power must go Cartels in the peace to come must be subjected to international control for the common man, as well as being under adequate control by the respective home governments In this way, we can prevent the Germans from again building a war machine while we sleep With international monopoly pools under control, it will be possible for inventions to serve all the people instead of only the few

Yes, and when the time of peace comes, the citizen will again have a duty, the supreme duty of sacrificing the lesser interest for the greater interest of the general welfare Those who write the peace must think of the whole world There can

be no privileged peoples. We ourselves in the United States are no more a master race than the Nazis. And we cannot perpetuate economic warfare without planting the seeds of military warfare. We must use our power at the peace table to build an economic peace that is just, charitable, and enduring.

If we really believe that we are fighting for a people's peace, all the rest becomes easy. Production, yes—it will be easy to get production without either strikes or sabotage, production with the wholehearted cooperation between willing arms and keen brains, enthusiasm, zip, energy geared to the tempo of keeping at it everlastingly day after day. Hitler knows as well as those of us who sit in on the War Production Board meetings that we here in the United States are winning the battle of production. He knows that both labor and business in the United States are doing a most remarkable job and that his only hope is to crash through to a complete victory sometime during the next 6 months.

And then there is the task of transportation to the line of battle by truck, by railroad car, by ship. We shall joyously deny ourselves so that our transportation system is improved by at least 30 per cent.

I need say little about the duty to fight. Some people declare, and Hitler believes, that the American people have grown soft in the last generation. Hitler agents continually preach in South America that we are cowards, unable to use, like the "brave" German soldiers, the weapons of modern war. It is true that American youth hates war with a holy hatred. But because of that fact and because Hitler and the German people stand as the very symbol of war, we shall fight with a tireless enthusiasm until war and the possibility of war have been removed from this planet. We shall cleanse the plague spot of Europe, which is Hitler's Germany, and with it the hellhole of Asia—Japan.

The American people have always had guts and always will have. You know the story of Bomber Pilot Dixon and Radioman Gene Aldrich and Ordnanceman Tony Pastula—the story

which Americans will be telling their children for generations to illustrate man's ability to master any fate. These men lived for 34 days on the open sea in a rubber life raft, 8 feet by 4 feet, with no food but that which they took from the sea and the air with one pocket knife and a pistol. And yet they lived it through and came at last to the beach of an island they did not know. In spite of their suffering and weakness, they stood like men, with no weapon left to protect themselves, and no shoes on their feet or clothes on their backs, and walked in military file because, they said, "if there were Japs, we didn't want to be crawling."

The American fighting men, and all the fighting men of the United Nations, will need to summon all their courage during the next few months. I am convinced that the summer and fall of 1942 will be a time of supreme crisis for us all. Hitler, like the prize fighter who realizes he is on the verge of being knocked out, is gathering all his remaining forces for one last desperate blow. There is abject fear in the heart of the madman and a growing discontent among his people as he prepares for his last all-out offensive.

We may be sure that Hitler and Japan will cooperate to do the unexpected—perhaps an attack by Japan against Alaska and our Northwest coast at a time when German transport planes will be shuttled across from Dakar to furnish leadership and stiffening to a German uprising in Latin America. In any event, the psychological and sabotage offensive in the United States and Latin America will be timed to coincide with, or anticipate by a few weeks, the height of the military offensive.

We must be especially prepared to stifle the fifth columnists in the United States who will try to sabotage not merely our war-material plants, but even more important, our minds. We must be prepared for the worst kind of fifth-column work in Latin America, much of it operating through the agency of governments with which the United States at present is at peace. When I say this, I recognize that the peoples, both of Latin America and of the nations supporting the agencies through

which the fifth columnists work, are overwhelmingly on the side of the democracies

We must expect the offensive against us on the military, propaganda, and sabotage fronts, both in the United States and in Latin America, to reach its apex some time during the next few months. The convulsive efforts of the dying madman will be so great that some of us may be deceived into thinking that the situation is bad at a time when it is really getting better. But in the case of most of us, the events of the next few months, disturbing though they may be, will only increase our will to bring about complete victory in this war of liberation. Prepared in spirit, we cannot be surprised. Psychological terrorism will fall flat. As we nerve ourselves for the supreme effort in this hemisphere we must not forget the sublime heroism of the oppressed in Europe and Asia, whether it be in the mountains of Yugoslavia, the factories of Czechoslovakia and France, the farms of Poland, Denmark, Holland, and Belgium, among the seamen of Norway, or in the occupied areas of China and the Dutch East Indies. Everywhere the soul of man is letting the tyrant know that slavery of the body does not end resistance.

There can be no half measures. North, South, East, West, and Middle West—the will of the American people is for complete victory.

No compromise with Satan is possible. We shall not rest until all the victims under the Nazi yoke are freed. We shall fight for a complete peace as well as a complete victory.

The people's revolution is on the march, and the devil and all his angels cannot prevail against it. They cannot prevail, for on the side of the people is the Lord.

He giveth power to the faint, to them that have no might. He increaseth strength.

They that wait upon the Lord shall mount up with wings as eagles, they shall run, and not be weary, they shall walk and not be faint.

Strong in the strength of the Lord, we who fight in the people's cause will never stop until that cause is won.

THE WARFARE OF FREE SOULS⁶

A A BERLE, JR.⁷

Assistant Secretary of State A A Berle, Jr, delivered this speech on February 12, 1942, at a dinner meeting of the Conference on Religion, at Columbia University, New York City. The address is not especially light reading, it is not filled with concrete and clever turns of phrase and detail welcome to dinner listeners. It is devoid of humor. Nevertheless, the theme, mode of development, and underlying philosophy were peculiarly well adapted to this audience composed largely of religious workers and clergymen. The significance of the address lies in the forthrightness with which a member of our State Department, two months after our entry into the war, defines the issue of World War II as one of defending a civilization based upon religious principles.

Similarly, Vice-President Wallace later identified the movement of the "common people" around the globe with the principles of the Old and New Testaments. Both speakers, then, would mirror our war aims against a background of religious culture.

How does Berle state his case? In philosophical terms, in deductive and abstract propositions that seek to set up the pattern in which our religious civilizations have survived. He views the universal effort of peoples in war and adversity to find a faith that will light the way to peace and progress, he proposes that only these nations that have nurtured such designs have survived ("no civilization has lasted for more than the briefest of periods on a philosophy of chaos"), he suggests that such mainspring for social and political cohesion provides "endless loyalties" and multiplies the united strength, he reasons that whereas scientists have moved toward faith, the political statesmen and their followers in the United States have neglected to do so, he reviews the Nazi regime, whose attempt to set up a social-political-military program failed to provide this dynamic and led to Rosenberg's effort to create a "Mein Kampf" religion, he urges the bold voicing of our faith in the "Godhead" and in brotherhood, and finally he posits that

⁶ Text supplied by the Honorable A A Berle, Jr

⁷ For biographical note see Appendix

such national alliance with our spiritual inheritance will bring us to victory and enable us to reestablish post-war "kindliness and order"

Each student of this speech will examine the facts of recent and remote history assumed in Berle's chain of reasoning. Although this address, especially in its closing sections, is not devoid of warm emotional suggestion, it is primarily a logical and philosophical document. If its tenets are sound, each expositor of our war aims will reiterate in practical areas these high doctrines essential to our national destiny.

Other noteworthy speeches by Mr. Berle during recent months included the address at Williamstown Institute of Human Relations, August 28, 1941, "The Program of the National Reich's Church of Germany," at Columbus, Ohio, October 25, 1941, that at Des Moines, Iowa, on February 29, 1942, and the one before Columbia University faculty and students on February 12, 1942, and a notable address on "Greek Independence" at a dinner at Columbia University, March 25, 1942.

The present war has brought many miseries and will bring more. But it has had certain effects which may be vastly useful to this country and to this time. One of its profoundest results I think will be to compel men to re-examine the basis on which they live. Almost inevitably this process brings about a fierce desire in men to formulate and assert the faith by which they live, for which they fight, and in which they can triumphantly die if need be, and conquer if God wills.

The reason for this is simple, and age old. The process of war limits and perhaps takes away altogether the material luxuries and even the necessities of existence. It tears men from their dearest terrestrial interests. Not infrequently it condemns them to pain—not merely the physical agony but to the even deeper moral agony of separation from people they love best, and to the apparent loss of everything to which they have devoted their lives. Necessarily men are forced to think more deeply, and most of all, to find some reason outside themselves for maintaining the loyalties and carrying on the efforts to which they are constrained by every fiber of their being.

Throughout history, out of this turmoil there has come a poignant and burning desire to find, accept and assert a faith which is beyond the limits of worldly existence

The historian understands this, but he understands something else as well. He understands that no civilization has yet endured which did not have a faith over and above faith in things which are seen. This phenomenon is almost universal. A Communist, for instance, will deny not only the existence of God, but the rationality of religion, insisting that all tests must be material, but in the same breath he will urge his fellows to work for the generations which come after, and to fight and die to give their children their chance at a better life. Yet if all life is judged merely by what happens on the material plane to each individual, this would be meaningless nonsense.

By the deadly evolution of inevitable paradox, the people who have most recently denied the religious doctrine have been swift to assert one at least of its basic tenets: faith in the growing life, and obligation to forward that life irrespective of self.

A layman in an assembly of philosophers and divines of course cannot speak with authority. Humbly, therefore, let me offer a few simple ideas in this realm of faith by which we must support life and in which we must gain victory through a long and a terrible road.

"In the beginning was the Word," said Saint John, "and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." I suppose Saint John was saying that underlying everything there was a conception, an idea, a design, and that the conception was divine. Under it, you will recall, all things existed, anything which denied it was destined to disappear. This seems to me the first and greatest essential of all faith, just as it is the first and greatest need of every human being.

Unless, in this vast collection of events and emotions, there is some design, then we are moving in mere disordered chaos. Yet chaos is itself death—the dissolution both of man and of the world. No civilization has lasted for more than the briefest

of periods on a philosophy of chaos. Men, to justify their lives, have to insist, and invariably do insist, that they have a place in the scheme of things, however small, that they are a part of the design, that they realize the best of themselves as they come into harmony with that design, and that that design is beyond measure greater than the life or fortune of any one of us.

Acceptance of this single idea brings with it two immediate results. The first is a prompt recognition of the endless loyalties which must exist between man and man, between men and their community, their country and their fellows everywhere. On this is based the union of free men which makes universities possible, which brings great religions into being, which builds nations, which defends humanity when it is assaulted.

The second result is that once man has accepted this fact his strength is multiplied tenfold. If he is living, working, fighting in the service of a great design, he need not fear the arrow that flies by day or the terror that travels by night. In his very being he is carrying forward the great work, even pain and suffering form part of the great count. He is of the race of heroes, and he can stand and look fearlessly at the sun.

It is now many years since my grandfather, a noted geologist in his time, opened correspondence with Huxley, perhaps the best known English scientist of the period. In those days the fashion was to assert a conflict between science and religion. Religion rested on an act of faith, whereas science was supposed to be grounded only on demonstrable fact. Through the correspondence the argument continued over many years. Today we should smile a little at that argument.

I think it is generally recognized today that every science, even the most abstract one we know as mathematics, begins by accepting a point of beginning which cannot be proved, which is merely another way of saying that your scientist begins with an act of faith. Indeed, a physicist who has reduced matter from molecules to atoms, from atoms to ions and electrons, and these in turn to merely balanced abstractions of electric charge,

which in turn may be analyzed into some still more abstract mathematical formula—your physicist has come perilously close to saying that everything that exists is an abstraction or an idea. In the nearly two thousand years he has come to say very much with Saint John that in the beginning was the Word, and that only by It was anything made.

But while scientists have reached faith by their own particular route, we have left undone one thing which our fathers knew better. We have neglected in recent years to insist that some consciousness of faith was essential to a sane, a happy and a useful life, to a strong, gracious and productive nation, and to the warfare which must always be carried on against the evil of neglect in the best of times, and against the organized evil of wickedness in times like these.

We were negligent enough to leave that kind of doctrine to evil men who did take an interest in the method and quality of life of the people around them. One cannot study the Nazi doctrine without being perfectly aware that a group of people, grotesque and horrible as their ideas seem to us, tackled the job of inventing a sort of perverted anti-religion adapted to serve their own ends, and that having done so, they endeavored by every means available to bring it into active play. The chaos of an intellectually decadent Europe gave them a clear field—even a hideous and perverted order is more attractive than no order at all.

Faced with a choice between the chaos which is moral and spiritual death, and subservience to something, however terrible, the choice lay in favor of the black Mass which was served up by politicians for their own advantage and end.

If the Nazi rulers had been more theologically minded than they were, they would have realized something which they now are finding out to their present grief and their ultimate disaster. They would have found that the moment a faith is perverted, the moment a design is invented which excludes humanity, it

must either conquer the world and assassinate every free spirit, or it must eventually die

Recently, under the direction of the Nazi group and more particularly of Rosenberg who is the specialist in these matters, the attempt was made to introduce a formal Nazi religion which quite literally was built on the drawn sword and on *Mein Kampf*, which abolishes immortality, and uses the word "God" only in the almost blasphemous sense of being an assistant to a mythical Germanic race

This balderdash is interesting chiefly because it exhibits a kind of compulsion. Having built this infernal machinery of lies, and having in its name attempted to show a people all the principalities and kingdoms of the earth, they were forced to try to give it some frame. So has every revolution in its time, the wilder stages of the French Revolution, after quite formally dethroning God and beheading the saints, invented a goddess of reason and attempted to palm her off as a guide to the spiritual life

One of the reasons why we know that the Nazi movement in Germany is on the eve of disaster lies precisely in this phenomenon, never has this kind of nonsense been forced into the open except as an accompaniment to a situation which has become so rotten that it presently is forced to change its face

A trained theologian would have known this, but he would also know something else. The moment man is denied a place in Eternity, the moment an attempt is made to separate him from his God, however indefinite, there is an immediate surge of protest against an act of aggression committed against every single soul. In the presence of a set of ideas which tears the child from its mother, the son from his father, the wife from her husband, the man from himself, and from every conscious wish and hope he has—when that is done every man feels that he must go out and end that thing as he would kill a poisonous snake in his own wood. So it is always proved in history and

so indeed it proves today In the deepest sense, the present war is fundamentally a religious war

It is my conviction that those who are brave enough to profess a faith must now state it in broadest terms For faith and religion are more than a refuge, they are a strength and a claim They insist on their own, and they can call out the strength and the sacrifice, the enthusiasm and the glory which lie in every man

Men will seek and find their faith and their godhead in many ways A Catholic sailor will turn to the Virgin Star of the Sea as representing the great design which is interested in him An Arab in the desert will look to the stars A Rationalist will consider the apparently infinite reaches of the human mind A Jew will remember the magnificent affirmation that the eternal God was one A Christian will remember a God Who could come among men and speak in terms of infinite love And each of those directly asserts not merely the place of the man, but his duty to unite with other men

There is not, and cannot be, any conception of faith which does not by its very terms impose a brotherhood among men, and with it the obligation to stand with other men shoulder to shoulder, sword to sword, gun to gun, in preserving the elementary rights of the human heart

I consider that now, more than ever before, faith and religion have something which not only can be said, but must be said Those who are charged with authority and position are bound to be evangelists and to train evangelists in their several ways We are in no sense limited to the methods of evangelism of old times, though these in their day were forceful and effective We have the right and the ability to speak in many tongues

It is our chief duty to assert that every human being is himself a part of a spiritual whole

Because of that fact, each one of us is bound to join in the common defense of elementary humanity which is at once mortal and divine

Whatever serves and strengthens and enriches this elementary humanity is right, and whatever denies it or maims it or weakens it is wrong

It is therefore necessary that men should cleanse themselves, for uncleanness or corruption or selfishness is wrong and it is weak, and this at a time when both weakness and evil are a danger to every one of us

We must make it clear that the issue of the time is a direct conflict between great forces striving for darkness, and millions of human beings seeking light. In that struggle no one is left out; to decline to be a part of it is to be defeated. The spirit triumphant in terms of today must be the spirit militant.

I believe we in America have the right to say this, for surely no nation more than we sought more sincerely to decide the issues of the time with reason and kindness. I am aware of no avenue left unexplored to avoid the supreme agony of the present World War. If there could be common ground, we were resolved to find it, but the many searches we made disclosed only that there can be no common understanding between those who insist on moral values, and those who deny even elementary humanity.

Of the ultimate victory there can be no doubt, whether on the political, the military, or the spiritual plane. No group of human beings, however implemented with artillery or airplanes, has yet been able to challenge the great design, and it still is true that those who take the sword are the first to perish by the sword. But this is not an automatic victory. It is built on the deepest spiritual instincts in men, which today call us to work, and arm, and prepare, and fight. They must guide us later in re-establishing kindness and order in a world of human beings.

There is no task of greater significance than to state and maintain the spiritual issue. Never has there been a time when the issue was so significant. Never were men professing spiritual faith assigned a greater role in history.

THE DEMOCRATIC ISSUE ⁸

WILBUR S HOWELL ⁹

This address was given before the Eastern Public Speaking Conference, held at the Hotel New Yorker, New York City, on April 10, 11, 1942. The lecture was read before the Public Speaking and Rhetoric section, on Friday afternoon, April 10.

As Wallace and Berle attempt to identify the war issues with postulates of religion (sacredness of personality, solidarity of the human family, the strengthening of the underprivileged, and the progress of the human race), Howell expounds the political impact of the struggle. His thesis is clearly stated and illustrated at length—that the salvation of our democratic state depends upon maintaining an equilibrium of individual and social interests.

The implications of this issue have been steadily before the American people since the rise of fascism. The problem of the relation of the individual to the state was one of the crucial issues of the "third term" campaign of 1940. It became more insistently an issue as we entered the present war and as we examined in more detail the philosophy of *Mein Kampf* and our own political bases.

The mature critic of this speech will need to bring to bear in full the history and literature of Greece and Rome and of England, and he will need to know the political philosophy of England and America, he will proceed to a rereading of Hitler's book, he will appraise the place of individualism as it should be determined by law, by social practice, by the Christian religion, and he will study or restudy the great orators for the essentials of their success. As a student of speeches he will inquire critically concerning the extent to which he and other speakers exercise the functions indicated in this excellent lecture.

As Berle's address well articulated with his group of students of religion, so does Howell's reflect the educational (especially speech education) concerns of his auditors, who were teachers of speech.

The great debate between Daniel Webster and Robert Hayne in the year 1830 was an episode in the historic struggle between

⁸ By permission of Professor Howell. Text supplied by the author. Printed in *Vital Speeches of the Day* 8:437-9, May 1, 1942.

⁹ For biographical note see Appendix.

liberty and authority. A later episode was our Civil War, the paradoxical issues of which reflected the antagonisms between a social authority that asserted the right of the individual Negro to his freedom, and an individualism that maintained the right of society to enforce and perpetuate slavery. In 1859, the year of Brown's raid at Harper's Ferry, John Stuart Mill published in England his essay, *On Liberty*, in which he supported the individual's right to be free in all matters except those where individual action could be shown to constitute harm to others. Well over two hundred years before the American Civil War, John Milton had cried in the *Areopagitica*, "Give me the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all liberties." Behind Milton lay the Reformation, the Inquisition, the struggle between Christianity and pagan learning. Urging the Commons of England to imitate "the old and elegant humanity of Greece" rather than "the barbaric pride of a Hunnish and Norwegian stateliness," Milton modeled his defense of freedom of the press upon a speech of the Greek orator Isocrates, and put beneath his title a quotation from *The Suppliants* of Euripides, where Theseus, in answer to the messenger who spoke in "barbaric pride" of the despotism of Thebes, defended "the old and elegant humanity" of Athenian democracy.

It would be untrue to say that the gradual victory of centralized authority over state sovereignty symbolizes in American history the renunciation of the principle of individualism. It would be more nearly true for future historians to say of us, that we were a curiously gifted people, more Greek than Roman in the fact that we attached great value to the individual, yet more Roman than Greek in our capacity to organize ourselves into a great political entity. We seem partially to have solved the contradictions between social regulation, with its tendency to crush all manifestations of personality, and individualism, with its tendency to divide society into as many separate atoms as there are persons in the state. In Daniel Webster's words, we have achieved "Liberty and Union"; Liberty, in the sense

that we have preserved a respect for variations in personality, and Union, in the sense that we can forget our differences in spheres where political unity is required

What American history records as the struggle to effect a reconciliation between extreme individualism and extreme centralization has become in the field of American education a struggle to provide two sorts of education at once. We teachers seek to make our students into individuals, and, at the same time, we seek to fit them to cooperate with others. We know perfectly well that if we succeed in making a young man or woman into a complete individualist, conscious of his uniqueness, discriminating in his judgment, unbending in his support of a righteous but unpopular cause, uninfluenced by the careless thinking and narrow prejudices of the average run of men, we may also have created a man or woman who is arrogant towards inferiority, self-centered in his conception of justice, undemocratic in his political loyalties. These abuses of individualism divide an individual from his kind, an educated class from the public, and encourage rulers to seek and enforce special privileges for themselves. We know, too, that if we succeed in making a young man or woman into a complete collectivist, we may have developed in him a ruthless contempt for the dignity and worth of the individual. Such an attitude, we believe, would not breed the self-reliance, the independence, and the courage which give fiber and permanence to the spirit of the individual, and to the morale of the democratic society. Confronted as we are by the excesses of the principle of individualism, and by the stark abuses of the principle of cooperation, we yet continue with our business as educators, striving always to produce the student whose sense of his own personality will temper, and be tempered by, his recognition of his obligations to his fellows.

Athenian democracy, which symbolized for Milton "the old and elegant humanity of Greece," was at length engulfed beneath the tide of a Macedonian stateliness. Demosthenes,

like a Greek Churchill, fulminated that appeasement would destroy Athens, but the appeasers thought they could do business with Philip. Thus Athenian individualism was submerged, because it lacked the social unity which alone could have saved it. About three centuries later, the Roman republic, warned repeatedly by Cicero that its liberties were endangered, fell victim to its own gift for organization, forgetting that organization passes into tyranny when a sense of the worth of the individual disappears from the consciousness of statesmen. Unfortunately, we do not possess towards our own time that perspective which would give us the power to perceive how far our own weaknesses parallel those of ancient Greece and Rome. But we can, in a measure, gain perspective upon ourselves, by looking, not at our present situation, but at the recent situation of men like ourselves, who, under our eyes, have lost the fight for liberty under the law.

Let us look at the intellectual class in Germany under the Weimar republic, and let us look at them through the eyes of Hitler. This class was composed of men much like ourselves, and Hitler's diagnosis of their weaknesses may teach us our own. In *Mein Kampf*, Hitler pictures the *bourgeois* intellectuals, occupied with theoretical discussion in the well-edited *bourgeois* press, while liberal institutions collapsed around them. One of these intellectuals, says Hitler, wrote a criticism during the war upon the speeches of Lloyd George, then minister of munitions in the British cabinet, and "came to the intelligent finding that these speeches were intellectually and scientifically inferior, and for the rest hackneyed and obvious products."¹⁰ Hitler continues

Later, I personally obtained some of these speeches in the form of a small booklet and I had to laugh loudly at the fact that a normal German knight of the pen had no understanding for these psychological masterpieces of influencing the soul of the masses. This man judged these speeches exclusively according to the impression that they left on

¹⁰ Hitler, *Mein Kampf* (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock), 1939, p. 712

his own conceit while the great English demagogue had directed them exclusively at exercising the greatest possible influence on the mass of his listeners and in the widest sense on the entire lower English people. Nevertheless, the average sparrow brain of a German scribbler, scientifically of course most educated, achieves the feat of evaluating the mentality of the English minister according to the impression that a speech, aiming at mass influence, leaves in his soul that is entirely calcified by knowledge.¹¹

As for himself, remarks Hitler, "I have to measure the speech of a statesman to his people not by the impression that it leaves with a university professor, but according to the effect that it exercises on the people"¹²

These quotations from *Mein Kampf* occur in a chapter devoted mainly to the thesis that a speech at a mass meeting is superior to any other kind of persuasive medium. The power to recognize the superiority of the speech over the editorial, and the will to influence great masses of people by the spoken word, symbolize for Hitler the superiority of the forces at work to destroy the liberal democratic world. Time and again in the course of his two bleak volumes, he indicates that the weakness of the academic intellectual in Germany was a compound of snobbish contempt for the popular agitator, of intellectual scorn of speeches as a means of communication, and of ill-concealed distaste for the masses, with whom political power ultimately rests. While the Marxists strove to win the support of the masses, the intellectual resided in his ivory tower, and did nothing but show syllogistically how the appeals of the Marxists were founded upon misconceptions of economics or of history. With these same weapons, the intellectual combatted the Nazi movement, when Hitler copied the Marxists and sought to control the masses. To Hitler, this state of mind was an expression of the bankruptcy of the ruling classes under the Weimar republic, was indeed the nucleus of the incompetence of the democratic state. His own instinct, as revealed in an

¹¹ *Ibid.* p. 712-13

¹² *Ibid.* p. 713

earlier chapter, was to recognize the power of the speech, and the importance of the attitude of the people "Every movement with great aim," he contends, "has anxiously to watch that it may not lose connection with the great masses"¹³ By what means shall these connections be established? His answer is clear

The great masses of a nation will always and only succumb to the force of the spoken word But all great movements are movements of the people, are volcanic eruptions of human passions and spiritual sensations, stirred either by the cruel Goddess of Misery or by the torch of the word thrown into the masses, and are not the lemonade-like outpourings of aestheticising *literals* and drawing-room heroes Only a storm of burning passion can turn people's destinies, but only he who harbors passion in himself can arouse passion¹⁴

Hitler's diagnosis of the ills of his country under the liberal republic suggests that the core of the malady was a democratic individualism which had lost *rapproch* with the people, and had denied itself the right to exercise its feelings in its own behalf Perhaps the German university, which produced great individualists, did not, at the same time, encourage these individualists, as a ruling class, to perceive their social obligations, and to cultivate, with honesty and devotion, the arts of cooperation, the arts of persuasion and democratic leadership

At any rate, Hitlerism succeeded, and Hitlerism is now synonymous with the starkest abuses of collectivism Hitler's movement may have succeeded because it succeeded in gaining the support of the masses But let no one suppose that the Nazi mind respects the dignity and value of the common run of men Over and over in *Mein Kampf*, Hitler expresses his own profound contempt for the masses Only the man who has risen from the people can, when he hates them at all, hate them as bitterly as Hitler does. His hatred reveals itself most completely in his basic conception of the folk-state as a society

¹³ *Ibid* p 137

¹⁴ *Ibid.* p 136-7

in which the leader assumes absolute authority over those below him, while those below accept absolute responsibility to the leader¹⁵ His state frees the "entire leadership—especially the highest, that means the political leadership—from the parliamentary principle of the decision by majority, that means decision by the masses" ¹⁶ If we ask why Hitler hates the masses, our answer could be found by saying simply that he is incapable of seeing them as individuals He talks of them as a distant, faceless, impersonal mob Thus he proclaims "the inertia of the masses,"¹⁷ he advises the leader to reckon with "the stupidity of his fellow citizens,"¹⁸ and with the "people's superficiality,"¹⁹ he declares that "the mass of people is lazy in itself"²⁰ Organization, he says, "has to start from the principle that for humanity blessing has never lain in the masses"²¹ The gigantic mass demonstration, he remarks, has the advantage of branding "the small, impoverished man with the proud conviction that although being a little worm, he was nevertheless a member of a great dragon under whose flaming breath one day the much-hated *bourgeois* world would go up in fire and flame" ²² "The great masses' receptive ability," he dogmatizes, "is only very limited, their understanding is small, but their forgetfulness is great."²³ Elsewhere he asserts

Like a woman, whose psychic feeling is influenced less by abstract reasoning than by an undefinable, sentimental longing for complementary strength, who will submit to the strong man rather than dominate the weakling, thus the masses love the ruler rather than the suppliant, and inwardly they are far more satisfied by a doctrine which tolerates no

¹⁵ *Ibid* p 670

¹⁶ *Ibid* p 669

¹⁷ *Ibid* p 102, 239

¹⁸ *Ibid* p. 102

¹⁹ *Ibid* p 681

²⁰ *Ibid* p 705

²¹ *Ibid* p 665

²² *Ibid* p 708

²³ *Ibid.* p 234

rival than by the grant of liberal freedom . They neither realize the impudence with which they are spiritually terrorized, nor the outrageous curtailment of their human liberties, for in no way does the delusion of this doctrine dawn on them. Thus they see only the inconsiderate force, the brutality and the aim of its manifestations to which they finally always submit²⁴

Observations such as these lead Hitler to conclude that "by propaganda, with permanent and clever application, even heaven can be palmed off on a people as hell, and, the other way round, the most wretched life as paradise ." ²⁵

How strangely this falls upon the conscience of Americans, who remember Lincoln's words "If you once forfeit the confidence of your fellow-citizens, you can never regain their respect and esteem. It is true that you may fool all the people some of the time, you can even fool some of the people all the time; but you can't fool all of the people all the time"²⁶

Having looked at Germany through the eyes of Hitler, we may evaluate in an enlarged perspective the dual character of the American system. For one thing, we can now see, more clearly than ever, that our education has been rightly designed to prevent the assumption by our educated class of an attitude of arrogance towards the public, and towards the arts of politics and persuasion. In other words, we can see that our education is planned, as German education was not, to prevent an individualism assimilated to its own abuses. And, on the other hand, we can see that our kind of collectivism never reaches the extremity where all sense of the individual is lost, and the electorate becomes, as in totalitarian Germany, a mass of faceless men.

Here we might close the argument, were it not for our realization that the adjustment between individual self-expression and social conformity is always delicate and insecure. The

²⁴ *Ibid* p 56

²⁵ *Ibid* p 379

²⁶ A. K. McClure, *Lincoln's Yarns and Stories* (Winston, Philadelphia), (undated), p 124

battle to preserve our liberties is still the battle to deepen our feeling of obligation to our neighbors, and this battle can easily be won upon either of these fronts at the cost of defeat upon the other. Our chief dangers are within ourselves. We as individuals tend ever to resent our neighbor's individuality. We as society tend ever to dislike our neighbors' interference in what we consider to be our own affairs. We see these antagonisms in our political life, and in our educational system. Since we teachers are most familiar with the way in which educational institutions reflect the conflict between liberty and authority, we can take special notice of the involuntary contributions that we as a class make to the abuses of individualism. It strikes us now and then, for example, that students of the pure sciences emerge from their studies with a contempt for the applied sciences. This attitude presupposes that an individual's interest in these subjects is higher and better than society's interest in them, when it ought to be obvious that both interests are equal in the scale of goodness. Students of poetry, of imaginative literature, may gain, as we know, a certain contempt for what can be called rhetorical, that is, didactic and persuasive, literature. Encouraged by recent tendencies in criticism, these students have acquiesced in giving the poet an aesthetic which defines the responsibility of the critic to poetry, but frees the poet from any responsibility to the critic, or to society as a whole. What does this aesthetic mean, if it does not abandon the distinction between liberty and license? Meanwhile, literary students express distaste for the speaker, and treat speeches, and other branches of argument and exposition, as peasants in the economy of the artistic world. It is right, of course, to have contempt for some speakers and for some speeches. I have a personal dislike for all defenders of totalitarianism, who submerge their personality to the point where they become mechanical megaphones, droning the canned doctrine of the master-mind. But I think that Demosthenes, Cicero, Burke, Webster, Lincoln, Churchill, and Franklin Roosevelt are speakers

worthy of comparison with the poets and philosophers of their time, and are speakers whose work is an expression of their strong individuality, and of their own generation's interest in the problem of good and evil. In fact, the speakers whom I have mentioned are all individualists, yet with a keen sense of obligation to their kind. Virtue, when given to the works of man, is always of the same essence, and will yet be virtue, whether we see it in the church or in the market place.

We ourselves, as teachers of public speaking in a democracy, have an important function. To us, a speech, as an artistic creation, must bear the marks of individuality, and must therefore mean something in the development of a human being. At the same time, the speech must bear signs of the speaker's responsibility to his audience, and must therefore mean something in the development of a social being. As long as our subject is represented in the curriculum, we can make it the means of freeing a man or woman from the arrogance of extreme individualism, and from the blind error which postulates mere obedience in the populace, and complete infallibility in the leader.

PROPAGANDA, FREE SPEECH, AND THE WAR

PROPAGANDA, GOOD AND BAD¹

ARCHIBALD MACLEISH,² HAROLD D LASSWELL,²
AND RICHARD P MCKEON²

This radio discussion in the University of Chicago series, over the Red Network of the National Broadcasting System, was held in Washington, D C, on Sunday, March 1st, 1942, at 2 30 P M, Eastern War Time. The participants were Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress and Director of the Office of Facts and Figures, Harold D Lasswell, Director of War Communications Research for the Library of Congress, and Richard P McKeon, Dean of the Division of the Humanities at the University of Chicago.

At this time the government was pouring out information and "propaganda," aimed to support America's war program, bolster "morale" on our home front, and to offer counter-propaganda to that of the Axis barrage of words.

Among the agencies handing out such propaganda and information were the Office of Facts and Figures, headed by Mr MacLeish, the Office of Government Reports, headed by Lowell Mellett, the Division of Information of the Office of Emergency Management, with Robert Horton as its chief, which office directed the publicity of such organizations as the War Labor Board, the Office of Coordinator of Information under William J Donovan, which directed foreign propaganda, the War and Navy Departments with their publicity organizations, and numerous other individual agencies and departments interested in giving to the people their ideas and projects.

The American public after December 7, 1941, as they received the information and opinion as handed out from these organizations listed above, asked, How much truth are we actually getting? Are we being unduly propagandized? What is propaganda? Are facts being withheld

¹ Reprinted from *Chicago Round Table*, no 207, March 1, 1942, by permission of the Chicago Round Table, and through the courtesy of the director of radio.

² For biographical notes see Appendix.

from us? What kind of information should be controlled by our government? Is there a real distinction to be made between "good" and "bad" propaganda? Is it the function of our democratic government to furnish "facts" but not to furnish us with standards and values? Is it the principal obligation of our government to present to us "the great idea of freedom and of liberty"? To answer such questions as these was the aim of this Chicago Round Table

From March until the middle of June, 1942, the public questioning and criticism of these various governmental agencies of propaganda and information continued. The public complained in increasing volume that public officials did not seem to trust the people, that good news was on too many occasions issued and bad news suppressed, and that some of the news that was issued seemed to be conflicting because given out by different government officials—information that was thus confusing to the public. Much criticism was offered with respect to the organization and personnel of these agencies. These agencies, the public alleged, were too numerous and a considerable number of the personnel were incompetent.

In the middle of June the government met this public criticism by the appointment of Elmer Davis, a radio commentator, author, and former newspaper reporter, as Director of Government News and Propaganda in the Office of War Information. It was thus proposed that he and Byron Price, Director of Government Censorship, should together perform the functions of the Creel Committee of World War I, which combined censorship and propaganda with total powers centered in one department. Mr. Davis was to direct domestic information and control foreign propaganda except that relating to Latin America, which would presumably still be under the jurisdiction of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.

Each of these speakers on the Chicago Round Table program had had considerable experience in round table discussion and in public speaking. Mr. MacLeish, for example, delivered a splendid address at the Associated Press annual luncheon in New York City on April 20, 1942, which speech had wide publicity and much favorable comment. Dr. Lasswell, formerly of the University of Chicago, often participated in that round table, including the discussion of "Polls and the Crisis" with George Gallup on May 25, 1941, and the discussion of "Censorship" with Byron Price and William Benton on January 18, 1942. Dean McKeon also was a frequent participant in the Chicago Round Table series, as for example in the discussion of "True Frontiers in Education and Research," September 28, 1941, and "Politics in Wartime," May 3, 1942.

The Chicago Round Table frequently described itself as, "the oldest educational program continuously on the air" The broadcasts were given without script and with little rehearsal Subjects were chosen for their social, political, or economic significance The participants were usually experts and "their remarks were usually aimed to provide information rather than to demonstrate heated controversy"³

MR MCKEON The problem of propaganda, which we have met to discuss this afternoon, seems to me only in part to be one of functions and facts but to be largely a question of words I'm not sure that the word "propaganda" has retained any good sense and that, therefore, good propaganda would, by that very fact, be bad propaganda

MR MACLEISH I don't want to raise questions of verbiage, particularly at the beginning of this discussion, but I wonder whether the time hasn't passed when you could talk about "good" propaganda and "bad" propaganda I wonder, in other words, whether our enemies haven't so slimed that word by their misuse and abuse of it that it is no longer possible to consider it as having any affirmative contents

MR LASSWELL I would like to stick to the word "propaganda" as a word referring to skill I think that it is one term that is fairly useful from a purely specialist point of view

I do recognize, though, that in recent times the word has gotten into frightfully bad company, and I think that probably it has begun to obscure thinking about the problem of government in a democracy

MR MCKEON Could you be a little more precise about the *good* sense of the word "propaganda" that you referred to?

MR LASSWELL Oh, yes! You remember the term "propaganda" was once used to refer to the foreign-missionary activities of the Roman church, and all the other associations it had were "plus" That seems to me to represent the *plus* side that we could usefully preserve

³ For further comment on the Chicago Round Table see Introductory Note, *Representative American Speeches 1939-40*, p 191, *Representative American Speeches 1940-41*, p 168

Yet, I think that MacLeish's point is probably a very sound one, and I would be willing to forbear my special prejudices on behalf of this term "propaganda" if he feels that these other negative connotations have become too numerous

MR. MACLEISH I think the American people are probably pretty wise and pretty right in feeling that the word can't be laundered, you can't wash it clean I suggest that we drop it and, instead of talking about words or definitions of words, see whether we can agree upon what the job is that is to be done Has a democratic government, as distinguished from a totalitarian government, any duties whatever in the field of information, particularly in wartime?

MR. MCKEON I think we might take advantage of Lasswell's definition of propaganda to separate that question into two parts the good propaganda that we are henceforth going to ignore was propaganda which, in part, imparted information and in part indicated a way of action Am I correct?

MR. LASSWELL Yes That's a valuable distinction to keep constantly in mind that to some extent propaganda was used to talk about the communication of facts and to some extent to talk about the communication of values, dreams, and aspirations

MR. MCKEON Bearing that in mind, it seems to me that your question concerning the duties of a democratic government could properly be divided into these two parts, and, as we discuss it, we are emphasizing three different aspects of the problem

MacLeish, in your position the problem would be largely a question of facts, information, and how to handle the facts Is that correct?

MR. MACLEISH I should say with reference to the two aspects of the problem that Lasswell describes that a democratic government is more concerned with the provision of information to the people than it is with the communication of dreams and aspirations, the furbishing of ideals, and so forth It would

seem to me that that latter job in a democracy is one for the people themselves Their morale is their own concern

MR LASSWELL Your point, then, is that the duty of a democratic government is to provide a realistic basis for the foundation of sound judgments?

MR MACLEISH Excellent phrase, put it into my mouth I'll accept it

MR MCKEON It is not only an excellent phrase but one rather difficult to understand What do you mean by "realistic basis"?

MR LASSWELL We should try to clarify, if we can, what this idea of a realistic focus of attention means

MR MCKEON I'd like you to approach it in terms of your special interest in the analysis of information While MacLeish would be interested in the information that a democratic government can put at the disposal of its citizens, you have worked for a long time, Lasswell, with the techniques of propaganda and of propaganda analysis

MR LASSWELL Yes, and it's possible to point out the kind of facts that are needed for sound judgments in a democracy What we should do, I think, is give people some conception of the situation they're in, what's happening, and what their goals are I think we ought to spell that out in terms that are meaningful and in terms that relate to the present situation

MR MACLEISH Yes Surely these are obligations of the government in the information field

But let's look for a moment at the nature of the relation of a democratic government to its people A democratic government, after all, is by definition, by hypothesis, the servant of the people It does not occupy the position of a totalitarian government, and this struggle is to determine that no government shall in this country

Now, the distinction becomes very clear in the field of information A totalitarian government—Mr Goebbels', for example—not only decides what the people are going to think but sees

to it, by various devices and means, that they think precisely that

The government of a democracy, on the other hand, has a very different obligation, which is to provide the informational basis for the formation of a sound judgment

MR MCKEON In terms of the distinction we made before, then, a democratic government would supply facts rather than fictions and would state issues that are genuine issues as opposed to those that were set up in the mind of the dictator?

MR MACLEISH A democratic government supplies truth and not lies, and it supplies truth and not lies which is relevant to the decisions to be made It engages, in other words, in a strategy of truth, a phrase that we have been fond of using here in Washington and a phrase that I believe makes sense

MR LASSWELL Then the point is essentially that it is our job to clarify reality as we honestly see it to our fellow citizens

MR. MACLEISH Let's talk for a moment about the duty of the government in terms of the issue of this war What is the duty of a democratic government in terms of giving the people, as you say, the basis for founding a sound judgment?

MR LASSWELL All right, I'll stick my neck out on that, and you can accept or reject as you see fit I think the very first problem is to clarify the possible consequences of victory by our enemies

MR MCKEON And as I understand you, that would mean both a positive and a negative series of consequences

MR MACLEISH That's just where I'd like to pick you up, because I should suppose (and perhaps I misunderstand what you are saying) that by the positive aspect you mean the presentation of the great ideal of freedom and of liberty as the affirmative goal There I am bound to say I don't think the government as such has a principal obligation The government isn't the possessor of all truth about freedom and liberty The people possess that And many of the people possess it with a clarity and a passion with which few of us here in Washington possess it

But there is another aspect to this—the negative aspect. That is, the presentation of the kind of world that we will live in if we don't win this war. I suppose the government has a definite duty to get this information before the people and to see that they understand it and that they make judgments on its basis.

MR LASSWELL. I agree that you have a valid point there, but I would like to emphasize the affirmative, positive necessity for clarifying the sort of thing we are shooting after. It certainly seems to me that democratic leaders are very well advised when they say that the modern meaning of our ideals and aspirations for freedom are summarized in the four freedoms, or in some other formulation that has vitality and vigor and power, and can give to all of us a sense of the modern meaning of these venerable ideals that we all share.

MR MACLEISH. That is a slightly different question. The one I thought McKeon was referring to—the redefinition of the emotional content of words like "liberty" and "freedom"—is a concern of the people, a concern of the citizens in a democracy. The statement of the goals of democratic action and a statement of the goals of this government is certainly a duty of the government, and the statement of those goals has rarely been made more effectively than in terms of the four freedoms.

MR McKEON. I think you've put the specific statement of the democratic aims that I spoke of in my mouth. What I had in mind was something rather less and something which is, in a sense, involved in the statement of the issues of the war—providing the people with a realistic basis for the foundations of a sound judgment. It is perfectly true that the public has been, in many instances, in advance of the government in resolving issues and in readiness to accept sacrifices. But the government must also formulate those issues in a fashion which will permit more than instinctive adherence. I am afraid, in other words, that if we emphasize only the negative, we shall make a "bogeyman" of the propaganda of the enemy. If we

fail to emphasize the positive, our facts need not be facts. Facts aren't facts merely by iteration but in the context.

MR MACLEISH: Of course, if you sit on the opposition of the two words "negative" and "affirmative," you come out that way. If, however, you talk about the duty of the government, the obligation of the government, what the government can do that the citizens can't do in relation to these problems, then you're talking about a different question.

Now, for example, break this thing down a little bit further. Instead of talking about the issue, let's talk about the specific kind of information. Take, for example, government information on the military and diplomatic fronts. What would you say the government's job ought to be there?

MR LASSWELL: Isn't the general principle to clarify the facts about military and diplomatic operations as far as possible consistent with the necessity of keeping certain secrets from the enemy?

MR MACLEISH: "Keeping certain secrets from the enemy." Let's use the phrase that is used everywhere in Washington, which makes complete sense: "We are not going to provide information which will give aid and comfort to the enemy." Is that proposition generally understood and accepted in the country?

MR MCKEON: I think so. The question of issues is, in part, one for the government to determine and in part one for individuals who discuss them on such radio broadcasts as this University of Chicago Round Table to determine.

MR MACLEISH: Isn't that a touch of propaganda right there?

MR MCKEON: I think that's an excellent point. I see no reason why we should not recognize that we are engaged in propaganda in the good sense that Lasswell has referred to.

MR MACLEISH: For the University of Chicago?

MR MCKEON For the University of Chicago and also indirectly—

MR LASSWELL That's *place* information

MR MCKEON It's information about a source of information Don't you think that we are contributing to the kind of faith that an agency of information needs by discussing these issues on the University of Chicago Round Table?

MR MACLEISH Oh, there's no question about it! It also gives us an opportunity to get behind some of the phrases which people don't ordinarily explore

Take the phrase that Lasswell and I have agreed upon We are not going to disclose information which will give aid and comfort to the enemy I agree with you that that is broadly accepted I think everybody understands why There is some question in the minds of some people about just what information should be withheld, within those terms, and what information should be released

MR LASSWELL The problem is where to draw the line We have had a great deal of experience in running democratic and semi-democratic wars in the past Isn't that so? And if we look around to see how certain of these problems have been solved by the Associated Nations, I think we can arrive at certain fairly clear principles to determine where the lines of demarcation lie

MR MCKEON That is an excellent point We tend, when we talk about information and communication, to think of what the enemy is doing, whereas we, as a democratic nation, have had a long history of informing the public and of using that information in times of crisis

MR LASSWELL We've had so much experience in running democratic wars successfully, even in the history of the American nation, that we can face the issues which are involved with a great deal of basic self-confidence

MR MACLEISH You can face them with a great deal of confidence in the confidence of the country also There has

been a considerable amount of talk about whether or not the government was telling the whole truth to the country. That is an interesting question and a question which deserves discussion

MR LASSWELL May I put it in the vulgate? Will you tell the *tough* truth to the country?

MR MACLEISH The answer is, of course, "Yes" The answer is that the people of this country can take the tough truth, and are taking the tough truth, and do understand just how tough their situation is

But the point I was going to make is this You can't talk about the whole truth, and so forth, intelligibly unless you define your terms

What is, for example, the practice of the army and the navy, who are charged with responsibility for the security of information regarding, let's say, naval losses? The practice of the British is well known and would be accepted by any reasonable man As I understand it (I can't speak with authority), the British take the position that they will announce promptly sinkings which are known to have taken place in the sight of the enemy For example, the "Barham" sank on December 24, 1941, and they announced her sinking a couple of weeks ago, because they weren't sure (and they were right) that her sinking had taken place in the sight of the enemy As far as damage is concerned, no government in its senses will provide information as to damage to naval ships until that damage is repaired

MR LASSWELL I don't think the American people would object to that if they clearly understand that that is the policy that must be pursued We simply have the problem of making clear what it is that constitutes information that we must withhold from the enemy

MR MCKEON But, coming back to this question of facts, what is the duty of the government in so far as information on the economic and productive front is concerned? What should the people be told? What should the people expect?

MR MACLEISH There you have exactly the same situation that you have on the military front, because economic and productive information is military information in a war like this. I think you can make several observations, however, about production information which apply also on the military front and which are very pertinent. One is that we were thrown into this war rather in a hurry, that no preparations had been made, could have been made, for the form in which communiqués were to issue. For some weeks the armed services and people charged with responsibility in the production field have been feeling their way toward forms of communication which would give the country the kind of information it must have to understand and to criticize the effort, because criticism is more important in war than in peace.

MR LASSWELL Underline that point. That seems tremendously vital to me, and the American people must understand and feel confident that that is a guiding principle. That is to say, that in the administration of information services in wartime it is necessary to give the public the facts which they can use to criticize the government. That is exactly what you mean, isn't it?

MR MACLEISH You recall Wilson saying in the last war—in the spring of 1918, I think—that criticism was more important at that time than at any previous time in the history of the country. And it's just as true today.

MR MCKEON Like all the words we have been using, the word "criticism" would have to be separated into two senses. There is a pseudo-criticism, a disguised form of introducing disunity in the effort of the nation, and there is the real criticism which would occur after the fact and with respect to general policies.

MR MACLEISH That comes very close to another aspect of the government's duties—the duty to inform the people of attempts made by our enemies to influence them. The government will have adequately performed its duty if it makes it clear

to the people of the country that the aim of the Nazis and the aim of the Japanese is to divide us from our allies. For example, anti-British propaganda, which is sweeping through the country, which has been repeated by some of our own people innocently and by some, I am sorry to say, not innocently.

MR LASSWELL That is terribly important from all points of view. After all, one of the ways that every citizen can serve a war effort is by using his tongue responsibly, and that means knowing when not to repeat a rumor. And the very first need there is for him is to feel that he can turn easily to some authoritative source to discover whether a certain type of rumor is, as a matter of fact, the sort of thing that is coming from the Axis' propagandists.

MR McKEON Don't you want to include not merely the question of separating ourselves from our allies but also the question of breaking us into groups within the nation? There would be a similar tendency on the part of propaganda from our enemies to attempt to separate us into groups, to spread hatred.

MR MACLEISH That is one of the clearest Nazi propaganda lines we put together, from time to time, in the Office of Facts and Figures in analyses of the propaganda line of the Nazis, which we receive from the Federal Communications Commission's monitoring systems and elsewhere. Certainly the predominant line has been to divide us from our allies, particularly from the British, if possible. They lie to us about the British and lie to the British about us. Their aim is to divide us within this country—Christians from Jews, Protestants from Catholics, Negroes from white people—and to break down everything that would tend to unify us. After all, the principle is *divide and conquer*, isn't it?

MR LASSWELL And the fundamental point to be emphasized is. Whenever you overhear at the factory or on the streetcar anything that tends to cast a whole group of America's fellow-citizens into disrepute, the problem is not to pass it on

as a rumor but to challenge it, to turn to some authoritative group in private life and in the government for information.

MR MACLEISH I'm going to hire you in the Office of Facts and Figures to print that information. That is good, valid information.

MR MCKEON Those are excellent rules, but I should like to add some others. In addition to questions of fact and information, such as MacLeish emphasized, and the techniques of rules that you have been emphasizing, my own emphasis would be upon the aims and objectives. I think there is some danger that we should think of this war in terms of instruments of production and of warfare, whereas the problem in addition is one of insight into the issues involved.

MR MACLEISH Forgive me, McKeon, but don't we have to keep coming back to what we are actually talking about here, which is the role of government?

There is a great mass of information in a war which comes not from the government but from the people. It is the people, the citizens, the responsible members of the community as a whole, who develop those inward values.

My notion is that the duty of the government is, and I come back to Lasswell's phrase, to provide a basis for judgment, and when it goes beyond that, it goes beyond the prime scope of its duty. There may be occasions where it goes beyond it because the line is hard to draw, but fundamentally the things you are talking about, I think, are the duties of citizens and of citizens' groups, and there is no one in Washington who doesn't hope that citizens and citizens' groups will perform those duties.

MR MCKEON I think that is an excellent transition. We have talked about facts, as I understand it, under three general heads. We have talked about military and diplomatic facts, about facts that bear upon economic questions and production, and about facts that bear on the opinion front.

But the kind of information that could be expected from the government and from governmental agencies would constitute, as I understand what you have been saying, only a small fraction of all the information that is available and should be available to the people

MR LASSWELL In addition, I think that we are talking about this from the standpoint of all the agencies of government We are not for one moment implying that any one single agency of a democratic government must shoulder all the responsibility for deciding what facts are to reach the minds of the American people, on the basis of which they can arrive at a sound judgment After all, the Congress of the United States, as well as the executive departments, has a vital responsibility for talking responsibly about facts

MR MACLEISH I am very glad you made that point, because I think it is essential that we should make it clear, not only to one another, but to anyone listening to this broadcast, that we are talking about the information services of government We are not, for example, talking about the great leaders of a government, who certainly concern themselves with the heart and soul and spirit of the people and the people's work We are not talking about the Congress, which is (if the members of the Congress will forgive me, I think it is a term of admiration myself) one of the greatest information offices and services in Washington and a place where ideas are really developed, spelled out, and cleared What we are talking about here is the obligation of an information service, an impersonal government information service

MR MCKEON I am glad you emphasized that, since that is a source of the information, the utterances, which get to the people from Congress which will not merely give us facts but a responsible criticism of facts and will aid in the formation and guidance of the opinion of the country at large

MR LASSWELL In a democracy we depend on talk and we depend upon discussion And you not only want to have

itemized details given and called facts but you would like also to have it emphasized that a democracy must improve its technique of talk and, if possible, develop methods of responsible critical discussion and comparison?

MR MCKEON I go so far as to say that facts are not enough, although I think MacLeish is right that the government should almost limit itself to the relevant facts I think that we need an aggressive attitude, and that aggressive attitude is one which the citizens themselves, individually or in groups, such as this group around the microphone of the University of Chicago Round Table—

MR MACLEISH There he goes again!

MR MCKEON —can create by formulating plans and policies and revitalizing ideals I think that for twenty years we found it rather difficult to talk in terms of the ideals that are embodied in the great documents of our democracy, and we are now beginning once more to be able to talk

MR MACLEISH We are, indeed, and the talk is becoming clear and sure and moving talk A great deal of it, as Lasswell points out, has come from Congress There have been statements from the leaders of the country which have clarified and made visible the goals and aims of our life as nothing spoken in years has made them clear That is the center, the moving spirit, of the thing

On the other front, I maintain that the duty of a government information service is to provide the bases for judgment and understanding and to provide them in terms of information which will be useful for that purpose.

MR MCKEON This brings us back once more to the strategy of truth as opposed to the strategy of lies I should agree that, in terms of a democratic organization, the strategy of truth does have the effect of indicating the ends as well as the materials

We are in general agreement, then, in spite of the differences of our approach, that the government has a proper function as

a source of information, that propaganda is quite different from information, and that the function of the government in dispensing news is one which should enter into a free but successful cooperation with other and private sources of information

The function of the government would, then, not be one of persuasion or one of forming public opinion but rather one of supplying the materials in terms of which an enlightened public opinion might take its point of departure

In these terms I think it would be correct to say that, when critics insist that the public has not been fully informed or accurately informed, the implication is usually grim and the assumption is that the news is bad. The importance of public information is not that the public should know the worst (it might be good news occasionally) but that, knowing the worst, it may be given the force and persistence to turn errors and even disasters to good account in preparation for better news

HOW TO USE CIVIL LIBERTY IN WARTIME ⁴

ROBERT E CUSHMAN ⁵

This address was delivered from WGY studio, at Schenectady, New York, on March 7, 1942, at 5 45 to 6 P M, Eastern War Time It was number 20, of series 2, on "Democratic Processes" The occasion of this address is adequately explained in the announcer's remarks

This address supplements the American Forum of the Air program on the same subject ⁶ Congressman Cellar and his colleagues draw the limits of free speech as dictated by legal considerations and suggest the philosophy of free criticism in relation to the preservation of fundamental civil liberty Dr Cushman, assuming such doctrine, outlines a program for using these liberties

To what extent are his principles the proper ones for full prosecution of the war?

The speaker states his ideas clearly and, as we should expect in a discourse so short, affirms his points rather than attempts to buttress them with detailed analysis and illustration The talk should be viewed against the background of Dr Cushman's address on "Civil Liberty in Time of National Crisis," broadcast from WGY on November 14, 1941 (See *Vital Speeches of the Day* 8 142-3 December 15, 1941)

OPENING ANNOUNCEMENT "Democratic Processes!" Station WGY presents Dr Robert E Cushman, head of the Department of Government in Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, who will speak on the topic, "How To Use Civil Liberty in Time of War" This will be the twentieth in a series of talks on Democratic Processes, arranged by President Dixon Ryan Fox, of Union College, in his capacity as chairman of the Conference on Democratic Processes The speakers in this series represent fifteen cooperating colleges in New York and New England

⁴ By permission of Dr Robert E Cushman Text furnished through the courtesy of the Union College News Bureau, Schenectady, New York

⁵ For biographical note see Appendix

⁶ See J H Coffee "What Does Freedom of Speech Mean to Us Today?"
p 96

Dr Cushman, whom you are about to hear, is a recognized authority in his field. He is the author of several books and articles, a member of the Board of Editors of the *American Political Science Review*, and was appointed in 1936 to the staff of the President's Committee on Administrative Management. His career as a teacher, extending from 1915, has taken him to the University of Illinois and the University of Minnesota, as well as to Cornell University, with which he has been associated for the past nineteen years. It is now my pleasure to present him to you—Dr Cushman.

DR CUSHMAN We are fighting this war to preserve our democratic way of life. In so desperate a struggle in which the stakes are so high, we are obliged to sacrifice for the time being some of our normal peacetime civil liberty—some of our freedom of action, freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of assembly. These civil liberties are among the high values which make democracy worth fighting for. Thoughtful people realize this. I believe that most of our leaders from the President on down realize it. The maximum *protection* of these civil liberties in time of war is the vital concern of every citizen whether he realizes it or not.

But I do not wish to talk this evening about *protecting* our civil liberties—vital as that is—I wish to talk about *using* them. If freedom of speech, press, and assembly are the priceless rights which free people believe them to be, certainly the intelligent citizen ought to give a little thought to what he is going to do with them. What responsibilities rest on him in the matter? If we are able to keep alive during this war crisis a reasonable freedom of public discussion and public criticism, how can we use that freedom to do the most good and the least harm?

Our attention is riveted these days upon our leaders—the men to whom we have given the responsibility of managing this war. Now while many of us may feel that serious blunders were made in passing us over in favor of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, it is after all true that most of us are being asked

not to *lead* but to *follow*. For each of us there are useful but unspectacular things which our leaders ask us to *do*. Each of us knows what his job is. Beyond that we are all in a position to watch how the war is being managed by those whom we have put in control of it, and to talk it over with one another after the manner of free Americans. We are assigned to the job, not of *leadership*, but of *followership*. That job calls for constructive intelligence, cool-headedness, and imagination. It calls for the wise, courageous, and patriotic *use* of our civil liberties—the valued rights of discussion and criticism.

I believe that patriotic and reasonably intelligent American citizens, like you and me, who want to help win this war, ought to have a sort of platform of principles which, whether consciously or not, we follow in *using* our civil liberties in the present crisis. I think there are at least three of these principles and they are these:

First. We must accept, without reservation, the fact and the necessity of wartime leadership with all its implications. We must realize that war cannot be carried on without giving almost dictatorial power to the President and the leaders responsible to him. We cannot win a war by turning its management over to a debating society. Congress cannot run the war. You and I cannot run the war. If we give our leaders power enough to win this war, we also give them power enough to make mistakes and to incur losses. We are fully justified in judging their leadership by its results, but we must support our leaders unless we are prepared to turn them out and put others in their places. We must, furthermore, be good losers and follow loyally the leaders selected by the majority of the people, even if we wish that other men had been chosen.

The citizen must realize that war decisions must often be made instantly and carried out secretly. There are a great many things which we cannot be told. We have become a nation of highly trained and accomplished spectators and listeners. The average American feels that he would like to watch this war

from the grandstand with the aid of binoculars and loud speakers. He must accustom himself to not knowing just what is going on, to receiving bad news without warning, and sometimes without immediate explanation. He must be willing to allow powerful leaders to lead.

Second, we must accept as a fact the vital need and value of public criticism and public discussion. We often tend to think of freedom of speech and press and *individual* rights, which exist for the sake of purging the emotions of the man who has something he feels he must say. That is of course true. But it is also true that public discussion and public criticism are necessary to the safety of the nation. And this is true in time of war. It may be that Hitler can run his end of the war by intuition, disregarding advice and criticism. But the intelligent leader of a democratic nation feels safer and stronger if his people are free to point out what they think are his mistakes, and to tell him what they think he ought to do. He cannot follow all this advice. But national security is protected and not threatened by a public opinion which is alert, which is critical, which is flexible, which realizes that there may be more than one course of action possible even in time of war, which realizes that conditions may arise which call for a change of leadership. Of course there are limits upon what men may say, and how and where they may say it. Of course it is true, as Mr. Justice Holmes put it, that "the most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting fire in a theater and causing a panic." But as Professor Chafee of Harvard suggests, there is a good deal to be said for the man who publicly protests because the theater has no asbestos curtain and the fire exits are locked. Thus the ordinary American citizen is entitled to feel that the right of free discussion and criticism belong to him as a privilege, and possibly as a duty. He must also realize that they belong equally to his neighbor with whom he may disagree.

Third, and finally, in exercising our right of free speech and public criticism we must never lose sight of the fact that we are trying to win a war. A heavy responsibility rests on every citizen not to use his civil liberty to obstruct, or make more difficult the war effort. That responsibility is inescapable, it is also personal. Within the range of the freedom of public discussion which it is so important to keep alive, there will be room to do a great deal of harm. Much of this harm will be done by careless irresponsible people who do not intend to do harm. It is not enough not to intend to do harm. We must intend, positively and intelligently, not to do harm. There are a few very obvious things which we must avoid. We must avoid the peddling of any unconfirmed and injurious rumors and gossip. There are people with a ghoulish type of mind who so enjoy spreading bad news that they are led to make it up when the normal supply runs out. We should lend them no aid. We must not join or be influenced by those who undermine public confidence in our leadership by insinuation or inuendo. We shall not abolish elections in this country. We shall have opportunities to pass judgment in the normal democratic way upon the way in which our leaders have discharged their responsibilities. But it is more important to win the war than to win an election. There is no place in the great war effort for the narrow partisan or the selfish publicity-seeker.

There are, however, no arbitrary rules to guide the loyal citizen in the use which he makes of his civil liberty in time of war. His freedom of speech comes to him as a citizen of a free government, but it is not an outright gift but a trust. He is bound not to use it to jeopardize the common welfare or the national safety. But within the legal limits of that freedom of speech he alone must decide what he is to do with it. This is a responsibility which no one of us can escape.

WHAT DOES FREEDOM OF SPEECH MEAN TO US TODAY⁷

JOHN M. COFFEE⁸

This address was given as one of the speeches in a symposium-discussion in the American Forum of the Air series, from the Ball Room of the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., on December 28, 1941, at eight o'clock, Eastern War Time. The subject was "What Does Freedom of Speech Mean to Us Today?" The proceedings of the American Forum of the Air were held each Sunday evening before an audience. The public was "cordially invited to attend these broadcasts and to submit questions from the floor to the participants."

Theodore Granik was moderator. Other participants on this program were Congressman Emanuel Celler, of New York, ranking Democratic member of the House Judiciary Committee, Wendell Berge, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, and Quincy Howe, editor of the publishing firm of Simon and Schuster. Congressman Coffee, of the State of Washington, was chairman of the House "liberal bloc."

Mr Granik, in his introductory remarks said

"Tomorrow we celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Bill of Rights. In the words of Professor Commager, in the *New York Times* today, 'The event has never seemed more significant, the anniversary more solemn, and the rights themselves more precious.' For tonight we are at war. Those sacred rights we so cherish are threatened—our territory under attack. And until the fanatic forces that seek to destroy us are themselves destroyed, our Bill of Rights will be subjected to the acid test. In times of war, some of the rights under the first amendment to the Constitution—freedom of speech, press, and the right of assembly and petition—are often endangered.

Of these, the American Forum of the Air is concerned tonight with the right of free speech. What does it mean to us today? How far can we go in our criticism of government? Where does free speech

⁷ By permission of and through the courtesy of the Ransdell Company and Theodore Granik, director of the American Forum of the Air. Text was taken from the *Congressional Record*, v 88, no 4, p A 58, January 8, 1942 (daily edition).

⁸ For biographical note see Appendix

stop and treason begin? Should we in times of great national emergency, such as we are in today, restrict the right of free speech? Those are the questions which the American Forum will discuss with you "

Free speech is mortally endangered in wartime John Galsworthy, in one of his books, illustrates that point rather well Shortly after the first revolution had begun in Russia an extremist was addressing a gathering on the street and telling the listeners that they were fools to go on fighting, that they ought to refuse and go home, and so forth The crowd grew angry Some soldiers indicated they were for making a rush at him, but the chairman, a big, burly peasant, stopped them with these words "Brothers, comrades, you know that our country is now a nation of free speech We must listen to this man, we must let him say anything he will But, brothers and comrades, when he is finished we'll bash his head in!"

The problem of the limit of free speech in wartime is no academic question From one viewpoint, thoughtful men and journals are and have been asking how scores of citizens could be imprisoned during World War No 1 in this country under our Constitution, only for their disapproval of the war as irreligious, unwise, or unjust On the other hand, Federal and State officials pointed to the great activities of German agents in our midst in the last war, and, more subtly, today

During the last year United States district attorneys regarded it as inconceivable that the Constitution should cripple their efforts to maintain public safety The issue is a conflict between two vital principles First, there is the view that the Bill of Rights is a peacetime document and consequently freedom of speech may be ignored in war Rearing itself at the opposite pole is the belief of many extreme liberals that the first amendment renders unconstitutional any act of Congress, without exception, "abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press," that all speech is free, and only action can be restrained and

punished This view was denied by our Supreme Court in the Robinson 1 Baldwin case in 1897

The courts have frequently attempted to define the line beyond which free speech may not go in wartime It is well to remember that at the time the Bill of Rights was adopted, Madison and Jefferson were imbued with a relentless hatred of the common law definitions and decisions with respect to seditious libel It was primarily to prevent the recurrence of outrageous miscarriages of justice which occurred in England and the colonies in the eighteenth century that the Bill of Rights was engrafted upon our Constitution The Peter Zenger (1725) case involved a New York printer, the account of whose trial went through 14 editions before 1791, when the Bill of Rights was adopted Seditious libel was then defined as "the intentional publication, without lawful excuse or justification, of written blame of any public man, or of the law, or of any institution established by law" There was no need to prove any intention on the part of the defendant to produce disaffection or excite an insurrection It was enough if he intended to publish the blame, because it was unlawful in him merely to find fault with his masters and betters

It is well to keep these historical concepts in mind in approaching the subject of freedom of speech or of the press We should not delimit the scope of free speech so much that we would put the judge, obliged to decide whether honest and able opposition to the continuation of a war is punishable, in the dilemma of Isabella in Shakespeare's Measure for Measure You will recall she had to choose between her brother's death and loss of honor

I have spoken briefly of these things to indicate the boundaries and legal philosophy implicit in the subject of freedom of speech

We are fighting against three world powers today. We are defending the essentials of democracy, without which free government is a misnomer and a mockery Of these, freedom of

speech and of the press are of paramount importance. Let us rebuke self-proclaimed patriots and vigilantes of the Ku Klux Klan stamp who would deny to the people fair and constructive criticism of the handling of the war. In World War No. 1 it was the forthright criticism by Lord Northcliffe which effectuated changes in the handling of munitions, which eventuated in a turn-over of the British administration, without which, it is now admitted, Great Britain would have been defeated before the United States had entered that war. Democracy grows and flowers on free speech—it must not be stifled, it must be encouraged within its limits. Possessing this priceless attribute of democracy, we are inspired in our battle against Fascist dictatorships. Whatever are our errors, we do not arrogate to ourselves infallibility. We welcome criticism. In this crisis freedom of speech faces its greatest test. We must preserve and protect it, no matter what the sacrifice, and at whatever cost.

LEADERSHIP AND THE SPOKEN WORD ⁹

LIONEL CROCKER ¹⁰

Professor Lionel Crocker, of Denison University, and National Secretary of Tau Kappa Alpha, delivered this address at a convocation of the University of South Dakota, on December 12, 1941. It was appropriate that the speaker should talk on such a theme. For several years, Dr. Crocker had investigated the speech methods and backgrounds of leading orators, including Winston Churchill and Harry Fosdick, and the speaker had been a writer of a well-known text on public speaking, a leader in forensic and speech organizations, and a speaker of no mean ability.

Professor Crocker's talk, in interesting contrast to some others in this volume, is filled with concrete illustrations. The address is inspirational. Not all college or school students will agree with every conclusion of the speaker (for example, differences of opinion may arise concerning whether "Harry Emerson Fosdick is our greatest living preacher"), but they will be strongly impressed by the accumulation of evidence in support of the practical benefits to each one who speaks "his piece as a boy."

The speech again raises the question concerning the importance of speech training. The reader should be stimulated to reexamine the contribution of American public speaking to our economic and political institutions, and to consider the role of speech in the Second World War.

Russell Conwell declared in his famous lecture *Acres of Diamonds* that if you want to be an orator as a man you must speak your piece as a boy. The road to the mastery of the spoken word is long and arduous. Public speaking is one of those universal arts which all practice but few practice with any degree of skill. Cicero declared that it was easier to be a military genius than to be an orator. Think of how many sermons are preached every Sunday, yet there is only one Harry Emerson Fosdick.

⁹ By permission of and through the courtesy of Professor Crocker and *Vital Speeches of the Day*. From the text as printed in *Vital Speeches of the Day* 8 180-2 January 1, 1942.

¹⁰ For biographical note see Appendix.

How badly society needs the public speaker! Social control is exercised through personality and personality is expressed through the written and spoken word. Through expression we help to discover the truth. There are two ways of discovering the truth, the scientific method and the dialectic. You and I are interested in both. In the realm of fact we use the scientific method, and in the realm of probability we use the discussion method.

In times of great crises we turn to the leadership of the spoken word. When I was a student at the University of Michigan during the First World War, Hill Auditorium was filled every night to hear some speaker discuss national defense and the prosecution of the war.

I wish to impress upon you the necessity of skill in speaking in the make-up of the leader in society today. Think of any of the dozen or so personalities who are before the world today and after some reflection you will admit that they rose to their position of leadership largely because they could speak. Think of H. V. Kaltenborn, Lowell Thomas, Harry Emerson Fosdick, Josh Lee, Dorothy Thompson, Wendell Willkie, Gerald P. Nye, Robert Hutchins, John L. Lewis, Stanley High, Winston Churchill, William P. Green, Elmer Davis, Raymond Gram Swing, Franklin D. Roosevelt and the dictators, Hitler and Mussolini.

Before considering the part these men are playing in contemporary life may I turn your attention to another war in our history and show how the power of public speaking shaped our destiny.

Did it ever occur to you that Abraham Lincoln became president of the United States because of his ability to find the truth through public discussion? Abraham Lincoln was not a governor of a state as were Roosevelt, Wilson and Harding. Abraham Lincoln achieved the necessary prominence to make him president of the United States through his debates with Douglas and his Cooper Institute Address. Two of the three greatest pieces of oratorical prose in the English language came from the lips

of Abraham Lincoln William Jennings Bryan has said, "Lincoln's elevation to the Presidency would have been impossible without his oratory"

Henry Ward Beecher through the power of the word showed the ruling classes of England in the fall of 1863 how the masses felt about the question of slavery The masses were disenfranchised, they could not vote, the newspapers were closed to them The only way they could make their mass influence felt was through assembly The only orator who was capable of conducting these mass meetings was the greatest preacher ever to preach in America, Henry Ward Beecher

Both Lincoln and Beecher studied to improve themselves as public speakers Lincoln studied William Scott's *Lessons in Elocution* Beecher praised the instruction he received from his teacher John Lovell at Amherst

After taking this glance at these two examples of leadership through the spoken word may I point your attention to some of the great personalities of today and show how their skill in speaking contributed to that leadership

Last year I made a special study of Lowell Thomas I found that Lowell Thomas did not achieve his prominence as a radio news reporter by accident He was a teacher of public speaking at Kent College of Law in Chicago and later taught public speaking at Princeton University How much he values his public speaking training and ability is revealed in this letter he wrote me

I could write volumes on the subject of my public speaking adventures My friends seem to think that I have had more than my fair share of fun—jaunts around the world, expeditions to far countries, association with many of the world's leaders and glamorous figures and so on Well, I owe it almost entirely to public speaking

As I look back on it now, if given the chance to do it all over again, and if obliged to choose between four years of college and two years of straight public speaking, I would take the latter, because under the proper direction it could include most of what one gets from a four year Liberal Arts course, and then some

I can think of nothing that is more likely to add cubits to your stature than well-rounded training in public speaking, combined with plenty of practical experience

Think of the many, many boys broadcasting the news from every radio station in the country at \$30 00 a week Lowell Thomas achieved his position through hard work Just listen to Lowell Thomas some evening and pay attention to his technique His program is impartial, his program has variety, his program is well written in the vernacular, he usually ends on a note of humor It is estimated that he is listened to by 10,000,000 every evening Who can measure his value to our nation as a disseminator of the news?

Skill in public speaking and discussion is the only explanation of the rise of Wendell Willkie to prominence in American life Willkie was undefeated as a debater on the University of Indiana Debate Squad He was the orator at the commencement exercises of the Law School In an article in *The Saturday Evening Post* for February 25th, 1939, the following paragraph appears in an article on "The Man Who Talked Back"

Even if a corporative executive is an able man and has a good case he is not usually a trained debater and wrangler He has not the equipment to take care of himself in the give and take of the committee rooms Instead of dreading a Washington Inquiry, as most businessmen do, Willkie uses it as a sounding board from which his views and proposals reverberate to the nation At high school and university young Willkie was a spellbinder of the debating teams He was a radical to the extent of advocating the abolition of inheritance on the ground that it was unfair to children who did not inherit

Kaltenborn spoke his piece as a boy Kaltenborn helped pay his way through Harvard University by giving lectures under the auspices of the Y M C A for \$5 00 a night In a volume of *Representative College Orations* published in 1909 there is an oration by Kaltenborn entitled, "The College and the Press" He won the Bowdoin Prize for Elocution of \$60 and the Coolidge Debating Prize of \$100

Harry Emerson Fosdick is our greatest living preacher. If you are a visitor and want to attend his church you have to have a ticket. His latest volume of sermons *Living Under Tension* has just been published and will have a wide sale. Think of the millions he reaches by radio. Listen to what he says about the power of the spoken word and about his training in public speaking in college.

Despite the importance of the printed word I think that the influence of public speech is likely to increase rather than decrease, particularly in view of the unprecedented opportunities now presented through the radio for influencing public opinion through the spoken word.

I never can be sufficiently grateful for the fact that in my undergraduate days public speaking was regarded as one of the most important enterprises on the campus, and we were rigorously disciplined and drilled in it.

One of the Senators of whom you hear a great deal these days is Josh Lee of Oklahoma. Did you know that he was for many years a teacher of public speaking at the University of Oklahoma? His knowledge of the techniques of public speaking and discussion stand him in good stead on the floor of the Senate. "Oratory," says Josh Lee, "is as effective today as ever. The printed word has not diminished but on the contrary has increased the influence of the speaker."

I could go on quoting from the leaders of our time as to the importance of the spoken word in the world today but let us turn our attention to a study of the leaders of the democracies and dictatorships—Churchill and Roosevelt, Hitler and Mussolini. Would these men have achieved the position they now hold if they had not the ability to speak?

Mussolini gave an interview to the biographer Emil Ludwig and much of one chapter in the book *Talks With Mussolini* is taken up with Mussolini's art of persuasion. The Italian dictator has paid careful attention to his skill in speaking and is proud

of his ability to sway the masses Let me give you an excerpt from this chapter

"Perhaps you are the greatest living expert in this art of influencing the masses," said Emil Ludwig

"In Milan I could empty the streets! There they called me Barbarossa," said Mussolini

"Never before had I heard Mussolini vaunt any of his achievements, but there was a proud ring in his voice when he spoke the words 'I could empty the streets' "

"You have told me that you prepare your speeches months in advance What difference does the sight of the masses make in them?"

"It is like the building of American houses," answered Mussolini "First of all the skeleton is set up, the steel framework Then, as circumstances may demand, the framework is filled in with concrete or with tiles or with some other most costly material I already have the girder skeleton ready for my speech for our next October festival It will be the atmosphere of the Piazza, the eyes and voices of the thousands who will be present to hear me, which will decide me whether to finish off the edifice with travertin or tiles or marble or concrete—or all of them together "

Mussolini never would have achieved his position in Italy had it not been for his ability to sway the masses.

Neither would Hitler have been an historical figure had he not realized that he had the ability to speak, and developed it In the 1920's there were scores of would-be messiahs trying to save Germany But because Hitler caught on to the technique of mass oratory he survived Otto D Tollischus in his book *They Wanted War*, p 7 points this out:

While reporting on political activities for the Reichswehr Hitler stumbled upon one of many little groups of serious thinkers seeking ways and means of national regeneration and, becoming interested, addressed its meetings and discovered that he was an orator, who could sway people "I spoke for thirty minutes," he says in describing the discovery in his book, "and what I formerly had sensed without quite knowing it was now proved by reality I could speak After thirty minutes people were electrified "

Hitler has spoken at length in *Mein Kampf* on the power of the spoken word. One entire chapter is taken up with this means of propaganda. In the preface to *Mein Kampf* Hitler says this about this power: "I know that one is able to win people far more by the spoken than by the written word, and that every great movement on this globe owes its rise to great speakers and not to great writers."

Hitler's theory of persuasion is evident in the following. To Herman Rauschnig, a former associate, Hitler declared:

At a mass meeting thought is eliminated. Because this is the state of mind I require, and because it secures to me the best sounding board for my speeches, I order everyone to attend the meetings where they become part of the mass whether they like it or not. What you tell the people in a mass in a receptive state of fanatic devotion will remain like words received under a hypnotic influence, ineradicable and impervious to every reasonable explanation.

There are many implications of the totalitarian philosophy of persuasion which cry out for discussion but I must refrain from taking them up at this time. Let us turn to a glance at the speakers for the democracies.

Whereas Mussolini and Hitler are past masters in the technique of addressing great masses of people, Churchill and Roosevelt depend upon the radio. We know that radio speaking is essentially personal speaking. Instead of appealing to the emotions alone, Churchill and Roosevelt must appeal to the intellect.

Winston Churchill spoke his piece as a boy. When he returned from his exploits as a reporter from the Boer War, where he had narrow escapes from death, he became popular as a platform lecturer.

Winston Churchill came by his ability as a speaker through inheritance and environment. His father was a first-rate speaker. Lord Roseberry devotes one chapter of his biography of Lord Randolph Churchill to his oratory. Winston was suckled on the spoken word.

In his novel, written when he was 24 years old, *Ravola*, Winston Churchill describes an orator in action. The entire chapter is an explication of the principles of persuasion. A few sentences will show his interest in the power of speech. "Then at last he let them go. For the first time he raised his voice, and in a resonant, powerful, penetrating tone which thrilled his listeners, began the peroration of his speech. The effect of his change of manner was electrical. Each short sentence was followed by wild cheering."

Winston Churchill made a lecture tour of the United States in 1930. He was paid the highest fees ever paid a lecturer on the American platform.

You are all familiar with some of the great words that have been uttered by him. These words are composed with great care. He walks up and down the room using his cigar as a sort of baton as he tries the rhythm of his passages. Just as we study Burke and Fox and Pitt today, future generations will study his great passages. How noble is this one.

We shall go on to the end, we shall fight in France, we shall fight on the seas and oceans, we shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air, we shall defend our Island, whatever the cost may be, we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills, we shall never surrender, or even if, which I do not for a moment believe, this Island or a large part of it were subjugated and starving, then our Empire beyond the seas, armed and guarded by the British fleet, would carry on the struggle, until, in God's good time, the New World, with all its power and might, steps forth to the rescue and the liberation of the old.

Unlike his predecessor, Herbert Hoover, who always had trouble with his courses in English, Franklin D. Roosevelt showed an interest in composition in college. He was a reporter for and editor of *The Harvard Crimson*. We note this interest in English composition in his youth. It is important. Roosevelt's conquest of the spoken word is no sudden conquest.

Like a well-trained debater, Roosevelt in the campaign of 1932 was thoroughly posted on all the issues. He secured the expert services of Raymond Moley. Professor Moley surrounded himself with experts on every problem from agriculture to finance. These experts provided the data for Roosevelt who had the material on the end of his tongue if occasion demanded.

President Roosevelt rose to supreme heights as an orator in his first inaugural address. I was in Washington on that March day with my debaters. The gloom which had spread over the nation could be felt. Roosevelt by his power of speech cut through this gloom and lifted eyes and hearts to the future.

H. V. Kaltenborn describes this miraculous change:

From the very first his self-assurance was convincing, nearly blinding, with the great white light of promise it shed over the vast surrounding gloom. The basis of his tremendous personal popularity still dates from that first flush of optimism with which he swept all the cobwebs out of his way as he passed triumphantly down Pennsylvania Avenue to his inauguration. I know from my own experience that the impression he made upon the throngs that day was enough to hold many of them in the palm of his hand for years to come.

At that first inaugural he seemed, veritably, the answer to a hundred million prayers. The few words he uttered on that memorable occasion endeared him to the hearts of liberals the country over, more intimately, than any president but Lincoln ever achieved. His first inaugural crystallized the force of his personality in the minds of the few thousand who heard and saw him and the many millions who listened by radio or watched the press for some word of hope.

President Roosevelt slaves over his manuscripts. Stephen Early wrote me that a manuscript is the product of scores of conferences. Sometimes a manuscript is rewritten as many as a dozen times. We know that the playwright Robert Sherwood is often called in to help with the composition of a manuscript.

Note the biblical character of the following passage from the March 15, 1941 address:

The British people and their Grecian Allies need ships
 From America, they will get ships
 They need planes
 From America they will get planes

Yes, from America they need food and from America, they will get food

They need tanks and guns and ammunition and supplies of all kinds

From America, they will get tanks and guns and ammunition and supplies of all kinds

In conclusion, may I not congratulate all of you who are striving earnestly to improve your skill in speaking. Your nation needs this skill. Wendell Willkie has spoken on this point "America within the next few years must make some very fearful and some very fateful decisions. And it is my earnest hope that in arriving at the conclusions with reference to such questions the finest type of American discussion may take place, so that democracy, functioning as it should function, will arrive at conclusions that will preserve this system for us." How futile it would be to fight to preserve the freedom of speech if no one were trained to exercise it.

May I say that it has been a pleasure to be here in South Dakota. Your university and state have stood for high standards in public speaking. You have contributed many of the best speakers of the nation and many of the best teachers of the art of persuasion. Your state along with the rest of the nation recognizes the need of training in public speaking. That we are attempting to meet this need is evidenced by the fact that there are more than 3200 registered, trained teachers of speech in the country and by the fact that more than 4500 copies of the *Quarterly Journal of Speech* are published each issue. Training in public speaking is not an extra of education any more than training in scientific laboratories is an extra. Both skills seek to help man in his search for the truth, one through the trial-and-error method and the other through the method of dialectic

CIVILIAN MORALE AND THE WAR

"IF WE'RE GOOD ENOUGH,
WE CAN TAKE IT"¹

ELMER DAVIS²

Elmer Davis, at that time news analyst for the Columbia Broadcasting System, gave this news broadcast on February 16, 1942. As the text reveals, Singapore had fallen, the Japanese were overrunning the East Indies and threatening to take the rest of Burma and China and to overflow into India and Australia.

The devastating Axis submarine attack off our Atlantic coast was getting into its full stride. Vichy was apparently veering more and more toward full collaboration with Germany.

Davis stated bluntly and candidly the "facts as he saw them," but, through his clever reference to Tom Paine's *The Crisis* and to recent instances of the courage and persistence of Britain and other United Nations, appealed strongly for proper morale.

In June Mr. Davis was selected for the work as Administrator of the Office of War Information. His calm recital of the facts and unemotional interpretation of the news had made him widely popular and partly explained his appointment.³

These are the times that try men's souls. Tom Paine wrote that in times far more desperate than we are undergoing now, far more desperate than we can imagine—when the United States was effectively cut in two by an invading army that had overrun the central part of the country, almost driven the government from the Capital, and defeated the American Army in battle after battle 'til it seemed that a few weeks more might see the end of this Republic. The summer soldiers and sun-

¹ Reprinted through the courtesy of Elmer Davis and of the Columbia Broadcasting System. Text reprinted from *Congressional Record* v 88, no 48, p A962-3, March 7, 1942 (daily edition).

² For biographical note see Appendix.

³ For more comment on Mr. Davis, see *Representative American Speeches 1939-40*, p 63-4.

shine patriots gave up—went home—told their neighbors about the mistakes of the leadership that had got the country into this disastrous predicament, blamed everybody but themselves, and prepared to make the best kind of deal they could with the victorious enemy. But there remained some few tough men who refused to quit, who stuck to George Washington in spite of the fact that he had lost some battles, who learned to take defeat, and lived through it and come back to win. Thanks to those men, the Republic, which, at the end of 1776, looked as if it might not last more than three weeks longer, has lasted a hundred and sixty-five years.

If we are in any way fit to be the descendants and successors of those men, we shall take coolly, realistically, and intelligently the bad news we are getting now, neither underestimating nor overestimating it, not flying off the handle and making things worse, but settling down to try to learn what we can from our misfortune and to do what we can to keep that sort of thing from happening again.

In the ten weeks of the Pacific war, the news has been almost uninterruptedly bad and has reached its climax with the fall of Singapore. Because Singapore is half way around the world, because it was a British and not an American colony, there may be Americans who do not realize how serious a loss we have suffered—we—all of us who are on our side, not just the British. But the enemy knows it. Yesterday a Japanese general, speaking for the War Ministry, declared that the war would be carried on until England and America were crushed and wiped out, and don't forget that Admiral Yamamoto, after his victory at Pearl Harbor, said that he was going to dictate peace eventually in the White House. Now, that seems ridiculous to us, but they mean it, they believe it, and on the record so far there seems to be some evidence on their side. We believe that far from their crushing us, in the end we are going to crush them, but we've got to prove our faith by our works.

Vaguely, most of us know that we are fighting for our existence—that Hitler has said that two systems, his and ours, cannot exist in the same world, that we are fighting for the continuance of this Nation as a free society, able to determine its own destiny. Other free nations that have lost this war have been utterly wiped out.

It could happen to us if we lost, but just because this Nation has never faced such a peril before a good many people seem unable to realize that it is an actual possibility. The Singapore disaster is a reminder that our side can lose unless we mend our ways.

In another respect a good many of us display the spectator attitude about Singapore, and that was in the bitter criticism of the British leadership, which some people even seem to extend to the whole British people. All right, British management of the Malayan campaign was terrible, there's no doubt about that; the British people have said so themselves, said so just as sharply and bitterly as we have said it, and their criticisms are likely to have more effect on their government than are our criticisms. If it comes to mismanagement, we have some of our own to think about. The two pivots of Allied strategy in the Pacific were Singapore and Pearl Harbor, and one reason Singapore fell, only one, a minor one, but a point not to be ignored, was that the fleet at Pearl Harbor was hit so hard on December 7 that it has not yet been able to undertake large-scale offensive action. Beyond that, some people seem to criticize British leadership at Singapore in the same mood as they criticized Mickey Owen for dropping that third strike, as if we were only in the grandstand. In fact, we're in the game, too, and everything we've got depends on our winning it. And then the way some people talked last week you'd have thought they wanted the British to get out of the war and let us fight it ourselves. They don't seem to realize not only that we're all in the same boat but that everybody in the boat is going to have to keep rowing as hard as we can if we want to get safely to shore.

The British have made plenty of mistakes—so have we—so, for that matter has Hitler. Give the Japanese time and they will make mistakes, too. Indeed they've already begun to make mistakes in their treatment of the inhabitants of the occupied countries, making nonsense out of their own slogan of "Asia for the Asiatics." If they had political brains as well as military brains, they could have gone pretty far with that slogan, but they seem to have as great a genius as the Nazis for losing friends and infuriating people.

As for the British, people who sound off about their shortcomings might profitably think back to June 1940. France and the French Army, supposed to be the best in the world, had been knocked out in five weeks. Everybody Hitler had attacked up to that time had been knocked out. Italy had joined him, Japan was sympathetic, Russia and America were standing aside, nobody was left but England and outside the British Isles hardly anybody believed that England would last any longer when Hitler struck than France had lasted. Those, if you like, were times that tried men's souls. The English stood alone, but they stood and they stopped the Nazis. Suppose they had folded up, as the French folded? At that time our army and our air force were trivial. We had the fleet at Pearl Harbor, but, aside from that, the United States by contemporary standards was almost undefended. If Hitler had rolled over England as he rolled over France, he might have kept right on rolling and there wasn't much to stop him then on this side of the Atlantic.

British mistakes have been costly, but the fact that we have been able to make a good start toward getting ready for war we owe to British resistance that summer, when everybody else had gone down and nobody thought the British had a chance.

When, if ever, we have had to live through something like that, we will have earned a better right to sound off about the mistakes of other people.

And speaking of times that try men's souls, consider what the Chinese have lived through for four and a half years. Almost

their whole coast line held by the enemy, their capital taken, practically all their industrial districts in enemy hands, their armies holding out against an invader enormously superior in war material and organization, their cities subjected to constant bombardment from the air to which there was no reply and almost no means of defense, and no apparent hope of help anywhere. All the high-minded nations of the world were very sorry for the Chinese but they took it out in talk. We were sorry for them but if we tried to do anything about it, we would have risked involvement. And back in 1937 and 1938, almost all of us knew that the way to never get involved in anything was simply to crawl in a hole and pull the hole in after us.

When President Roosevelt suggested that it might make sense to try to quarantine aggressors, he was howled down and we went on being sorry for China and selling the Japanese gasoline for their planes and scrap iron to be made into bombs. And in China the summer soldiers and sunshine patriots quit, sold out to the enemy, pretended not to notice the murder of their friends and the rape of their women, and tried to ride along with what they thought was the wave of the future, but the mass of the Chinese people stubbornly held out, sat there and took it and proved by their victory at Changsha last month that years of an enforced defensive had not deprived them of the ability to come out and hit back. Now, if Burma is to be saved, it looks as if it may be mostly Chinese armies that will save it, and in the eventual victory over Japan, Chinese armies are certain to play a very large part. We, as a nation, will have to live through a good deal before we prove ourselves worthy of allies like that.

There are also the Dutch. It's their turn now, as the Japanese sweep into Sumatra and prepare a great concentric attack on Java. The Dutch weren't strong enough to hold the outer islands, but where they had to move out they left nothing behind for the enemy. Three of the world's greatest oilfields, some of the world's greatest refineries have been wrecked rather than let

the enemy have them. The Dutch don't take it out in mere defensive destruction either. In these ten weeks they seem to have done more damage to the Japanese than has anybody else. There has been defeatist talk in certain places in the world that Java can't be held, but you don't hear the Dutch saying that. They believe it can be held, and anyway they're going to try.

However, their resources are limited and every correspondent in the Far East says that to save Java, we must rush in as many men and as much material as can be sent. All these correspondents agree, too, that enough air reinforcements in time would have saved Singapore. They disagree as to how much would have been enough. One man thinks 1,000 planes, another only 250. Some air reinforcements did get to Singapore, but, as usual, it was too little and too late. Now we know that some reinforcements have reached Java. We know that more are on the way. How much more and how far on the way is, naturally, a military secret. It's hardly possible to speak of rushing reinforcements when they have to be sent 7,000 or 8,000 miles, but we've had 10 weeks in which to send them and it seems a not impossible hope that enough will get there in time to enable the Dutch to hold Java.

The more we hold now, the less we shall have to recover later on, the less time it will take and the fewer men will have to be killed in undoing the mistakes of the first ten weeks of the war. Whereas if we lost Java, it would be a disaster as serious as the loss of Singapore.

The Atlantic situation, too, has got no better this last week. Enemy submarines operating in American waters achieved their most spectacular success when they got into the Caribbean and sank three oil tankers, though it looks tonight as if prompt counter measures may have accounted for a couple of the subs. The escape of the German battleships from Brest opens up the possibility of the concentration of a really powerful German fleet, for operations in the Atlantic. It has been suggested that such a fleet, if organized, might attack Iceland or might go

south and try to seize other islands, if indeed they have to be seized, for German diplomacy seems to be trying to build up an Atlantic front with Spain and Portugal and Vichy. What has come of the negotiations among these powers is not clear. All the evidence indicates that the Portuguese leader, Dr. Olivera Salazar, wants to continue his policy of genuine neutrality. There is some reason to believe that General Franco, too, would like to keep out of trouble, but it's a question how long he can resist the pressure of the Spanish Fascist Party, which has redoubled its propaganda work for the Axis in South America.

As for Vichy—well, let's look at the record. Vichy turned over Indo-China to Japan, thereby making the attack on Singapore a good deal easier. Vichy tried to turn over Syria to Hitler. Vichy is sending food to General Rommel's army in North Africa, sending food though millions of Frenchmen are starving.

The British say Vichy is sending Rommel gasoline, too; perhaps not the same gasoline that the State Department supplies to French North Africa, but gasoline which we replace. Now, perhaps Vichy will never become an outright ally of Hitler. Petain has scruples, if Darlan has not, and the French people still have feelings that their government may be afraid to offend too grossly. But Vichy could do pretty well by continuing its present policies, giving the Nazis first this and then that under cover, with Mr. Henri-Haye assuring the State Department that everything is all right, just as Mr. Kurusu was assuring them last fall.

We must be prepared for the possibility that this spring Hitler may be able to add the Vichy Fleet to his own, may be able to occupy the French West African coast, and then with our two-ocean navy still unfinished, we would see some times that would really try men's souls. All right. If we're good enough, we can take it. Like every other nation, we have our quota of sunshine patriots and appeasers and trimmers and plain blatherskites, but we seem to have some men also who are worthy of their forbears. Those were good men who crossed

the Delaware with George Washington on Christmas night, 1776, but they would have been proud to shake hands with the men who defended Wake Island or the men who are hanging on with MacArthur on the Bataan Peninsula. We may have more men like that, too

MORALE BUILDING IN OUR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES ⁴

JOHN W. STUDEBAKER ⁵

Commissioner Studebaker delivered this address at the annual convention of the American Association of School Administrators at San Francisco, California, February 24, 1942

The address formulates clearly the policy and program of the United States Office of Education, with respect to American education and the war. The Office of Education, as the speaker indicates, developed, after the declaration of war, an intensive program of vocational training as preparation of young civilians for direct war effort.

One of the important activities of the Office of Education, however, was the effort at morale building in schools and colleges. The Office proceeded to set up some one hundred fifty "key-centers" in American colleges and universities, which were to provide training service and establish the civilian morale in their area. The immediate program would be to furnish written information concerning war activity to schools, colleges, and communities, to train speakers, that is faculty, student, and community leaders for this program, to make available speakers to groups on and off campuses, to create occasions in communities and schools and colleges where this information would be discussed. Part of the program included setting up libraries of information at these "key-centers" which would furnish distributing centers for data relative to the topics under discussion. Further suggestions from the Office of Education would have to do with mobilizing the mailing services of the "key-centers," the modification of the curriculum to meet these wartime conditions, the utilization of such agencies as the radio to this end, the development of an extensive public relations program and, in other ways, facilitation of the nation-wide study of the war problems. By June, 1942, the nation was fairly well organized under Mr. Studebaker's direction for some of the services outlined above.

Mr. Studebaker's address is a rather elaborate explanation of "morale." He illustrates the term and then, by recurring reference to it, brings fully to light his notion which includes the concept that "through it all and at the heart of the matter of sustained morale is

⁴ Text furnished by permission and through the courtesy of John W. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education

⁵ For biographical notes see Appendix

the persevering mind, which has reached the conviction concerning the purposes of the difficult action it undertakes" The student-critic of the speech will raise the question as to whether "morale" is the proper term or whether "understanding," "enlightenment," or some similar word would more nearly fit Mr Studebaker's purpose

The speaker castigates the American public for its political ignorance or illiteracy prior to our declaration of war Such national self-denunciation was popular in the United States in February, 1942 We could not easily forgive ourselves for what we allowed the Japs to do to us at Pearl Harbor We were also condemning ourselves for the apparent success of German propaganda in our midst The Office of Facts and Figures, as well as the Office of Education, was warning us about the further inroads of German propaganda and the consequent threat of further confusion to the American public The speaker gives graphic illustration of how such Nazi propaganda was working in the United States, he shows specifically what program the elementary schools, the secondary schools, colleges, universities, and adult education centers could do to solve the problem

The address is well-organized, inspiring, and specific in its recommendations Students of the Second World War, reading this example ten years after the conclusion of that war, will find in this address interesting suggestions as to how the educators early in 1942 proposed to deal with the war situation⁶

There is a strange notion abroad these days You hear it expressed on every hand It is the oversimplified notion that ships, planes, tanks, and guns alone can win this war

No sane person will minimize the vital importance of these weapons As most of you know, I have personally worked with all the energy I possess to develop policies and practical plans for the school and college training of millions of industrial workers And I expect to continue vigorously to promote such training But let us assert as plainly as we can and as often as we have opportunity that this war is going to be won by men and women with unconquerable morale Let's look at the record and see again how much of this war we have lost for lack of morale based on understanding

⁶ For further comment upon Mr Studebaker as a speaker, see the introductory note to his address, "Democracy Shall Not be Plowed Under," *Representative American Speeches 1939-40*, p 375

We lost the battle of Manchuria in 1931 when we ignorantly paid no heed to the warnings of Mr Stimson. We didn't possess the clear-headed morale to present a united front of peaceful nations against the first move of the aggressors. We lost the battle of Ethiopia for lack of unity and morale to stop the flow of oil to the aggressor. We lost the battle of the Rhineland when we didn't have foresight or courage enough to see what that first step of the ill-prepared Nazis could lead to if they were permitted to get away with it.

Our free world failed to stop the arming of the Nazi, Fascist, and Japanese militarists when they were weak. We permitted the leaders of a blatant philosophy of banditry to grow strong—indeed, we even helped them. Why? Because we in the free world dared not cross them for lack of military power and industrial resources? No! We had a preponderance of physical strength. What we lacked was understanding and spiritual fortitude. We were kidding ourselves into believing that power-thirsty dictators could have their thirst quenched before they got to our wells of freedom. We had become supine enough to let our friends in the free world be sacrificed to the brutal aggressors if only we might have peace and comfort. We lacked *morale* even more than we lacked planes, ships, tanks, and guns. All the time we had the overwhelming capacity to produce them. But we didn't see or understand that we should put this productive power to work making the instruments of force that are needed to stop the aggressors.

Why did the free nations of the world stand divided and stupidly neutral, awaiting their turn on the boasted Nazi's list of victims? The free people could read. They could hear wise words of warning. But they refused to believe. They clung to their illusions and their fond wishes. One by one, just as Hitler had openly promised, he enslaved these peoples.

The free peoples had resources, factories, shipyards. Together they had these things in Europe, two to one over the Axis. Even when they were confronted with the marching armies

of the aggressors, did they set these factories running 24 hours a day producing weapons of defense? No! They quarreled among themselves. They sat behind their Maginot Line. They didn't use their vastly superior military power or their capacity to produce even in the midst of war itself. They lacked the *morale* to produce planes, ships, tanks, and guns.

And we in this powerful industrial nation sat securely behind our oceans deluding ourselves with the wish-thought that planes could not bomb Pearl Harbor or San Francisco. We took no responsibility for helping to stop the aggressors except as we contributed a little sideline applause and some lend-lease help to the fighters for our cause. Did we do this because we lacked weapons or resources to make them? No! Even after the fall of France we and the remaining free nations could match Axis strength and more. Yet, seeing the growing strength of the enemies of the free world as they marched along picking up the practically unused armies, air forces, fleets, and factories, and hearing President Roosevelt's urgent appeals, did we turn from the pursuit of "business as usual" to a serious all-out production program? No! Rather, we produced an all-time high of pleasure automobiles in the last year of grace—1941. And let's make no mistake, we, the people, *wanted* those pleasure automobiles more than we wanted tanks and ships and guns. We deluded ourselves into believing that we could prepare our defenses without discommoding ourselves. We paid ourselves dividends and salary increases and rushed into the market place to buy up the articles we wanted for our own comfort at a time when steel, tin, rubber, and other things were needed for the safety of the Nation.

We kept repeating to ourselves that we needed planes, ships, tanks, and guns. But somehow they didn't roll off of the assembly lines nearly as fast as cars, radios, and gadgets. Why did we follow this line? Because we lacked ability or resources? No. Because we lacked *morale based on understanding*. In other words we lacked the rational determination to restrain

our penchant for peacetime pleasures in order to produce the weapons required for self-defense

These are harsh words. But the time for pussyfooting is long since past. If we are to win now that we are locked in mortal combat, we have got to stop our disastrous wishful-thinking. We must look at the facts and take ourselves to task for having dodged them so long.

Shouting slogans over the radio about sacrifice, merely passing larger and larger appropriations for weapons, ringing bells, and sounding cymbals cannot answer our problem. We will never have ships and tanks, planes and guns in the decisive quantities which we are capable of producing unless we gain an unconquerable morale based on clear understanding. We cannot buy these things quickly enough in large enough quantities merely with more money. We cannot sloganize our people into making the sacrifices and expressing the devotion that it takes to get these weapons. We must not unduly stress entertainment and amusement with the false notion that people can be jollied into giving themselves to a cause.

Developing understanding is essentially an educational job. But, of course, we all know that the press, radio, motion pictures, and civic organizations other than the schools, colleges, and libraries are vital media for transmitting the materials out of which understanding develops. Fundamentally we have failed to use these organized, educational instrumentalities broadly and persistently enough to get the profound understandings we need.

At too many turns we have misjudged the world situation. We were asleep at Pearl Harbor—not simply a few naval and army officers, but the American people were apathetic and lacking in alertness. Was this because we lacked planes, ships, tanks, and guns? Of course not! The very lack of these weapons in sufficient quantity should have made us alert to the dangers of a swift attack in the night. The trouble was that we didn't understand what the Japanese militarists stood for and what they were planning. It was written in the books. The record

of a hundred years of plotting was available. But the vast majority of Americans did not know about this body of material. We turned deaf ears on repeated warnings, our wish was father to our thoughts. We were told we couldn't be attacked over an ocean but we didn't examine this wish-thought very carefully. We were told we could "lick the Japs in 60 days" but we didn't inspect that proposition very closely.

The British have suffered from the same disastrous lack of understanding of what this war really involves. They were not ready at Singapore partly for lack of military force but largely because they didn't understand what to expect. And it is natural that they didn't understand. They never took the trouble to educate themselves about the struggle in the Orient which began in 1931 in the open. They were apathetic and overconfident because of their lack of understanding.

How many more outposts of our free world must we lose before we wake up to the fact that the trouble is in our heads first and foremost? How many more defeats must we suffer for lack of airplanes at the right places before we see that the fault is not in our capacity to produce them or to fly them but rather in our heads and hearts for not understanding the need—the desperate need for all-out production?

These are searching questions. They do not concern the motives of men. They concern the understandings of men. I assume that if we had taken the trouble to understand the Far East, Congress would have seen to it that Wake and Midway were properly fortified in advance, we would have been on our toes in Hawaii, we would have stopped using up our materials and skilled labor producing pleasure cars.

Our national ignorance and pathetic, wishful thinking must be turned into understanding and determination. And that cannot be done with a few posters. That is an educational job of the first magnitude.

Education at this time is a life and death matter. We'll go down unless we have it—and have it streamlined, using every

device we know to clarify problems. We can cut down on many things, but we cannot cut down on education. Oh, of course, we must make changes in our educational programs putting less emphasis on certain things and more emphasis on others. But those who think that the program to get understanding is something made up of frills and fancy work, miss the whole point of our present fearful predicament.

The human spirit is capable of supreme heroism and tenacious struggle. But these great qualities cannot be called forth by preachments and harangues, by money or entertainment. They are called forth by the sense of deep personal convictions in the minds and hearts of individual men and women. Human heroism and unconquerable morale are possessed by people when they see the light on the road to Damascus—as Saint Paul saw it. When they understand what great things are at stake and how much they as individuals are needed in the struggle, people will give themselves to a cause. The human spirit rises naturally to such a challenge.

But that human spirit has reached a stage of evolution in the civilized democracies where it requires a decent respect for intelligence. It is not to be called forth to high devotion by anything *less* than a clear vision of a high purpose—a great cause. The human mind must know for itself. Enlightened men of today do not give their lives for money, or in mere obedience to commands, or for clever slogans. Yet, they are more capable of giving their lives and doing it more intelligently than any other generation in the history of the world.

Witness the men at Pearl Harbor once the issue was clear—once they had been rescued from old illusions of security by the flaming realities of December 7. Yes, witness the British people responding to the challenge once they saw the light on the road back from Dunkirk. Enlightened free people know how to fight and work and die better than doped and duped Hitler Youth, once they see clearly what is at stake and believe in what they are fighting for. They need tanks, guns, ships,

and planes to be sure. But once a whole people sees what must be done and how to do it, the ships, planes, tanks, and guns will begin to roll off the assembly lines in constantly increasing numbers, every worker and manager giving himself completely to the task. And one ship sails as two when an awakened and inspired human being is at the helm. One plane flies as two when the man at the controls really knows that he is on the business of a future world of freedom.

The Nazis have shrewdly understood this situation. They know they can fight appropriations if they can keep them from being turned quickly into weapons. They know they can fight superior productive power if they can keep it from being used quickly to produce weapons. They know they can fight even superior weapons if they can keep them out of the hands of men who know what they are fighting for and believe in it.

There is no secret about this matter. It is written in the Nazi books—*Mein Kampf* and scores of others. These books have been translated. They tell us on every page that the Nazi plan of warfare starts and never stops on the morale front. Psychologists, scientists, shrewd and ruthless men have been at work thinking up ways to confuse and break down human personality. They first tried out these methods on one of the most educated people in Europe—the Germans. Since then they have perfected the "War of Nerves," the "psychological warfare." And they have applied the war of nerves in many countries with the most tragic results.

I say to you men of professional education, we Americans are illiterate about this kind of warfare. Yet it is this kind of warfare upon which the enemy depends. Unless he can succeed on the psychological front, he is doomed by our superior productive powers and our potential fighting strength. It is this warfare against the mind and spirit for which we are not prepared. And no amount of money for the weapons of war can make up for this unpreparedness. Only by *understandings* gained through the hard methods by which our forefathers

learned the tricks of tyranny in the Town Meetings can we be saved from this weakness

Many people have the idea that the Nazis are trying to convince us of nazism, to propagandize us for their system. This illusion is so widespread that it can be counted as a Nazi ally as precisely as zero weather is a Russian ally. This notion catches us on our blind side

We know that Hitler's gibberish doesn't convince us of anything except that he is a riddle full of contradictions. We feel superior and quite immune from this Nazi poison. Certainly, what we recognize as Nazi propaganda doesn't sell us on the Nazi way of life. Hence, after hearing a great deal about the war of propaganda, many conclude that there is nothing to it. And that is precisely what the Nazis hope for.

We must understand that it is not their purpose to convince us. They know they cannot win us with arguments *for* something. They knew they couldn't win the intelligent Germans with arguments *for* a program. The War of Nerves is an attack on the sensitive emotions of human beings involving terror and subtle suggestions.

The object of the propaganda offensive is not to convince but to confuse and demoralize. The Nazis do not care what you *think* as a result of their propaganda. They care only about how you feel.

The rumor—"Hitler is sick" is launched *via* Ankara, Turkey, as news. The Nazis do not care if you believe it or what you may think about it. They want you to feel relieved knowing that in a few days you will probably forget why you felt relieved, because in 4 or 5 days they plan to tell you that Hitler, the master magician whose mystical power you fear, is taking personal command of the armies on the Eastern Front. That is a simple example of a tactic which the Nazis have worked over and over. The purpose of it is to confuse and drive the individual up and down emotionally from hope to despair until he no longer trusts anyone—least of all his own reason.

There is nothing mystical about Hitler's power. He got every bit of it not by strength on his part but by a sort of jujitsu trickery by which he has used his opponent's strength to down the opponent. Anyone can stop Hitler in one's own mind where the main front line in this war is and has been from the beginning. He can stop Hitler and all he stands for by understanding the tricks the Nazis have used, by understanding profoundly what we stand for in this struggle, by seeing clearly what we fight against. When the trickster is exposed he no longer has your support in putting you in his power. Education must therefore offer a program by which we find out how to defend ourselves and our ideals as self-respecting human beings against tricksters and tyrants.

Surely, we have enough interest in our individual futures and in the future of our Nation to study and find out why strong nations permitted weak fanatics to start from scratch and finally to threaten the very existence of those nations and the whole world.

There is no way to short-circuit the liberating process of understanding and yet to secure a morale capable of saving a democratic society. There is only the way of Samuel Adams and Thomas Jefferson and Horace Mann.

Our forefathers were able to beat trained professional soldiers with the poorest kind of weapons by hanging on even in the snows and bitter cold of Valley Forge. Those who did it had what I call *morale*. That was the winning factor. There was nothing superficial about it. They got that morale out of a profound *understanding* of what was at stake, an understanding gained through long discussions and disputations in Town Meetings. They got it from reading and discussing Tom Paine's pamphlets. They got that morale from a faith in God and in their righteous purposes.

Morale is created in men out of many influences. It is surely affected by wind and weather and food and warmth, by a friendly hand or a hostile attitude. But through it all and at

the heart of the matter of sustained morale is a persevering mind, which has reached convictions concerning the purposes of the difficult action it undertakes

If that is so, the schools, colleges, and libraries, as liberating institutions of learning, bear a very heavy responsibility for morale. It is about the essential role of those institutions in building up morale that I speak.

The morale of our Nation is the sum total of the morale of its 132,000,000 individuals. Morale is a matter of the individual's spirit, and consequently we have a right to expect that those institutions of our society which are concerned with the development of individuals—the schools and colleges—will help to build individual morale and in so doing to build national morale.

Education is now finding its proper place in the massing and organization of the powers of the Nation for an all-out war effort. Dotting this broad land are educational institutions, close to the people, a part of the structure of life in every community, 26,000 secondary schools, 1,800 colleges and universities, 7,000 public libraries, more than a hundred thousand elementary schools. No other institution in our American scene has a closer immediate daily contact with the homes of the Nation, no other institution has a higher level of trained and devoted leaders. Today schools and colleges are no longer going their separate ways, no longer doing business as usual, no longer casual and complacent about the war. They have thrown themselves into the war effort in every practicable way—in civilian defense activities, in developing and conducting organized public discussion, in training workers for war industries, in preparing men for the armed forces.

What can schools and colleges do to build an invincible morale? The answer has already been given by thousands of our schools and colleges in actual practice. First, the schools and colleges are continuing in uninterrupted operation. That in itself is a distinct contribution to the spirit of the civilian popu-

lation With the conversion of industry and disruption of economic life, security in the homes of the land must be maintained A large element in the security of homes is the feeling that children and youth are being properly cared for, their education continuing

Small children in elementary schools have little to contribute directly to a successful prosecution of the war These children must be made to feel secure, their parents relieved of anxiety concerning them As more and more mothers leave the home for essential employment in war industries, they must know that their children are being well cared for The schools can help to organize nursery schools and to train lay volunteers for the before-and-after school care of children of working mothers

Parents must know also that proper provision has been made by school authorities for the safety of children at school, through the organization of approved air raid measures of precaution

Schools are contributing to morale by giving attention to mental hygiene measures affecting school children With the family dislocations of war—with fathers or brothers in the military services, with mothers or sisters at work in war industries, children must find security in the calm and sympathetic understanding of teachers They must be protected against demoralization of family life and lack of supervision This calls for a strengthening of the social services of the schools, for home calls or visiting teacher services to deal understandingly with the causes of schools nonattendance or incipient juvenile delinquency

In wartime the schools are making better provision for the physical hygiene and care of children and youth Reports from Great Britain indicate that many British teachers are engaged in certain health activities, preventative and therapeutic in character, which in normal times would be handled by the doctors It is entirely possible that wartime needs for medical men and for trained nurses will so deplete American schools of the services of nurses and physicians, that teachers will be called upon

to carry increased responsibility for health services to children. The recognition of signs of incipient contagious disease, home calls by teachers to help assure proper nursing and medical care for children excluded from school because of illness, are more important now than ever before.

Again, the schools are contributing to civilian morale in the health field by measures for the proper nutrition of children. This is not entirely or chiefly a matter of *instruction* in principles of diet. Small children especially can do little to determine the kind of food set before them on the family table. But the schools can do much to see to it that every child has an adequate school lunch. In this connection many schools are planning school gardens and the provision of school lunch-room facilities to insure a nutritious luncheon, at public expense if necessary, to every child in school.

Education of parents which helps them to meet critical consumer problems, the wise expenditure of income, the conservation of family resources through home repair, the canning and preserving of foodstuffs, budgeting for taxes and defense bonds, is being provided in many communities.

If morale in the elementary school is made up chiefly of the ingredient of security, morale building in the secondary school is to a large extent a matter of participation in useful work for the common cause. Young people want to be a part of the world-moving events—to share in the war effort. What can they do? The high schools cannot become military training camps, nor can they produce arms or tanks or guns. But our high-school youth, 7,000,000 of them, can be given an important part to play in civilian defense. Older high-school boys can act as messengers, as auxiliary firemen, the girls can make bandages and surgical dressings in home economics classes, they can serve as nursing aides, they can help in emergency feeding depots if necessary.

In Britain today it is reported that nearly as many youth under 19 years of age are attached to organizations directly or indirectly

connected with the war effort as there are men under arms. The units of the British youth service groups are sponsored by the Board of Education. They are run by youth leaders. Organized in squads these youth tackle any job that comes along. They have no set tasks. It is up to them to find jobs that need doing and to do them. They receive no pay. They are patriotically motivated to do everything they can do to help.

Perhaps the most realistic service that high-school youth can render is to get themselves ready to take an efficient part in the productive life of the community. We are going to need all our productive manpower. Boys, and some girls too, must learn how to tend lathes, to plant and harvest crops, to work in mines and shipyards and aircraft factories. There is a growing reorientation of the high-school curriculum in the direction of training for work. There must be an even greater emphasis on the industrial and practical arts, on vocational training for industry, agriculture, homemaking, and for the clerical and distributive occupations, as well as on the subjects which prepare for technical training in college.

Educational and vocational guidance services in the schools are being expanded. In many high schools and colleges at least one professionally trained person has been assigned the responsibility of counseling youth, presenting them with the facts concerning the various possibilities for service—in industry, in the armed forces, or in civilian defense. Here, in this guidance service, are places for vital contributions from many competent volunteers.

The social studies courses of the high schools are putting less time on the study of Greco-Roman civilization and more time on a realistic study of *What This War Means To Us*—the aims for which we fight, the sacrifices that will be required of us, the kind of peace we seek to insure. In many high schools units of study on Latin American neighbors and Far Eastern peoples are finding their way into the curriculum. Enrollments in courses providing basic preparation in mathematics

and science increase. There is some evidence of a new emphasis on world geography, world economics, and international relations in many schools.

Finally, the local school systems, the high schools and colleges are building morale by becoming centers for adult education. Civilian morale in a democracy must be built upon the wisdom and understanding of the ordinary man and woman. Of course, the schooling of every child and youth must continue without interruption. But the decisions which confront this Nation in the near future will be made not by children but by adults. Freedom's Forums for organized discussion of public affairs, aimed at real and full understanding of the meaning of this world-wide struggle and of ways to participate in the prosecution of the war, may therefore be regarded as a major contribution of school and college administrators to civilian morale.

Schools, colleges, and libraries are girding themselves for their tasks in the field of adult education. Reports coming to me show a serious planning and considerable accomplishment in the School and College Civilian Morale Service program, which President Roosevelt, last September, through Federal Security Administrator Paul V. McNutt, asked the Office of Education to inaugurate. Leadership training institutes have been held in scores of places and are being planned in hundreds of places. War Information Centers are being organized in colleges and public libraries. So the story goes. It is told briefly in the forthcoming issue of the Office of Education biweekly periodical *Education for Victory*.

Another contribution that the schools are making to morale building is citizenship education for the foreign-born. Classes are being organized to teach the foreign-born to read, write, and speak English, to acquaint them with our history and government, to assist the foreign-born both in applying for and preparing for citizenship in the United States.

Today the schools and colleges of the Nation have an unparalleled opportunity to act with unity and vision, to submerge

provincialism and institutional vested interests in a great national cause. The educators of America are speaking with one voice, they are acting in concert, giving their assurance of whole-hearted cooperation in the war program. Today the schools and colleges are being recognized as a great national service agency, as they are being called upon to organize civilian participation in the educational phases of health, welfare, and related activities, to expand their training programs for workers in the war industries, to channel the enthusiasm and energy of youth into a wide variety of needed community services. Let's all stand behind our professional organization, let us all follow its leadership, and let us act with zeal to carry out the policies enunciated in its recent pronouncement, "A War Policy for American Schools." Thus shall we do our proper share in the achievement of victory. Thus shall we build morale in our schools and colleges; a morale based on the clear understanding, the certainty of purpose, and the deep convictions that will carry us through to victory.

THE SIXTH COLUMN⁷

RICHARD C PATTERSON, Jr.⁸

Col Richard Patterson, New York State Chairman of the Defense Savings Staff, delivered this address in New York on March 17, 1942. If President Snyder urged us to put out of our minds the "half truths," if Elmer Davis told us to face the facts and "take it," if Archibald MacLeish warned us against "bad" propaganda, Mr Patterson, taking his cue from the constant admonishings against "Fifth Columnists," denounced for us the "Sixth" Columnists—the dupes, gossips, fault-finders, shirkers, skeptics, hoarders, wasters, and others of their school.

The address was typically American in its one-two-three organization, its concrete illustrations, its use of slogans ("Don't be a Sixth Columnist"), its persuasiveness, and its "action" step at the end ("Buy United States Savings Bonds and Stamps"). The speech made good "listening" and good reading. Its didacticism was needed. Again school and college speakers would find it suitable for public reading.

On March 23rd, President Roosevelt at a press conference, when asked to comment on Col Patterson, Jr's speech, suggested that many sixth columnists in the United States were at work on newspapers, over the radio, and at cocktail parties. When a reporter asked Mr. Roosevelt to amplify his statement endorsing the Patterson speech, the Chief Executive replied that it would not be polite since it would include a lot of people at the press conference.⁹

When Hitler's forces made that first memorable drive into Austria, the world was amazed at the quickness and ease of the conquest. When next Czechoslovakia fell almost as easy a prey—after the perfidious pact at Munich—the world was again set aghast.¹ Then came the rapid conquest of Poland, France, Belgium, Holland and other victims of this new and terrifying scourge let loose upon a seemingly helpless world.

⁷ This address is printed through the courtesy of and by permission of Mr. Patterson. Text was furnished by the speaker. See also *Congressional Record*, v 88, no 69, p A1437-9, April 3, 1942 (daily edition).

⁸ For biographical note see Appendix.

⁹ See *Congressional Record*, v 88, no 69, p A1439, April 3, 1942 (daily edition).

What power was it that won for this new Attila such swift, crushing, overpowering defeat of all opposition?

The *Fifth Column* marched in first. In small groups, unnoticed, it crept into Austria and Poland and started its treacherous undermining of the country's political structure and of the people's faith. Then we found it at the tip of Norway where the Nazi puppet, the traitor, Quisling, now rules. Fifth Columnists seeped into other countries and softened them up for the blitzkrieg—they persuaded Czechoslovakia that it was done for—they gave Nazi shock troops the keys to Belgium—they reduced the brave French to a disgraceful servitude—and they made possible Japan's sneak-punch at Pearl Harbor.

And—the Fifth Column is with us too, trying with all its devilish efficiency to prepare the way for conquest by Axis hordes.

You will find it in and around our airplane factories—among our troops—and in almost every place where people gather to talk about the war. *Don't underestimate its power.* Any time you are inclined to do that,

Think of Austria and Poland and Norway and France.

The tool of the Fifth Columnist is *propaganda*.

It took us some time to comprehend this force called propaganda—But when we did begin to grasp its meaning, we then understood why Austria fell so quickly—why the resistance of these other conquered lands buckled and cracked, like so much pasteboard, at the pressure of the German blitzkrieg. We understood why the then all-powerful German war machine considered propaganda *so important* as to assign it a Government Ministry all its own, with thousands of operatives spread out everywhere that Nazi greed coveted a country. We found that Hitler—with consummate skill—had developed propaganda into one of the most vicious and devastating tools of modern warfare.

Yes, propaganda is the weapon of the Fifth Columnist, to use it, skillfully and adroitly and subtly, is his mission, just as the saboteur is charged with the responsibility of blowing up

a factory or wrecking a train, and the spy is commissioned to seek out military secrets and other vital information

Unlike the saboteur, however, who must skulk in the dark, and the spy, who must also operate alone, the Fifth Columnist, by the very nature of his commission, is obliged to walk and talk with his fellows in the infamous role of a modern Judas

The Fifth Columnist must direct the flow of the enemy-planned propaganda into the proper channels. He must see to it that it spreads, like some sinister fungus growth, to warp the minds and mentalities of the susceptible to the end that fear and doubt and dissent triumph over patriotism, good sense and solidarity. It is the duty of the Fifth Columnist to divide the people against themselves so that they will fall ready victims to Hitler's basic and oft-repeated principle—divide and conquer.

But to do this he needs a co-worker—one who will, wittingly or unwittingly, spread and multiply his propaganda. While the Fifth Columnist plants the seeds, he must have accomplices to sow them among the homes and factories, the clubs and cafes and the thousands of other fertile fields where he himself cannot reach now. This is where we discover the *SIXTH* Columnist.

Let me tell you right off, the Sixth Columnist is not necessarily a vicious creature. He's *not* in the employ of a foreign government. What he is, most often, is an ordinary American citizen, outwardly little different from you or me. Where he does differ, however, is in the fact that his patriotism is of the vacillating variety. He lets himself become swayed or doubtful over that which there can be no doubt—that in wartime a nation must pull together, that minority grievances, real or fancied, must be subordinated to the welfare of the majority, that, right or wrong, it must be "Our Country" first and foremost!

It is on this premise that I predicate my case against the Sixth Columnists of America. I do not term them traitors. I call them dupes. They are the puppets who dance when Hitler pulls the strings. Theirs are the voices, conducted from Berlin

by Choirmaster Goebbels, which reach crescendo in a national chorus of carping criticism. Unchecked, it may yet *drown* out the Battle Hymn of the Republic.

Who are these Sixth Columnists, you ask? How do they operate? How are they identified?

To that I'll answer they are *any* Americans who—directly or indirectly—willfully or innocently—consciously or unconsciously—*do anything at all*—by word or by act—which will or which might—cause an interruption, or a slowing down of the national war effort.

The Sixth Columnist may be any of the following types.

First: The Gossipers These are the rumor spreaders, who get you in a corner and, very importantly and confidentially, impart to you some startling story about our army, navy or government operation of the war—some vicious rumor without real foundation that in all likelihood reached *them* through the machinations of some enemy Fifth Columnist. They will whisper in your ear such news as—"Say, did you hear they are going to send all our ships to so and so?" or "Do you know that Nazi troops landed yesterday in such and such a place?" Talk of this sort should never be repeated, either *to us* or *by us*.

Second The Fault Finders This type of enemy helper is well illustrated by the man who sits in the comfort of his club or at his favorite cafe, or even the corner store, and criticizes—and perhaps even sneers—at the war deeds and decisions of the President of the United States or other high government executives. This is a luxury no one can any longer afford. While the right of free speech is one of our most treasured possessions—and open and frank political discussion a jealously guarded franchise—yet *again* we must remember that we are at war—and new conditions must be taken into consideration. We have elected the President our leader, the Commander-in-chief of our armed forces. Not to support him now—not to encourage him—not to do everything in our power to help him and

his aides promote the conduct of the war is to definitely help Hitler and his plans for world conquest

Third The Shirkers These are the people who either from laziness or an inferiority complex want to put *their* share of the burden on someone else's shoulders. This is the type who will talk something like this—"They want me to take charge of this air raid warden work—that's no job for me—Bill Jones can do it much better and easier—he has more time than I have—anyway we've got to go to Florida next week" Such a person is a public slacker who shirks his responsibility under conditions where *everybody* has a definite responsibility in regard to this war and where *everybody* must assume that responsibility and do his full share towards winning

Fourth The Skeptics Doubting Thomases Pessimists These are the people who spread the propaganda of fear According to them the war is already lost and our efforts to combat the enemy are futile. They will tell you something like this—"Do you mean to tell me that England can defend that part of the world—why in three months time it will be overrun by so and so"

Fifth We find the Hoarders These are the entirely selfish, who want to maintain certain privileges and luxuries for themselves, though their neighbors do without The Christian spirit of "Share and share alike" is entirely alien to these people These are the individuals who lay aside quantities of certain scarce materials to satisfy their own petty pleasures even though, in doing it, they may be stealing strategic commodities from the very fighting men themselves The fact that they are not only contributing to, but actually *causing* inflation, is of no consequence to these self-seeking opportunists They have theirs, the devil take the hindmost. That's their motto.

Sixth The Wasters On all sides of us we find salvage committees For paper, for tin, for rubber, for numerous other scarce commodities. The wasters blithely ignore all such appeals It's too much trouble! These are the people who skid

their autos around corners when the government is *pleading* for the conservation of rubber They are the one who leave electricity burning needlessly when the nation already has gone on one daylight saving time and prepares for another These are the careless citizens, the *thoughtless* ones They'll learn eventually—but I hope not too late

We have other categories of Sixth Columnists too—too many We run the entire gamut of dreamy idealists with their hazy "isms" We even have draft evaders—and war profiteers—and exploiters of labor And socially, we can find both indolent rich and professional poor

So march the ranks of the Sixth Columnists—at the present time more valuable to Hitler and Hirohito than divisions of troops, fleets of warships and squadrons of planes

Another thing We Americans at home do not know the meaning of sacrifice In England they know it and in Greece and Poland and Russia All through Europe they know it even to the Axis peoples . the Germans and Italians The Chinese know it and the Japs and all the other races of the Far East Only we Americans at home have been immune to the full realization of what a war can mean in the way of objective altruism and self-sacrifice

I say it is time we shed our genteel manners and customs and girded ourselves for the fight It doesn't belong alone to the soldiers on the fighting fronts or the sailors running the Axis submarine lanes . or the marines defending Midway Island It is not alone the fight of the flying aces who are dealing such devastating blows to Japanese air power and morale over the rice paddies of Burma It is our fight, too So, for God's sake let's *begin* to fight .

You know, I think it is not unlikely that future historians will draw the conclusion that this war will have been a good thing for the American people I am thinking back to some other races which grew to be too rich and powerful and com-

placent for their own good Like fat, well-fed geese, they were ripe for the plucking—and they were plucked

I think that, like some of those dusty empires, we too might have been getting too rich and powerful and complacent for our own good Our purses, on the whole, have been well-filled, our natural resources almost limitless Our factories and our mills have been busy turning out the conveniences on which we all had learned to lean too heavily of recent decades Our manner and our way of living has been wasteful

The American people are only just beginning to wake up to the dangers that confront them They do not really think that this war can be lost—but let me tell you, it *may* be lost unless they wake up—and soon!

Let me remind you that a nation at war is the *total* of its population at war A *country* fighting to retain its liberty and integrity is its *people* fighting and the sum of the individual efforts of all of us—at home or at the front—is the strength of our national war effort

We, as a nation, have undertaken to fight a *war* Let us now, as individuals, *fight it!*

First Don't be a Sixth Columnist!

Second Get out and *do something* to help your country win the war—even if it's only saving tinfoil!

Third Buy United States Defense Savings Bonds and Stamps—which is the one *vitaly important* war duty that every one of us can fulfill Buy regularly and systematically and to the utmost of your resources If you *can't* fight with bullets you *can* fight with bonds!

■

ANOTHER "SHOT HEARD ROUND THE WORLD"¹⁰

FRANKLYN B SNYDER¹¹

President Franklyn B Snyder, of Northwestern University, delivered this address before the Union League Club, of Chicago, at the Founders' Day Luncheon. Less than two weeks before he spoke, the Pearl Harbor catastrophe suddenly transformed and united the Americans behind all-out war against the Axis. The problem which President Snyder faced with his December audience was, Can the United States maintain this single-mindedness?

To maintain the will to victory (or morale), the speaker felt that the unspoken reservations or "half truths" still lingering in the American mind must be disposed of. Thus the speaker adopted the technique of refutation. He stated clearly the idea to be refuted, he examined the false assumption back of the idea, he summed specific evidence in reply, and he persuasively summarized the conclusions to which he would lead his listener.

Especially well expressed is the speech. Its warmth of mood might well label it an "oration" (to be used as a declamation by high school speakers). The historical-literary allusions are typical of this speaker's "forms of support" in speaking.

President Snyder in public speaking is one of the more effective university presidents. He is enthusiastic, pleasing in his vocal skills, original in his use of language, impressive in his thought.

"And fired the shot heard round the world" Emerson's perfect phrase, coined in honor of the men of Lexington and Concord, is on our lips again. The embattled farmers' scattering volley of musketry on that April day of 1775 signaled the birth of a new nation, the signing of the Declaration fifteen months later announced this great fact to an incredulous world; the bombing of Pearl Harbor marked that nation's coming of age. Never before had there been such a United States of America. From now on we place the Seventh of December

¹⁰ Through the courtesy of President Snyder. Text reprinted from *Northwestern University Bulletin*, v 42, no 8, December 15, 1941.

¹¹ For biographical note see Appendix.

beside the Fourth of July and the Nineteenth of April in our calendar of great days. A fourth we shall add to this list—the day on which, with victory won, we shall make a just peace with those misguided people whose rulers have forced them to attack us.

Our first reaction to the news of that Sunday afternoon was unbelief. "This is another hoax," we said to ourselves, "as unreal as a reported invasion from Mars." And then, when unbelief was no longer possible, anger and regret in turn gave place to a calm determination, an ominous determination, and—curiously enough—to a great peace of mind. Uncertainty and hesitation and doubt had blown down the wind, criticism had gone silent, "if" and "perhaps" had fallen out of the dictionary, the issue before us had suddenly become clear. There was no need of a Public Information Office to tell us what that issue was. A way of life utterly repugnant to all who love freedom had challenged us, and by six o'clock on that Sunday afternoon, we had resolved—not alone our national administration, not alone our Congress—but "we, the people" had resolved to meet that challenge. We had picked up the gauntlet so defiantly flung in our faces, and had highly determined to settle the question whether this nation of ours is to be free from the menace of foreign aggression.

Yes, by the evening of that great day we had seen again the age-old miracle—out of suffering had come a spiritual rebirth. Daniel Webster must have slept peacefully in his grave at Marshfield that evening, for a hundred and thirty million people were echoing his words—"One and inseparable; now and forever."

This magnificent national unity must be somewhat bewildering to those who have chosen to call themselves our enemies. They had seen their nationals at liberty to pursue their peace-time occupations within our borders, they had seen our press uncensored; they had seen us exercising our right of free discussion; they had heard the clash of opinion which the events

of the past two years have provoked. And they thought, in their stupidity, that all these betokened some flaw in the fabric of our nation, that this thing we call freedom is no sure foundation on which to build national strength. Already they know their error.

Five times since 1776 the United States has entered a major conflict, each occasion save this present one has been marked by a sharply divided public opinion. In 1812 the Congress debated Madison's "War Message" for eighteen days, the final vote was 18 to 13 in the Senate and 79 to 49 in the House. Everyone knows how wide this gulf had become by 1861, when the attempt to solve our national problem by discussion gave place to Civil War. On the nineteenth of April, 1898, Congress declared war on Spain. A change of four votes in the Senate (42-35) would have defeated the resolution, though the majority in the House was overwhelming. When the First World War was upon us, and Congress had President Wilson's war message before it, 56 members of the two houses—virtually 6 per cent of the total—voted "no" on the joint resolution. But last week only one vote was raised in protest against accepting the issue which Japan had forced on us, when the question of Germany and Italy was before the Congress, even that one objector was silent.

Incidentally, we should delight in that solitary vote of "no." It was in no sense obstructive, and it was symbolic of a great and important fact: the fact that even in time of war an American legislator's conscience is free, the American ballot is still a means of registering a choice between two alternatives, it has not become solely a means of approving what a dictator has ordered—and it never will.

There is no doubt concerning our national determination or national unity. As of today, we are one people, politically and spiritually, with only one purpose: to win the war. Can we maintain this single-mindedness, this sharply focussed oneness of purpose, during the years that lie ahead? Can we

endure the hardships, the inevitable setbacks, the delays, which the future may have in store, without losing the will to victory which Pearl Harbor engendered? Can we live through months of preparation, of comparative inaction, without losing our grip on ourselves and permitting dissension and a lack of steadfastness to handicap our national effort? This is the real problem before us as a nation

I have no doubt that we can I have no doubt that just as our armed forces will win the victory on land, sea, and in the air, so we whose lot it may be to serve behind the lines, will keep our own morale, and that of our associates, unbroken—even though the day of complete victory may be long deferred

But if we are to be thus successful in maintaining the nation's will to victory, if we are to prevent the development of schisms behind the lines, we must lay the ghosts of at least three half truths which have been much in the air during the past decade, and have found lodgment in the minds of many persons, especially in the minds of our young men and women. The half truths to which I refer—specious as such approximations to truth often are—are these

1 War never really settles anything

2 If we go to war, we lose our democracy, and totalitarianism is upon us

3 The real task before the nation today is to preserve democracy

“War never really settles anything” So says many a person who looks sometimes through slightly pink-colored glasses, at the developments between 1918 and the present. Well, war leaves wounds that are long in healing, when war ends in an unjust peace it sows seeds which—like the dragon's teeth—bring forth as fruit another horde of armed men. As we plan for tomorrow we must not forget that! And many a war settled nothing except the fact that it would soon be followed by another. If one were planning a Utopian civilization, one would omit war from the frame of things, and substitute even-

handed justice dispensed by a world court. But things on this earth being what they are, and man being what he is, war is one of the factors with which any intelligent man must reckon. And the fact to remember is this: that war, despite its brutality and illogicality, does settle a good many things, and sometimes settles them right. It was war that settled once and for all the question whether the British colonies in North America "are and of right ought to be free and independent states." It was war that settled the question whether Napoleon was to be the master of Europe. It was war that settled the question whether Negro slavery was to exist in this country. It was war that settled the question whether the Kaiser was to dominate Europe. In each of these instances the decision reached by Force was in accord with the highest standards of Justice. And it is war that will settle the question of today: whether or not this world of ours is to be fit for decent people to live in.

No, the doubter who says that war never settled anything, or who ridicules the idea that Force can ever be an agent of Truth and Right—this man simply does not know whereof he speaks. But because he speaks with the easy assurance which believers in half truths so readily assume, he is a menace to our national unity. He must be educated—or must learn to hold his peace.

There is a second arm-chair commentator whose influence I have seen during the past few years, and who might well be an agent of Hitler himself, so insidious is his attack upon national morale. He is the one who tells our young men and women that if we go to war we lose our democracy, that by opposing totalitarianism in arms we are sure to bring upon the land the very scourge which we are seeking to destroy.

Again I see a half truth in what this critic so persistently reiterates. We realize well enough that in times of emergency there must be a limit to debate, the town meetings always adjourned when the Indians attacked the stockade. In times of war a free press will see to it that no news is printed which

might give aid and comfort to the enemy, should some newspaper refuse to conform to this emergency standard of journalistic behavior it will—and should—be suppressed. With no hesitation whatever we grant wartime powers to the President—knowing, as does the President, that when the emergency has passed, we shall recall those powers.

That, of course, is what this objector to the use of force forgets—that many a time our American democracy, exercising one of the highest prerogatives of sovereignty, has voluntarily relinquished some of its basic rights, and as often has resumed those rights when the emergency has passed. There was no free speech in Massachusetts or Virginia during the Revolutionary War, Tories lost their civil liberties overnight. The writ of habeas corpus ceased to run during the latter part of the Civil War, twenty-five years ago one of my neighbors in Evanston was transferred to the Federal Prison at Fort Leavenworth merely because he insisted on saying that he hoped Germany would win the war. But when these emergencies passed, tempers cooled, restrictive legislation was rescinded, and the debate was resumed where it had been left off.

No, we need not fear that a total warfare against totalitarian enemies and totalitarian ideas will destroy our American democracy. Indeed I think I could show, if time permitted, that mankind has taken the most significant steps toward a democratic form of society as a result of having used force to clear the way. Begin with Magna Charta, come down to our American Civil War, and see whether or not I am right.

The third person whom we must educate if we are to preserve and strengthen our national morale is the one who, believing that democracy offers more hope of human happiness than any other type of social organization, says "The great task before us is to preserve democracy." Again I say "here is a half truth—but only a half truth." A week ago I received an invitation to take part in a large conference which had as its theme "The role of education in the defense of democracy." I replied that

I was not interested, that the time had passed for such talk, but that if the theme of the conference could be changed to "the role of education in the defense of the United States," I might have something to say

It has caused me real concern, gentlemen, during the past few years, to see how widespread has become the tendency to substitute this sort of faith in democracy for belief in and devotion to the fatherland. I yield to no one in my hope that the privilege of living in a democratic society may some day be accorded men and women of all nations. I realize, too, that here at home we have many readjustments to make in our own national organization. But I believe that the best way to promote the welfare of democracy, both at home and abroad, is to preserve, protect, and defend the country that guarantees you and me the privilege of living as free men in a free land. Do that, and the rest will follow. The Chinese know that this is true. During their magnificent struggle, they have not been fighting for democracy, but for the good earth that is theirs, for the country which their ancestors handed on to them. The English have no delusions. When they won the battle of England they were not fighting for some pallid goddess of international democracy, but for "This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England." And we, too, know the truth.

How hard it would be, how impossible it would be today, to ask any group of Americans to rededicate themselves to the cause of world-wide democracy! Noble as the concept is, it leaves me relatively unmoved. I cannot see it or touch it, it has done nothing for me. But how easy it is, how natural it is, to dedicate ourselves again to the service of our country. For we know what we mean when we say "our country."

We mean the red clay of Virginia and the granite hillsides of Vermont, the dust that blows from Oklahoma and the fog that drifts in on an east wind from the lake, we mean the lumber camp in the Minnesota woods and white-pillared mansion in South Carolina, we mean the banker on Wall Street and the

cowboy in Wyoming, Grant's tomb on the Hudson, and Lee's grave in Lexington, a log cabin at Hodgenville and a White House by the Potomac, we mean Jamestown and Plymouth and the unsolved riddle of Roanoke, the Alamo and Appomattox Court House and the mast of the battleship *Maine* in the Academy grounds at Annapolis, we mean warriors in tattered buckskin or faded continentals, in gray and blue and khaki, fighting to preserve what their fathers had given them, and what you and I have enjoyed, we mean men and women with plough and broad-axe and musket pushing back the frontiers and bringing civilization into the wilderness, we mean the Mayflower Compact and the Declaration of Independence and the letter to Mrs Bixby, we mean Lincoln with his deathless sorrow, and the clear-eyed lad who last year in the uniform of our navy stood beside me at University functions, and died the other day in the *Arizona*. All these I know—and these I have in my mind and in my heart when I say "My Country"

James Russell Lowell, who was once a guest of this Club, put it all in the lines with which he brought his "Commemoration Ode" to a close

O Beautiful! my country! ours once more!
 Smoothing thy gold of war-dishevelled hair
 O'er such sweet brows as never other wore,
 What words divine of lover or of poet
 Could tell our love and make thee know it,
 Among the Nations bright beyond compare?
 What were our lives without thee?
 What all our lives to save thee?
 We reck not that we gave thee,
 We will not dare to doubt thee,
 But ask whatever else, and we will dare!

THE HOME FRONT

MacARTHUR DAY CELEBRATION SPEECH ¹

DONALD M NELSON ²

This address was given by Donald M Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, at the MacArthur Day celebration, at Soldiers Field, Chicago, at four o'clock, Central War Time, Sunday, June 14, 1942

Starting at ten o'clock in the morning and extending until after midnight, a fourteen-hour parade in conjunction with a world-wide United Nations "Flag Day" celebration was staged through down-town Chicago. It was estimated that more than 100,000 were in line—a military vanguard, but mainly civilians—representatives of factory, workshop, schoolroom, store and office—"awake to the production requirements on which American victory depends" ³

In the afternoon "115,000" jammed Soldiers Field in special honor of General Douglas MacArthur ⁴ "An overflow crowd of 60,000 swarmed Burnham Park, unable to gain admission"

On the program were distinguished religious leaders (Most Rev Samuel A Stritch, Roman Archbishop of Chicago, Dr Ernest Lynn Waldorf, Methodist Bishop, Dr Solomon Goldman, Rabbi); city, state (Governor Green, of Illinois,) and national officials, army and navy officers, radio and movie stars (Eddie Duchin and his orchestra, Marlene Dietrich, Bob Hope, Mary Howard), and veteran's organizations

The speaker tactfully paid tribute both to MacArthur and the "heroic men who have been fighting under him"

He bluntly told his mammoth audience that autos were to be used only for essential services. He referred to the rubber shortage—another problem that the Americans of June, 1942, were still finding it hard to understand and slow to accept

¹ By permission of Donald M Nelson. Text furnished through the courtesy of Mr Nelson

² For biographical note see Appendix

³ *The Chicago Daily News*, page 1, June 15, 1942

⁴ *Chicago Sun*, page 1, June 15, 1942, *Chicago Daily News*, page 1, June 15, 1942

He bluntly warned these listeners that the pinch had just begun "Whatever" victory "costs, we'll pay and pay gladly"

He eulogized those who as of this date—six months after the start of the war—had helped win this remarkable Production Drive

He concluded with a rosy view of the post-war world

The address has few marks of literary finish, it will probably not be read and reread generations hence. Speeches, however, are for the immediate occasion. This one, in view of the important situation and the theme—a proclamation of our home front accomplishments and a warning of the years of steady sacrifice ahead for civilians—has much value for students who would understand America of June 1, 1942. In addition, it is direct, clear, and certainly persuasive.

As of that time the all-important questions were, would rubber hold out for the duration? If not, would satisfactory substitutes be provided? (None were in sight for civilian use until—say, 1944.) Should the entire nation have its weekly gasoline quota cut as had been done in the Eastern states? Would industry operate with large scale efficiency? Would a sufficient pool of men and women workers be available to produce the materials necessary to carry through to a victory over the Axis? Would, for example, capital and labor, keep sufficient peace to secure the 160,000 planes, the tremendously expanded navy, the millions of tons of new shipping, needed? Students of this speech will analyze the subsequent history of production and decide whether Nelson was justified in his somber view of coming events and in his confidence that America can "take it"

We are gathered here today to honor the name of a great American soldier General Douglas MacArthur—and the emergence of a strong, united, determined democracy. This mighty city has today given abundant evidence of the place General MacArthur has won in all American hearts. The fact that this vast crowd has gathered this afternoon in this stadium is a great testimonial to the way we all feel.

Yet I am sure that if General MacArthur were here he would ask us to remember that in honoring him we pay tribute to the heroic men who have been fighting under him. General MacArthur is more than a splendid military leader; he is also a symbol of the courage, the endurance and the magnificent fighting qualities of the American soldier. Our salute to him is a salute to

all of the men, living and dead, who with him gave us renewed confidence in the certainty of America's final victory in this war

And I am sure of one other thing, too. If the General were here I am sure he would want our pledge that we are going to pay tribute to the American fighting man with deeds as well as with words. Parades and orations are very fine, but we shall have to do a great deal more than that if today's ceremony is to be anything more than an empty gesture. We know that our fighting men are going to win this war: but let us not forget that we at home could lose it for them if we failed to play our parts properly.

In other words, we at home have a big job to do. This war makes a demand on every man, woman and child in the United States. If we meet that demand in full, we are going to win. If we fail, we can lose—and, losing, prove ourselves unworthy of our heroic soldiers.

What is this job that we have to do, anyway?

First of all, we have got to take it. This war is not going to be pleasant for any of us. We're not going to get rich out of it and we aren't going to have much fun along the way. We are going to have to do without things—things that we usually think we just have to have. We are going to have to upset our daily lives, put up with discomfort, get used to hardships.

Take our use of autos as a sample. From now on until the war ends no one of us has any right to drive his car any more than he really needs to drive it. The rubber tires that are now rolling along the roads on the 25,000,000 privately owned autos of this country are part of our essential transportation system.

As far as any man can see, they are all the tires we are going to have for some time. When they are burned up our autos stop moving. If our autos stop moving, millions of workers can't get to their jobs. If that happens our production of war goods slows down to a crawl and our soldiers and sailors in every part of the globe are put in dire peril. So we have got

to get used to the idea that pleasure driving is just about out for the duration of the war

That's a nuisance, of course. We all like to hop into the car for a Sunday spin, or for a visit to a friend's house, or for a weekend trip. It will be tough to give that up. But how pleasant do you think things were for MacArthur's boys on Bataan Peninsula?

SCRAP DRIVE JUST ONE STEP

Our need for rubber for military purposes is so great that beginning at one minute after midnight tonight the War Production Board is conducting a nation-wide campaign to collect all of the scrap rubber there may be scattered around the country. This represents just one step to deal with the rubber shortage, which is so pressing that our army and navy have already been forced to cut their use of rubber by 25 per cent. We hope that we can collect enough scrap rubber to help relieve that situation. But with such an acute shortage you can easily see the extreme importance of using the tires on our autos only for essential driving. If you will all cooperate in this drive it will help relieve a shortage which directly affects our military production.

Now that is just one little sample of the way our daily lives are going to be upset by this war. We haven't begun to feel it yet. We are going to feel it before we are very much older. Then we are going to show whether we can take it. We'll have to keep on showing that to the end of the war.

I think it is worth while to see why we are going to have to learn to take it.

The answer is simple. It takes so much stuff to fight a war nowadays that if you fight to win you don't have much left over for yourself. Modern war needs all kinds of things. It needs airplanes, guns, tanks, ships, ammunition, supplies of every kind you can imagine. And it needs them in perfectly

enormous quantities We couldn't possibly make half of the things we have got to have to win this war if we tried to keep on making all of the things we are used to making for ourselves at the same time We don't have enough factories, enough machines, enough material or enough workers So the only way we can hope to win is to strip down to bare muscle and bone We have to survey our whole national plant, everything we have in the way of strength, from machines and mines to workers and managers, and turn all of it that we possibly can to the production of war goods We can keep for ourselves only enough to supply us with the bare necessities Everything else is out

FROM PEACE TO WAR PLANTS

If you could travel around the country to our great manufacturing centers you would see that this job of turning peace industry into war industry is going along splendidly

The huge factories that make autos, refrigerators, washing machines, typewriters and all the other things aren't making any more of those things for us nowadays They're working for the army and navy And they are beginning to do a perfectly grand job We are today turning out a greater quantity of arms, munitions and equipment for our fighting men and the fighting men of our allies than any of us thought possible six months ago That quantity is going to keep on getting bigger, month after month Before we get through, it will most certainly be heavy enough to break Hitler's back

But remember this that although we are getting production on a very large scale, you and I haven't really started to pay for it yet We can honestly say that as far as production itself is concerned, we are "over the hump" but as for the inconveniences, discomforts and hardships that you and I will have to endure—why, we haven't even got to the foothills yet We are just beginning to learn that we can't drive our autos to suit

ourselves while the war lasts before we get through we'll get an equal or a greater jar in every single part of our daily lives. We won't get the new homes we want, or the new clothing we want, or all of the kinds and varieties of food we want, we won't be able to do much traveling for fun, and when we do travel we'll go by train instead of auto, and we'll probably sit up in the day coaches instead of riding in Pullmans, we'll see a good many thriving little business enterprises go out of business, and a great many people will find themselves taking on different jobs for the duration, we'll pay taxes as we never paid them before, and we'll do without a lot of things until it really hurts every single one of us.

Yes, we'll really learn to take it, and if I understand the temper of the American people today I don't think there will be one single complaint. We know what we're up against. We want just one thing—victory. Whatever it costs, we'll pay and pay gladly.

But this isn't all a negative proposition. Just learning how to take it isn't all of our job. The other part of it is—to work, to work as we have never worked before, to work for our country instead of for ourselves.

I don't know of anything that has happened since the war began that has given me as much solid encouragement as the way in which the American people have tackled the job of working for victory. There is a new spirit abroad in this land—or perhaps it is just a spirit that has always been there, and always will be, and was just waiting for a chance to show itself. By that I mean that all up and down the land, in mines and shops and factories, everywhere, American men and women are showing that they know what teamwork means, that they can forget their own selfish interests and sink their quarrels and go forward together to get a job done.

I would like to spend a minute or two talking about that, because I think it is tremendously important.

Early this spring I invited management and labor in our war industries to join in a great Production Drive to hurry along this job of turning out ships, tanks, planes and guns for our fighting men. The plan that was laid out for this Production Drive was quite simple. Management, which provides the plant and the machines, join hands with the men and women who must operate the machines, together they form joint committees for each factory—committees made up of representatives of management and labor—so that they can pool their experience and their ideas and find ways to increase the output of war goods.

Now when that plan was proposed we began to hear from pessimists—on both sides of the fence. Some of the people on the management side were afraid that this would turn out to be a dodge to turn the management of our plants over to labor, lock stock and barrel. Some of the people on the labor side, in turn, thought that the whole thing was just the old-fashioned speed-up in disguise. I am very happy to be able to say to you that the experience to date in more than eight hundred war factories has proved all of those pessimists to be dead wrong. Neither side has tried to take any undue advantage. Neither side has tried to twist this plan into something that could be used against the other fellow.

The men and women who make up these joint committees in our factories have spent precious little time bickering among themselves or debating questions which properly belong to the regular collective bargaining groups. Instead, they have devoted themselves to just three questions, as follows:

How can we get more production out of the machines we have?

How can we improve the quality of the workmanship?

How can we prevent material and man-hours from being wasted?

Answers have come in thick and fast. They come from front-office people and from the men and women who run the

machines As they come in they are examined by the joint committees

MANY BOTTLENECKS BROKEN

The ones that look promising are tried out Those which work are put into operation And the flood of new ideas for increasing production, for improving quality and for saving labor and materials has been beyond all expectation Not a day goes by but dozens and hundreds of little bottlenecks are broken as a result of these suggestions And remember, when we have broken the last little bottleneck the battle of production will be over

I think it is high time that these production soldiers got recognition for their effort similar to the recognition which is given their brothers in army or navy uniforms for especially meritorious effort I am glad to say that such recognition is going to be awarded

There will be inaugurated this week a series of honors for individual production merit by which the War Production Board, acting on the recommendations of the joint committees, will recognize production soldiers for outstanding contributions to our war effort Instructions and authority for making these awards are now going out from Washington to the various committees As those awards are made they will carry to each individual who receives one the assurance that both his fellow workers, his employers and his government recognize the especial contribution he has made to victory

I have spent a good deal of time talking about this production drive because to me it is extremely important, both as a means of getting the job done and as a symbol

WINNING WAR IS FIRST

It expresses to me the fine determination of the American people to put winning the war ahead of every other consideration. It proves to me that when the test comes we all realize

that the things which all of us Americans have in common are infinitely more important than the differences we have with each other. It shows that when there is a big job to be done we can all get together and do it.

And all of that adds up to the most important part of all. We are free men and women in America. We don't go to work at the point of a bayonet the way the people in the Axis countries have to go to work. Nobody drives us. We go of our own free will. That's something our enemies can't understand. They have done a good deal of talking these last few years about how democracy is out of date and inefficient. They have boasted that men had to become slaves and take orders blindly in order to survive in this modern world. What nonsense. We are proving them wrong right now. Proving it by out-producing them, by beating them at their own game, by showing that free men always could and always will work better than slaves.

This war has not yet been won. Some very hard months are ahead of us, and this is no time for easy optimism. But whether this war is to last two years longer or ten years longer, one thing we can be sure of—we can look ahead to the future with hope.

Consider this: our America today is really beginning to work at full speed for the first time. We're just beginning to realize what our strength really is. We're just starting to use it. As we do so, we are learning that when we really try we can do anything we want to do. Or—if you want to say it in another way—you can say that we are now putting into operation the most magnificent productive plant any nation ever dreamed of, and we are learning things about production, about the use of materials, about the way to make more out of less, that we never knew before. And we're doing all of this as free people, in a free society, without giving up our ancient rights.

Do you see what that means to us when we look to the future?

This war will be over, some day. Then our real job will just be beginning. It will be as big a job as this war job—and we can do it just as well. We actually have in our hands the materials out of which a freer, richer, happier world can be made. Let no one imagine that we shall lack the good sense to use those materials properly.

This world will need many things, when the war is ended. There will be tragic wreckage to clear away and great damages to be made good, there will be homes to be rebuilt, cities to be re-established, endless quantities of the things men and women use in their daily lives to be made. And when those needs are met there will be still another demand—an irresistible cry from millions of plain people who will insist that in one way or another the power which was used to win the war be turned now to satisfy human needs.

We can answer that cry. This war is being fought to see who controls the future. We are going to win it and the future is going to be ours, and we shall have the fairest opportunity any nation ever had—the opportunity to put unlimited strength to work in a free world for the benefit of all of us.

And in the meantime we've got a job to do. We've got to win the war. We've got to put the tools into the hands of our fighting men. General MacArthur has said that if we will give the boys the weapons to fight with, they'll take care of the fighting. We know that he is right, we know that our part is to work and work and work. For the sake of our fighting men—for the sake of ourselves—for the sake of our right to shape our own futures as free men—we will all stand together to finish this job.

EQUALITY OF SACRIFICE ⁵

LEON HENDERSON ⁶

Mr Leon Henderson, Administrator, Office of Price Administration, gave this address over Station WOL and the Mutual Network at 8 15 P M., Eastern War Time, on Friday, June 5, 1942.

His main problem, in a word, was to prevent inflation. At this time the triumvirate of "economic dictators" were attempting to gear the United States for the winning of the war. Lieutenant General Brehan Somervell was to spend \$114,000,000,000 in short order—to get rubber, steel, wool, copper, to outfit the army. Donald Nelson's business was to "gear United States industry to war." Leon Henderson's job was to keep living standards down, to control trade and industry through "managed" prices.

President Roosevelt had attempted to back up the Henderson program by talking on "The Peril of Inflation," on March 9, 1942, and on "Self-Denial for Victory" on April 28, 1942.⁷ In the latter speech to "keep prices down" the President proposed a "seven-point program"—(1) heavier taxes, (2) fixing of ceiling on prices and rents, (3) stabilization of wages (not ceilings on them), (4) billions into war bonds, (5) stabilization of farms prices (not ceilings on them), (6) rationing of essential commodities, (7) and the discouragement of installment buying and encouragement of debt payments.

General resistance met Henderson's efforts to carry out in detail these features of the Presidential plan which directly related to the cost of living and to inflation.

At the time this speech was delivered the Price Administrator was facing defeat and disaster. June 30, 1942, was approaching with a deficit of \$20,000,000,000, the new fiscal year would begin with a budget estimate of a national deficit of some \$60,000,000,000. At the same time wages were rising (no ceilings or prospects of such), farm prices were rising (no prospects of ceilings), individuals were getting comparatively large incomes. At the same time volumes of goods for sale were steadily shrinking—which condition meant that more and more money would be available to bid for fewer and fewer goods (including food), and war bond purchases were obviously not in sufficient amount.

⁵ Reprinted through the courtesy of Leon Henderson. Text furnished by the Office of Price Administration.

⁶ For biographical note see Appendix.

⁷ For texts see *Visual Speeches of the Day* 8 322-3 March 15, 1942, and 8 450-3 May 15, 1942.

to absorb the extra income Congress, on June, 1942, was still debating the increased income taxes and avoiding proposals to establish a sales tax to further siphon off the expanding wages (Congressional elections in November, 1942, were alleged to lull the Congress into no action on these problems) Thus the situation had the elements that might easily generate the inflationary spiral

Mr Henderson patiently and simply stated his case, and presented the issue Is the financial sacrifice a fair one?

The persuasive devices of the speech justify special study—the preliminary directness, the reference to the President's pronouncements on this subject, the appeals to patriotic sacrifice, the "market-basket" illustration, the handling of the two points for which the speech was apparently given—stabilization of wages and of farm prices—the final appeal for the people to enforce these principles

Whether the speech was logical in its arguments and effective in its results will best be judged by those who look back in retrospect to these economically perilous days of mid-1942

Tonight I am to speak to you about the President's national economic program I am going to talk straight from the shoulder, for it is terribly important that everyone understand clearly what the program calls for and how essential the program is to the winning of the war

This is a tough war To win it, will take everything we've got It will take the work and sacrifice of every man, woman and child in the country That's not pep talk, it's cold fact

We all know that the war will have to be won on the battle fronts It will have to be won out there where our boys are fighting—on the sea, in the air, and on the land It can't be won anywhere else But whatever the courage, whatever the heroism, of our boys out there, the war *can be lost* right here on the home front

The war can be lost unless you and I—unless the entire civilian population—do the job that is assigned to us, and do it right The President's program provides the strategy for the home front It shows us our battle stations It gives us our marching orders The rest is up to us.

What is it that is expected of us? I can put it in three short sentences

We must produce to the limit of our capacity and our strength

We must produce more than we have ever produced before
And we must learn to live on less

That's what it takes Only in this way can we put into the hands of our boys the weapons that will insure and speed the final victory

That means we must reorganize our daily living to one of stern self-denial, so that our fighting men will have all that they need Today we call this conversion, but down the centuries men have known that in time of war they must beat their plowshares into swords and their pruning hooks into spears They have known what we know today, that to achieve victory in the field there must be sacrifices at home

We face a savage cut in our standard of living This is one of the grim necessities of war No one is unwilling to make these sacrifices Everyone recognizes that they are part of the cost of victory There are only two questions in people's minds First, are the sacrifices being distributed fairly? Second, are we making sure that every sacrifice is translated into effective fighting power? In other words, is the sacrifice fair? Does it count in the final victory?

Before the announcement of the President's program, we were already pulling in our belts In April of this year we on the home front consumed almost 10 per cent less of goods and services than we consumed last August This meant sacrifice, it meant the first stage in cutting our standard of living

But this sacrifice was neither fairly distributed nor, I am sorry to say, did every part of it count in furthering the war program

The sacrifices we civilians made we made through paying higher prices We were spending more and more money, but we were getting fewer and fewer goods. The housewife, spend-

ing her carefully planned budget, came back from the store with a lighter market basket because prices were up 2 per cent one month, 3 per cent the next Her dollar was not going as far as it used to

But not every housewife came home with a lighter basket Many were able to bring home a basket just as heavy as before because their incomes were large enough or had increased enough Still others came back with heavier baskets

This means some families were making a heavy sacrifice Others were making a light sacrifice And some were actually better off because of the war

Everyone bitterly resented this increase in the cost of living I believe it was because everyone recognized how unfair were the sacrifices brought about in this way Everyone saw that rising prices were imposing harsh sacrifices upon some and giving windfall profits to others A few were made richer while many were made poorer

Because the nation's sacrifices were distributed so unevenly and because there was no assurance that these sacrifices counted in the war effort, there was uneasiness, distrust, and social and industrial friction I do not think it is unfair to say that in the months before the President spoke, many were engaged in a scramble to advance their own selfish interests, to get what they could without regard to the national interest

This hurt production Vitaly needed materials were being hoarded, precious time was lost in industrial disputes, men felt they were unfairly treated and did not produce what they were capable of producing Not everyone understood the economics of the situation, but everyone sensed that this was no way to fight a war

It was to stop all this that the President formulated his seven-point program This program is designed to distribute the sacrifices of war fairly and to make those sacrifices count This program stabilizes our economy It assures the full marshaling of all our productive power for the prosecution of

the war. It guarantees a healthy and sound productive system when this business of war is over.

Under the President's program we have made a frontal attack against the rise in the cost of living and have brought it to a halt. The General Maximum Price Regulation has put a ceiling over practically every retail price at its March level. These prices cannot go up, they can only go down. Rents in war production areas, where 90 million Americans live, have been stopped from further increase. Wherever present rents are too high, they will be put back to a fair level.

The stabilization of the cost of living is no longer a promise. It is a fact. Every worker now knows how far his wages will reach. Every farmer now knows that when he harvests his crop the dollars he gets will not be frittered away in rising prices for the things he buys. Every saver, every purchaser of war bonds, now knows that his and her savings are secure, that their value will not be eaten away by inflation. The worker, the farmer, the saver—all of us—know that this is true so long, and *only so long*, as the cost of living remains stable.

We at the Office of Price Administration are determined to keep it stable. Whether we succeed or not, depends not alone upon our administration of the price ceiling. It depends upon the effective carrying through of all the other parts of the President's seven-point program. It depends upon the stabilization of wages and of farm prices. It depends on our paying heavier taxes and increasing our purchases of war bonds. It requires restrictions on consumer credit, and the paying back of debts. It requires the rationing of all essential consumer's goods that become scarce so that all of us may have what we absolutely need.

All these parts of the President's program are necessary to secure equality of sacrifice. They are necessary for the continued success of our control over the cost of living.

As to stabilization of wages, we face the basic fact that the war program is cutting down the supply of consumer's goods.

At the same time, it is swelling the stream of civilian incomes. If wages and other incomes continue to grow at the same rate they have this past year, the pressure of swelling spending power upon the shrinking supply of civilian goods will smash through our price ceiling.

Rising wage rates not only add to the dollars bidding for a dwindling supply of goods, but they increase the costs of production. It is true that in some industries profits are large enough to absorb increased wage rates and still maintain ceiling prices. In many industries, however—particularly the civilian industries—this is no longer true. In these industries, rising wage costs would force a break in the universal ceiling. I want to say frankly, that unless wage rates are stabilized—that is to say, unless wage adjustments are limited to remedying substandard and inequitable conditions—the cost of living cannot be held. We shall be back where we were before the President spoke. The choice before us is just that simple.

The stabilization of farm prices is equally necessary. Food prices constitute a third of the cost of living. Because of the agricultural provisions in the Emergency Price Control Act, a number of farm products cannot now be brought under the ceiling. Furthermore, unless government-held feed stocks can be sold at present prices, a rise in the price of feeds will force up the costs of producing meats and dairy products. The Congress must take action to permit the stabilization of farm prices. Unless this is done, the cost of living cannot be held. Here, too, the choice before us is just that simple.

The President has recognized that the stabilization of farm and wage incomes is not enough. Supplies of goods are decreasing and must decrease more every month. Purchasing power must therefore be brought down into balance with diminished supply by increased taxes and savings. The Treasury has recommended such a tax program. It is designed to insure that the cost of war is borne equitably, by each according to his capacity. It would reach incomes lower than have ever been reached by

direct taxation. It would sharply increase the taxes levied upon high incomes and upon business profits. This is the largest tax program—and the most drastic, at both ends of the income scale—ever to be placed before Congress. But it is no larger, nor more drastic, than the situation requires, and it is fair to all.

All these measures and the other items of the President's program which will be discussed later in this series, fit together. Each is necessary for the full effectiveness of the others. But even the most complete success of these measures cannot eliminate the need for one other element of the President's program, the administration of which also falls to me—rationing.

There will be many goods the supply of which will be so short that we shall have to step in directly to insure an equitable distribution. Already we are rationing automobiles, tires, sugar and gasoline. Before long there will be other items. Sometimes we shall be able to share and share alike. Sometimes the shortage will be so great that distribution can be made only upon the basis of need, some of us will have to go without. All this is going to be irksome and annoying. I ask you to remember, when you are confronted with the inevitable irritations, that it is war which creates the scarcities and that rationing, however trying, is the only means by which acutely scarce goods can be distributed fairly.

We are not going to plunge into rationing all across the board. But we are prepared to move promptly where it is necessary. How far we shall have to go will depend upon public good sense and self-discipline. There will be many goods of which the supply will be enough to go around if everyone thinks before buying and buys only what he absolutely needs. But if many who can do without go ahead and buy, and if others buy ahead of their needs, or hoard, stocks will run out and rationing will become necessary.

We in Washington have been immensely gratified by the magnificent response of the American people both to the rationing programs and to the general price ceiling. This has been

a response by consumers and by producers and distributors as well. Despite personal inconvenience and actual business hardship, they have cooperated wholeheartedly.

There are, of course, some who cheat, through thoughtlessness or greed. The law is plain enough and plenty tough. We mean to enforce it, against the thoughtless and the greedy alike. I know that the great mass of the American people want us to enforce it. They are willing and eager to make the sacrifices required of them. But, I repeat, they want to be sure that their sacrifices are fair and that they count.

The President's program gives us that assurance. Under his leadership and under this program, we know that the sacrifices *will* be distributed fairly and that they *will* count toward victory. We can all march forward together to do the job—the biggest job of our lives—a job in which no one must hold back waiting for the other fellow—a job in which, thanks to the President's program, no one feels he is the loser by plunging ahead. As I said at the outset, the President has shown us our battle stations, he has given us our marching orders. From here out, it is up to us.

LABOR AND THE WAR ⁸

PAUL V McNUTT ⁹

The Honorable Paul V McNutt, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, delivered this address at a patriotic rally of the members of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, on Tuesday night, April 7, 1942

Great issues before the American people at this time were (1) To win the war on the home front, would organized labor wholeheartedly carry on to realize the administration program of 1942 of 60,000 planes, 45,000 tanks, 20,000 anti-aircraft guns, 8 million tons of shipping, in addition to the naval shipbuilding program? (2) Should the forty-hour week be repealed to ensure greater production? (3) Should the right of strike be prohibited for the duration of the war? (4) Should a ceiling be placed on wages to prevent inflation? The speaker deals directly with these perplexities and, as one would expect from the nature of his audience, sympathetically with respect to the interests of labor

He argues at length and plausibly that the forty-hour law should be retained and that wages should not be rigidly fixed at the April, 1942, levels

The speech should be weighed in the light of McNutt's wisdom as indicated by industrial trends in the United States after the date of this speech. Have strikes persisted? Have plants developed maximum efficiency? Have adequate measures been taken to prevent inflation?

Another problem faced the speaker and his audience, not discussed in this speech except by indirection—the problem of the coordination of the A F of L and the C I O. It was hardly true that "labor is united". The battle between the two organizations continued with much fury. And within the C I O, President Philip Murray and Ex-President John Lewis were developing their feud that threatened further breakdown of labor's "unity"

Mr McNutt is a highly effective speaker. His speeches are uniformly well-prepared, filled with factual details, interspersed with short, pointed statements, such as "Despite its clear record since Pearl Harbor, labor is accused of work stoppage while the country is under

⁸ By permission of and through the courtesy of Paul V McNutt. Text furnished by the Federal Security Agency, Washington, D C

⁹ For biographical note see Appendix

attack The accusation is false" An oratorical pattern in the style is present as in all of McNutt's speeches—"It is your war . It is the war of the American people It is the people's war" Note also the typical McNutt method of using enumerative details—"men in uniforms of the United Nations, in Africa, in Europe, in Asia, on Bataan, in the tunnels of Corregidor "

McNutt talked up and down the land and over the radio with great speaking success on such topics as "Of Cabbages and Kings," (food and the war), "Where Do We Go From Here?", at a Nutrition Foundation meeting, New York City, March 12, 1942, "Physical Fitness in War-time," at the American Association for Health meeting, New Orleans, April 17, 1942, "Manpower for Victory," at St Paul, Minnesota, April 29, 1942

The workers of America are set to win this war.

Despite every effort made by the enemy to breed confusion and disunity among us, the working people of America know that this is their war, and that the Nazis and Japanese are their deadly enemies

This meeting tonight is magnificent testimony to the fact that American labor is united in the face of national danger It is proof of statesmanship of a high order It throws the challenge in the teeth of those who said it could not be done

It has been done

I congratulate you Your government is heartened and all men of good will are encouraged This meeting will be bad news for Hitler and the mad militarists of Japan

Four months ago our country declared war on Germany and Japan The American people have backed the war with sacrifice and resolution But now, we are asked by a few members of the Congress to carry on a war also against labor, against half the American people, against the half upon whose unremitting toil depends the flow of weapons and supplies, so desperately needed for victory These men are more interested in grinding the axe of their hostility to labor than in sharpening the weapons to defeat the Axis

Many who are not themselves hostile to labor are disturbed and confused by the specious arguments of the few who have been trying to create dissension in America

I think it is time we examined the facts

What is labor's record since Pearl Harbor?

Labor has at the outset, voluntarily laid aside the only weapon for economic self-defense that has ever proved effective—the right to strike

Justice Holmes once called the right to strike democracy's safety valve. Every Union man knows how precious this right has been in man's long struggle to achieve industrial democracy

By voluntarily waiving the right to strike, organized labor has assured the nation of uninterrupted production of war materials as far as labor is concerned. It has also given evidence that free men are capable of meeting the challenge of the dictators—that the people of a democracy, when the need is clear, can exercise self-discipline without coercive legislation

Organized labor in directing its unified strength to the war effort has placed the loyalty and patriotism of the American working man beyond all doubt. It has also provided the most inspiring exhibition of the unity of our citizens since the treacherous attack upon Pearl Harbor that fateful Sunday morning four months ago

Yet while the workers are loyally pulling their weight in the war effort we are faced today with a stream of libels against labor in the press and in Congress. These indictments are part of a campaign to arouse antagonism based on confusion and misunderstanding. It is the kind of attack against patriotic citizens that so often proved successful in weakening other countries to the advantage of the Axis powers

These accusations are systematically planted and repeated from one part of the country to the other in the hope that they will be accepted as truth through repetition

What is the truth about these accusations?

Despite its clear record since Pearl Harbor, labor is accused of work stoppage while the country is under attack. The accusation is false.

Since the pledge was given to the government not to strike, not one authorized strike has been called. Even unauthorized strikes have been so rare as to be negligible. In the last three months, the War Labor Board reports, only two one-hundredths of one per cent of the time in war production was lost through strikes. Ninety-nine and one-half per cent of all the workers in war production worked through this period without striking even for a day. In a country of sixty million working population that record for practical purposes can be called perfect. In fact, as an accomplishment of human nature it is amazing under any circumstances.

The men who are attacking labor have also set out to create popular misunderstanding about the 40-hour week.

Although the President of the United States has pointed out that the law does not prevent work in excess of 40 hours in a week, the fact has to be repeated again and again, so that everyone can understand the issues.

First, the law does not prohibit a longer work week, but calls for an increase in hourly wages after a man has worked forty hours.

Second, everyone should know that organized labor has never taken a position against a longer work week when it was necessary to get the fullest possible production.

The fact is, millions at the present time are working far more than 40 hours every week with the full approval of their unions.

Anti-labor propagandists try to give the impression, to those who are not familiar with industrial employment, that a worker on a 40-hour week stays on the job for 40 hours and then goes home, leaving the work to take care of itself.

The fact is that practically all the workers in the machine tool industry are actually working 56 hours a week, those in

ship-building are on the job 52 hours, the men building steam locomotives work 53 hours

Some men may be on a short week for lack of material, but in the bottlenecks where the strategic battles are in progress the men are in there toiling at the job

How long can men work without losing efficiency by fatigue and strain? The experience of the British has provided much information on the limits of efficient labor under wartime conditions. There is plenty of evidence that American workers today are not hesitating to drive themselves to the limit whenever industry is organized to make use of their effort.

No one who knows anything about industry believes that the forty-hour week really interferes with full utilization of plant. In a recent Federal Government survey, only two out of 650 employers expressed the view that the 40-hour week stood in the way of production.

The 40-hour week has no effect on production in industries where it is possible to find enough skilled workers for night and day operation. The aircraft, shipbuilding, and most of the ordnance plants are operating now on a four-shift schedule. On February 27, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that two-fifths of the war industries were operating 100 hours a week or more.

Everyone who is familiar with industry knows that the hours a plant can operate will depend on technical conditions. The schedule depends on the supply of material and the quantity of machinery and skilled labor available for each process.

The forty-hour week is a method of bookkeeping by which wages are customarily figured. To abandon the established system of determining wages would simply require the adoption of a different method of accounting, creating confusion in every war contract in the country. Some of those who are behind the attack on the 40-hour week probably hope that in the confusion they can deprive the workers of a part of their pay. But I am sure that the majority of business men realize the true

nature of the controversy and have no interest in upsetting their labor contracts.

The men who are attacking labor have also tried to use the fear of inflation as a weapon to beat down the wages upon which the workers and their families depend for a living

Let us not be misled

Inflation is not caused by maintaining a fair relationship between wages and the changing cost of living. The workers must struggle with rising prices and with the dislocation of families as they move into crowded areas where war material is being produced

We know what inflation is—a runaway rise of prices. We know, also, how inflation in wartime can be kept under control. Most of the countries involved in the war have successfully warded off this danger

The experience of all other countries has proved that the two main instruments for control are taxation and the regulation of the prices of material and products. Next to these is the sale of bonds to the public to mop up surplus purchasing power and keep the markets from being flooded with money. Next comes the control of profits. Last of all comes wages, because wages always lag behind a rising cost of living. Wage rates are not the cause, but the effect, of rising prices. When prices and profits have risen, it is essential that a part of the profits should be used for bringing wages into line. But that is not, as some people often believe, a fair excuse for a still further inflation of prices

There is no reason to regard a moderate rise of wage rates as adding to inflation as long as they do not run ahead of living costs

The great virtue of private enterprise is its ability to adjust these relationships without having to decide them all in Washington. For those who want the greatest possible efficiency with the least possible bureaucracy, a flexible policy for determin-

ing the relation between labor and capital is undoubtedly the best

We now have such a policy and the machinery to make it work. A War Labor Board for the settlement of industrial disputes has been established.

This Board is composed equally of representatives from management, from labor and the public.

Disputes are presented to the Board, in the traditional American way, each on its own merits, that justice may be done in the particular case according to the peculiar circumstances that may attend it.

In my opinion, the War Labor Board, as long as it remains unfettered by restrictive legislation and unwise limitations, is an ideal tribunal to meet the problems of American industry during the trying days that are before us. We must work together to protect that tribunal and increase its effectiveness and its authority as the final arbiter of our industrial disputes.

We are fortunate that the machinery for collective bargaining, which has long been firmly established in all the other democratic countries, was built into our American law before we came to this present crisis. The trade union, as the instrument for supporting the position of labor in bargaining with employers, is as democratic an institution as can be found in American life.

Unfortunately, there are a few people in America who would still like to destroy the power of labor unions to maintain their organization, as it has been destroyed so successfully under the rule of Mussolini and Hitler. I believe that, especially now when the right to strike has been patriotically laid aside, the system of union security should not be undermined or weakened. The workers of America need to be reassured that their patriotism will not be the occasion for the loss of their union organization.

Ahead of the people of this country are troubled days and nights. We know that our efforts in 1917 and 1918 were nowhere near as great as the task we have now undertaken. The

production goals—planes, tanks, guns, by the tens of thousands—mean only one thing The skill and energy of the laboring men and women of this country must be carefully maintained, and used with the least possible waste and friction

This is a war unique in the history of man

Whose war is it?

It is your war and my war

It is the war of the American people It is the war of every man—everywhere in the world—who would be free

It is the people's war

You cannot drive a wedge between the Army of the United States and the American working man

Whose army is this? Who are its men?

Your sons and your neighbor's sons Bill Jones who worked beside you at the lathe John Smith, whose skillful hands once ran the overhead crane is now a tank driver in the armies of MacArthur

Yes, your sons, your comrades, fight in Burma, Australia, Africa, and Europe They know—and you know—that they fight your battle

They know and you know that this war can be won or lost in the mines, the factories, the foundries, and the blast furnaces

We shall have synthetic rubber and substitutes for tin These are easy

But there is *no* substitute for free men and women

You are deciding the destiny of the world You are deciding the fate of free government

Men in uniform of the United Nations, in Africa, in Europe, in Asia, on Bataan, in the tunnels of Corregidor, in Australia, in Ceylon, and on the seven seas, you are battling against odds—fighting as only free people can fight

Men in overalls in Pittsburgh and Detroit, San Diego and Birmingham, in Youngstown and Buffalo, hurl forth your challenge to the dictators Show them how a free people can produce in the mines, at the blast furnaces, and on the assembly

lines Show them American products of war, not made under the label of the concentration camp and the Gestapo, but under the badge of liberty and freedom—the symbol of free labor

Fighting men on Bataan, fighting men on the road to Mandalay, fighting men in Africa, fighting men for the cause of freedom the world over—here is the pledge of the American working man

We pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor
And, we pledge our brains and our brawn to the mightiest task
that ever confronted a free people

THE MILITARY FRONT

CORREGIDOR ¹

FRANCIS B SAYRE ²

The Honorable Francis B Sayre, United States High Commissioner to the Philippines, gave this speech at a dinner of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in New York City, on April 23, 1942. The speaker's aim was obviously to honor the heroes of Corregidor and to drive home to his audience the horror of fighting without proper weapons. Using this Far Eastern tragedy as an example, Mr Sayre states his two appeals (1) greater home production, and (2) better preparation for the peace to come.

Readers of this speech will turn again to the history of Bataan's five months' defense, worthy of the best American traditions of courage, and of Corregidor, which fell to a final Japanese invasion some two weeks after Sayre spoke.

On the evening of May 5, 1942, Washington announced that the Japs had begun a "landing attack" on the fortress. The Rock, toward the end, suffered thirteen bombing raids a day. From Cavite, to the South, and from the Bataan heights, to the North, the Japs poured merciless artillery fire without cessation. For twenty-four hours after the assault began, the defenders grappled against overwhelming invaders. Finally, General Jonathan Mayhew Wainright, with those who remained alive of his 7,000 followers, capitulated. Wrote General Douglas MacArthur, in Australia, "Corregidor needs no comment from me. . . But through the bloody haze of its last reverberating shot, I shall always seem to see the vision of its grim, gaunt and ghostly men, still unafraid."

Before speaking of Corregidor, as you have asked me to do, I should like to pay a tribute to your own men, the correspondents who have covered the story of the war in the Philippines. They have done a magnificent job. They have written history as it exploded before their eyes. They have carried out

¹ By permission of Hon Francis B Sayre. Text furnished through the courtesy of the author.

² For biographical note see Appendix.

the supreme duty of the good reporter under the supreme test they got the story and they got it in the face of death

It is still difficult for me to realize that, under the President's direction, I am really back in America and not dreaming on my rough cot in the tunnel on Corregidor

War against Japan was a cloud on our horizon at Manila which for months we had been watching and planning for. In the summer of 1941 we had mined Manila Harbor, for a long time our army intelligence officers had been preparing lists of suspects to be arrested upon the outbreak of war, the movements of American merchant ships had been put under navy control. Finally, on December first we received a message from Washington warning us of the possibility of attack, as a result of which Admiral Hart, General MacArthur and I met in my office to confer and outline plans. Even then the reality of war seemed hard to believe.

At 4 00 A M on the morning of our December 8 (corresponding to December 7 on the other side of the International Date Line) I was awakened by the sound of bare feet running down the corridor. Claude Buss, my executive assistant, burst into my bedroom and breathlessly told me of the Japanese attack upon Pearl Harbor. Rousing my staff, we went at once to work. Commonwealth officials had to be notified, press releases given out, constabulary guards posted around the Residence compound, and our gates closed to all except those holding passes. I ordered the closing of the Japanese banks. In accordance with carefully worked out plans some of our staff I put to work filling and piling sandbags to protect our building, others were detailed to procure food and water storage cans in case of siege, still others were set to work gathering first-aid materials in our splinter-proof shelter in the basement. At the end of that memorable day I went down to General MacArthur's headquarters to confer with him over the situation. He told me of the gravity of our position—of the ships that had been lost that morning at Pearl Harbor and of the flying fortresses and planes

that had been lost that noon at Clark Field and Iba Field, north of Manila

The days that followed were crowded with activity. We worked against time, never knowing when Japanese bombs would wipe us out. We slept in our clothes, up and down those first few nights three or four times a night because of air-raid warnings. All of our staff who were not living with their families gathered at the Residence every evening before dark, we improvised a men's and a women's dormitory of mattresses spread out on the passageway around the court and protected by sandbags, and here we caught what sleep we could against the coming day. Nerves were taut and ears always strained against every noise, exaggerated rumors were rife, yet never have I seen a group of men and women working in more splendid self-control and fine cooperation. It helped one over rough places and was a constant inspiration to work with a staff like that.

Through those crowded days and nights amid a few hopeful and many disheartening reports, one fact became increasingly clear. Japanese troops had landed in large numbers on Lingayen Gulf to the north and also in large numbers to the South, both forces were advancing upon Manila with the evident intention of cracking us. With the Japanese in complete control of the air our own troops were proving unable to check the double advance.

Finally, on Christmas Eve, General MacArthur decided Manila could not be held. He called me on the telephone and said that I, together with President Quezon, must leave within four hours for Corregidor, there to set up a temporary seat of government. He agreed to join us on that island fortress the same evening.

That morning the Japanese commenced bombing the port area of Manila, and in between two bombing raids we made our getaway, President Quezon and I together with our families and staffs, putting off in two small launches from the Presi-

dential pier and boarding the "Mayon," an inter-island steamer waiting for us outside the breakwater

We went to sleep that Christmas Eve in cots jammed end to end along the side of the Corregidor tunnel, with all our possessions in suitcases under our cots. There we lived during the next two months, sharing with our American and Filipino troops a memorable life.

It is a privilege to be one of a company of men like that I have never seen their equal. We had our tunnel to run to when the bombs began to fall or the shells came our way. But the majority of them just had to stand by their guns and take it. They never flinched and they never complained. I've watched them going out to dangerous posts night after night, some of them whistling as if it were all in the day's work. I've seen them carried, torn and bleeding, into the hospital to the operating tables, gritting their teeth and still taking it. Their spirit is magnificent. They cannot be beaten.

A few get medals, the great majority, just as brave, go out in the dark and are never heard of again.

Now as I step into the dazzling sunlight of America with its gay, soft life—a life that I have loved and still love—I think of those boys over in the Philippines—Americans and Filipinos, living next to death. Corregidor and America are two different worlds and the contrast is almost shocking.

Yet I know I speak truly when I say that the American people are not indifferent or apathetic. They care and they care tremendously. But what can they do? I believe all America is asking that question. What can we who are not in uniform do?

First, we must realize that the war is being fought on two separate fronts,—the battle front on the other side of the world and the production front back home. Each is of equal importance. No matter how magnificent their spirit, men can't win without planes and guns and ships and war supplies. Because we lacked sufficient planes and fighting material in the war areas

our best fighters were powerless to stop the Japanese sweeping Southward from Lingayen Gulf to Manila. The hardest thing our men had to face was not savage hand-to-hand fighting with fanatical Japanese, not even planned mass attacks at critical points, but the helpless feeling of watching oncoming waves of Japanese bombers in the sky with no American planes to oppose them,—having to stand by one's guns and just take it, utterly unable to fight back.

One of the most tragic sights I have ever witnessed was the bombing of Cavite a few days after the outbreak of the war. Cavite was the old Spanish naval base which America had taken over in 1898 and had converted into a modern naval base with repair shops, ammunition stores, and oil supplies, a very vital link in our naval defense in the Far East. From the terrace of our Residence one noontime we watched the Japanese planes come sweeping over Manila above us and then on across the bay to Cavite. Shining in the sun, in perfect V formation, with slow deliberation they circled over Cavite and then dropped their bombs. Following the roar of explosions, great clouds of smoke and later leaping flame rose over the inferno. Cavite was wiped off the map. That afternoon small boatloads of mutilated human bodies came across the bay and landed their dreadful cargoes to be taken to Sternberg Hospital in Manila. All night flames lit up the sky above Cavite and even next day the fires still raged. Because of our lack of planes, Cavite was left a shambles and a gaping ruin.

Wars these days are won or lost by what happens on the production front quite as much as by what happens on the battle front. Fighting on the production front is probably the more difficult job of the two. It is less romantic and requires even more tenacity and ingenuity and brains and grit. Upon victory or defeat on the production front will ultimately hang the winning or losing of the war.

The wheels of war production are turning in America, but we must get them turning faster. Time is of the essence. A

plane today may be worth ten planes next year We must drive production more furiously

Surely, America will not fail her boys at the front We are engaged today in a grim struggle, far more difficult than any previous war in which we have taken part It will not be an easy victory The power of evil arrayed against us is stupendous Never before in our history have we had to fight on so many fronts at once and so far away from home It will demand sacrifices such as America has not yet even begun to make

America must awake to the grimness of the struggle We must learn to forget our differences,—to unite all our forces in the great common cause

I remember at Corregidor, as we hung over the radio at the tunnel entrance, hungry to hear encouraging news from home that would mean the sending of help—I remember more than once how heartsick we were over news of this plant or that falling down in its production We were not pro-capital or pro-labor, closed shop or open shop men We were but soldiers at the front trying to defend our countrymen, with our lives at stake and forfeit if our countrymen failed us

If we, back home, win on the production front, there is not the slightest question about ultimate victory We shall have discouragements We shall have reverses But final victory will be sure I know whereof I speak I have seen our boys fighting Given anything like equal chances they outfight the Japanese at every turn

In the second place, we must remember that we are fighting not merely to win a struggle, but to establish a world where our children can live in peace and security under law The real objective for which we are fighting is a world of freedom and democracy. We can have such a world only if we find the way to build a peace that will be lasting

That is as difficult a job as the winning of the war And it is also as necessary if we are to obtain the objectives for

which we are fighting. If we lose the peace our military victory will turn to dust and ashes.

To find the way will demand months of hard work and study and planning—before the making of the peace treaty. For instance, after we have won the war, are we going to allow individual nations at will again to build up gigantic armaments, and thus compel other nations against their desire to divert money vitally necessary for economic development and other peaceful needs into competitive armament building? Are we going to leave every small nation to the mercy of the gunmen and the freebooters? If not, how practically can the world be made safe for the peace loving? How practically are we going to make the earth's raw materials accessible to peoples who need them? How practically can we keep open and unchoked the avenues of international trade upon which the standards of living of every industrial people vitally and inescapably depend? How practically can we prevent unfair commercial practices and trade discriminations which lead the way directly to the final crash of war?

We cannot successfully build a peace that will be lasting until these and a host of similar knotty problems have been studied and thought through by competent experts and economists. But this is not enough. The solutions reached by experts will be valueless unless backed by a true understanding of the real issues by an informed public opinion.

You have probably a more vital part than any other group in the making and informing of that opinion. This will take time. The issues are complex and obscured by much emotional prejudice. If we wait until after the war is won it will be too late. That work must begin now. And yours in large part is that responsibility.

WILL AIR POWER WIN THIS WAR? ³

ALEXANDER P DE SEVERSKY ⁴

Major Alexander P de Seversky gave this talk as part of a debate on the topic, "Will Land, Air, or Sea Power Win This War?" at "America's Town Meeting of the Air," held in the Town Hall meeting, on Thursday evening, October 23, 1941. On the program were also Rear Admiral Harry E Yarnell, former Commander-in-Chief of the Asiatic fleet, now retired, and Mr Fletcher Pratt, military expert, and author of *America and Total War*. Fifteen hundred people made up the audience. The moderator of the program was George V Denny, Jr. ⁵

As America developed her military preparedness program in 1941, the question became more and more acute: how should our vast expenditures for war preparation be distributed between army, navy, and the air arms? What did the military record of the Axis in France, Greece, and Crete indicate concerning the importance of the airplane? The unsuccessful German attack upon the British Isles in 1940? What of Russia's power against the Axis in the air? Are navies, especially dreadnaughts, obsolete? Should aviation become the spearhead? Can air power win as decisively by itself? Was General William Mitchell right when he argued some thirteen years previously that "air power is the deciding factor in our defense of the Pacific"? In Congress, in committees, over the radio, through the press, the debate developed.

Major de Seversky was often in the thick of it—uncompromising advocate of air power.

In the light of developing military events in 1942 the student of this speech will weigh the validity of Seversky's point of view.

Major de Seversky was in general demand as a speaker during this period. ⁶

It will not come to you as a surprise, I am sure, to learn that I consider air power the decisive factor for the final outcome of this war. I believe that it is entirely right and neces-

³ Reprinted from *Town Meeting Bulletin*, v 7, no 2, October 27, 1941 by permission of American Education Press, Inc., Publishers, Columbus, Ohio.

⁴ For biographical note see Appendix.

⁵ For further comment on the Town Hall programs see *Representative American Speeches 1939-40*, p 233-5.

⁶ See, for example, *American Forum of the Air*, v 4, no 9, March 1, 1942. 'The Role of Air Power in Modern Warfare' Ransdell, Inc., Washington, D C.

sary that the subject be discussed at open forums and on the air. We shall not have true American air power—the kind of air power we need for national security and national survival—until we can arouse public opinion on the issue and break through the thick walls of military conservatism.

All the naval and military experts will admit readily enough that aviation is playing an important role in the present war. But most of them fail to visualize the nature of that role and to draw the obvious conclusions—*that no operations on land or on sea are possible until control is assumed of the air overhead*. That is the first and indispensable condition. A nation may have overwhelming superiority in naval forces and overwhelming superiority in land forces. But these advantages mean nothing if the skies above the battle area are held by an enemy possessing real air power. Great concentrations of infantry or naval strength, if the air above them is in enemy control, merely provide bigger targets for destruction from the skies.

Let us recall the dramatic events of the German invasion of Norway. The British concentrated a huge navy at the Skagerrak in the hope of interrupting the flow of men and machines across that water gap. Not only could they not stop the invasion, but the British naval forces were forced to withdraw to a safe distance. Why? Because the Royal Air Force did not have sufficient range to dispute the skies over the Skagerrak, and British aircraft carriers proved no match for land-based aircraft. Hitler held the skies, and hence the British were helpless.

By contrast we have the dramatic episode of the evacuation from Dunkirk. At that point the R.A.F. was able to function. It took local superiority in the skies and thus established a canopy of air power under which the evacuation was carried out.

In the swift knock-out of France, the great French armies had no chance to show their mettle. They were licked before they started—because the air above them had immediately been taken over by the enemy. Maginot fortifications became meaningless.

The Battle of Britain will go down in military history as the first example of an all-air war. In that crucial struggle the armies and the navies of both the belligerents were simply ignored and reduced to helpless spectators. If Britain had possessed a navy and land forces ten times as effective they could have contributed nothing to that battle. No surface operations were possible until the paramount question—who controls the skies over England?—had been answered. When Hitler failed to drive the R A F out of the English air, all his plans for invasion collapsed. And I want to tell you as emphatically as I can that so long as British air power holds those skies, there can and will be no invasion of the British Isles.

And the same thing holds true on the other side. As long as the shores of Europe are dominated by the German Luftwaffe, there can be no British invasion of the European continent with any hope of success. Those who clamor for an immediate invasion of Europe haven't caught up with the facts of modern war. They should ask themselves these questions. Why is it that bombers rather than battleships are pounding at the so-called "invasion ports" and submarine bases across the English Channel? Why cannot the British Navy, though it has a virtual monopoly of sea power as against Germany, even approach the coastlines held by the Germans? The answer, of course, is that the skies are in Hitler's hands, making everything below untenable for his adversaries. The first job of Britain is to wrest the air from the enemy's grip. And that holds true for America if and when we are at war. Any attempt to skip that step—mastery of the air—is to court catastrophe.

At the island of Crete the British had a powerful navy, whereas the Axis powers were practically devoid of naval strength. Yet Britain suffered a disastrous defeat. The Nazis held the skies and consequently were masters of the situation.

Such is the new reality. No amount of explaining or quibbling or wishful thinking can alter it. The advent of aviation has carried war-making into a third dimension, and that dimension must be conquered before any decision can be sought on

the surface of the earth. There are already in existence aircraft which will enable air power to bridge oceans as easily as it now bridges narrower bodies of water. Strategically speaking, the North American continent will then be as vulnerable to aerial attack as the British Isles, our last margin of immunity and physical "isolation" will have been wiped out.

Air power is decisive. As long as the Germans can dominate in the skies, they cannot be defeated. For us in America this holds a life-and-death moral which I have made it my business to shout from the housetops *that we must proceed immediately to organize and to build for air power supremacy*. We talk of freedom of the seas. But there can be neither freedom of the seas nor freedom on land until we achieve freedom of the skies. Naval aviation, no matter how splendid, cannot combat the enemies' land-based aviation. Only long-range air power with fighting efficiency built on the principle of unity of control in its own sphere can wage war in the air ocean which envelopes the entire globe, over land and over sea. For this purpose, we need an independent and unified American air force, in place of the divided air forces subservient to the army and the navy which we now have. For this purpose we need an over-all air strategy, which only a unified and separate air department can give us. For this purpose we need unlimited opportunity for the aeronautical genius of America to express itself—and that, too, can never be until the leadership of aviation development is entrusted to airmen, who know aviation, understand its tempo and its laws, and recognize it as the paramount element in modern warfare.

It is the civilian population who will be primarily burdened with the horrors of the war that we may have to fight. It will be your stamina and resistance to air destruction that will win that war. But that resistance cannot be maintained until and unless you are confident that we have a competent agency to strike back and destroy the very source of attack. It is time for us Americans to assert ourselves and demand this protection.

■

EDUCATION AND THE WAR

WISDOM BEFORE INFORMATION¹

ROBERT I GANNON²

This address was delivered at the final ceremony of the three-day celebration of Fordham University's Centenary, December 17, 1941. Fordham University is "the largest Jesuit university in the world." Near the conclusion of the three days, various honorary degrees, including Doctors of Laws, Science and Letters, were given to prominent visitors, among them Governor Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Archbishop Amleto Giovanni Cicognani, Apostolic delegate to the United States. Following this ceremony President Gannon of Fordham delivered this address in which he expounded with great vigor his philosophy of education.

The address constitutes a statesmanlike interpretation and defense of humanistic, liberal education in contrast to the growing utilitarian specialization. President Gannon and his University stand with Walter Lippmann in his notable address before the American Association for the Advancement of Science at Philadelphia, December 29, 1940, on "Education without Culture"³. On that occasion Mr. Lippmann stated that "deprived of their cultural tradition, the newly educated Western men no longer possess in the form and substance of their own minds and spirits, the ideas, the premises, the rationale, the logic, method, the values of the deposited wisdom which are the genius of the development of Western civilization, that the prevailing education is destined, if it continues, to destroy Western civilization and in fact is destroying it." Of the same educational school is President W. H. Cowley of Hamilton, who in a notable address at the annual convention of the Association of Life Insurance Presidents at the Waldorf-Astoria, in New York City, on December 12, 1941, discussed the "broad issues behind education and national defense." President Cowley gave a trenchant indictment of what he called "researchism, specialism, and impersonalism" as constituting the foundation stone of the present day university.

¹ By permission of the Very Reverend Robert I. Gannon, S. J. Text furnished through the courtesy of President Gannon.

² For biographical note see Appendix.

³ *Representative American Speeches, 1940-41*, p. 292-302.

President Cowley stated, "I have said enough, it seems to me, to give point and justification to Mr Lippmann's warning that Western civilization is being undermined by our present educational practice I believe that Mr Lippmann is right I also believe that we can and must overhaul our colleges and universities so that the dangers that now threaten us can be avoided" In a similar vein concludes Gannon "We want the enlightened bravery of Christian humanism Far from despairing, then, in the growing darkness, the universities of the world should be inspired by the glorious realization that they were never more needed than today because the Liberal Arts were never more necessary, Wisdom never more precious" In view of the educational impact of World War II and the sudden expansion of professional and technical training, Gannon's apology for a liberal education would seem to be almost futile and, to many patriots, almost inappropriate

Not the least of the virtues of the Fordham Centennial address is its stylistic excellence The maturity of the thinking is matched by the oral rhythm, the emotional and imaginative movement of the text itself The speaker refers to the "nostalgic hoarding of older glory," of "this wistful glancing backwards" as a heartening "sign" of the fact that "we can discern a kind of watershed somewhere in the middle of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries", "with every step we grow more conscious of increasing instability," "our graceless and unseasonable usefulness," "our dangerous and recurrent adolescence," of the fact that "maturer civilizations have a haunting suspicion that there were heroes before Agamemnon", "a kind of assembly line has been introduced into our universities", "we cannot banish the formless fear that this glory of ours is a touch of autumn coloring"

President Gannon has become known as one of the foremost speakers of this country on ecclesiastical and educational subjects With a rich background of learning, power of analysis, ability to play a subject up against a rich background of language, emotion, and imagination, with a superior voice, and knowledge of how to use it effectively, with a personality, with dignity combined with rare humor, President Gannon has the essential qualities of Cicero's Orator

We take for granted, after all these years, the growing spirit of fellowship and understanding amongst educators that has brought felicitations from so many and such great institutions of learning We take for granted too, the fact that you have come in your wedding garments "In vestitu deaurato circumdati varietate" and rejoice especially in this latter fact because it is

your splendor rather than your graciousness that opens up the following train of thought

Here in the United States, side by side with the youthful, bounding spirit of research, we are all aware of a certain nostalgic hoarding of older glories. Prior to the Civil War, this hoarding was rather of substantial things, of educational ideas and traditional curricula. All our American institutions of learning were still within striking distance of the trivium and the quadrivium, so that every college student in the city of New York knew silver from golden Latin and could recognize the Attic spirit in literature. He was even held responsible for the elements of logic and was never allowed, even in debate, to derive conclusions through an illicit process of the major. On the other hand, academic robes had not appeared as yet on this side of the Atlantic. Old Sir J. J. Thompson, the physicist and Master of Trinity, frequently enjoyed telling us that he had himself witnessed the American premiere of caps and gowns at the opening of the Johns Hopkins University, and used to add good natured but typical British comment at our expense.

With the rise, however, of a secular and scientific spirit, with the growing predominance of German influence on our leading institutions, extraordinary changes of opinion occurred with regard to the essential subject matter of an education. So that now if one of our first graduates, Bishop Rosecrans, for example, were to examine the mental content of a modern college student who had majored, let us say, in traffic problems or in hotel management, he might in his simplicity, mistake an arts man for an apprentice. But as though in compensation for the change of what our forebears would have called essentials, there has been a decided growth of interest in mediaeval pageantry. Bachelor's gowns are now being worn by Freshman, and in high school, grammar school. Specially tinted hoods have been devised for the most unexpected branches of learning. Long processions, led by a mace, wind their way across campuses where not a word of Latin is spoken, to amphitheatres where not a

word of Greek is understood. Schools of Methodology where credits are amassed by future creditors are being housed in arched and groined Gothic dreams that would have inspired a Jowett or a Newman. Cynics may derive what conclusion they will. To us simpler folk, this wistful glancing backward is a heartening sign. It means that more people than we realize are still aware that education, especially higher education, has a two-fold function, that its aim is not only to increase knowledge, but to preserve it, that it must, therefore, always be not only progressive but conservative, in the original meaning of the words *progredi* and *conservare*, that where in isolated cases, familiar to us all, it is merely forging ahead and has lost all contact with the precious past, it must risk a liberal damnation and become (some courage is required to use the awful word) reactionary. It must, that is, double back on its tracks until it can pick up the golden thread once more.

As if to echo this two-fold function of increase and preservation, someone endowed this University many years ago with our only endowment, an excellent motto for the official seal. "Sapientia et Doctrina," wisdom and information. The "Veritas" on Harvard's seal is simpler and embraces just as much. The "Yahveh" of Yale is simpler still and all-embracing. But "Sapientia et Doctrina" carries with it a suggestion of analysis and emphasis that makes it a specific thing, a definite educational ideal. For it stresses Wisdom before Information and helps to answer the ageless question. "How much information is it wise for one generation to have?"

Now everyone knows, in a general way, what is meant by Wisdom, even though he may not be able to give the Scholastic definition straight from the treatise on the speculative intellectual virtues. He may never have thought of it as a "knowledge of conclusions through first causes," involving as that does, the First Cause of first causes, but he does know that there are thoughtful people here and there who have lived long and unselfishly, who have been through danger and suffering, who have

had their little moments of triumph, their hours of disillusionment, their days and nights of silence and spiritual growth. He knows of harassed men who can pause in their incredibly busy lives to say, with the simplicity of children, "I believe that character, not wealth or power or position, is of supreme worth. I believe that love is the greatest thing in the world." He knows that such people have a quality that enables them to realize values, to weigh motives and to understand how God works through His creatures. Although this quality in greater or less degree may sometimes glow in the mind of a self-taught man, or even in the mind of a man who cannot read or write, he knows that there are shortcuts in its acquisition. There is much that a wise and loving father can give to an admiring son. There is much that one generation can hand down to another through that great, deep, wide channel of tradition, the Liberal Arts, especially through the wisdom studies: theology, philosophy, history and literature. For these are the studies that bring us closest to the ideal of knowing conclusions through first causes, of understanding how God works through His creatures.

As with individual man, so with groups of men, whole generations of men. Some we find who lay more store on *Sapientia*, some who find *Doctrina* more important. In the past millennium, for instance, we can discern a kind of watershed somewhere in the middle of the 15th and 16th centuries. On one side the stream of inspiration seems to be flowing from the past. On the other, strangely enough, from the unseen future. The latter of course, appeals to us as obviously preferable, because we are of the 19th and 20th centuries. We have been brought up in an evolutionary atmosphere that leads us to expect, contrary to human experience, always better and better things. We are still hypnotized by the charm of the very latest, the most advanced, convinced as we are that to march forward is always to improve our condition, even though we march from a fertile field into a tractless waste, even though we march straight over a cliff. This modern tendency has of course produced great

changes in the lives of men. We are fond of boasting that there has been more progress in the fifty years just passed than in the previous five hundred. But progress toward what? We have undoubtedly been rocketing toward some part of space with terrific and accelerated speed, but when we get there, are we sure that we shall find it worth the journey? We are progressing undeniably, but with every step we grow more conscious of increasing instability.

Even those very ends for which we have sacrificed so much health, culture and comfort, are being blown from the face of the earth. It is true that killing people off is a more complicated business than it used to be, but are we not cleverly solving all the complications?

When we come, at length, to examine the cause of our unprofitable speed, it seems to lie partly at least in our graceless and unseasonable youthfulness. It may be embarrassing to admit that 2400 years after the age of Pericles we are suffering from a dangerous and recurrent adolescence, but the sad truth is that when the intellectuals of the last few centuries successfully cut off our past, they cut off, to a great extent, our only source of maturity, wisdom, and condemned us to play the role of brash and ignorant children who despise the yesterdays of which they know so little.

For seeking inspiration from the past is not peculiar to a primitive people, nor does it normally mean that a generation lacks confidence in itself because of small achievement. Rather, it indicates a degree of disillusionment which belongs to years of discretion. Like older men, maturer civilizations have a haunting suspicion that there were heroes before Agamemnon. Rome was in her prime, already showing her wrinkles in fact, when the poet wrote of her the line once at the top of every schoolboy's copybook: "*Veribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque*" And Troy was all but finished when the warning came from Apollo: "*Antiquas expuritate matres*" Greek philosophers and scientists built upon the wisdom of the East. The Romans built upon

the Greeks In the high noon of the Middle Ages, Sentences and Summas organized, enriched and modernized Plato and Aristotle and the early Fathers of the Church And even in the proud, self-conscious Renaissance, when *Doctrina* began to surge ahead exuberantly, Wisdom studies and veneration for tradition were long in dying

In fact they are not quite dead even now, though information at the expense of Wisdom has become the earmark of our modern schooling We realize with concern that too many of our principals and supervisors and university faculties have been false to their high trust They have become infected with a dangerous—because exaggerated—experimentalism that seeks, like communism, its real parent, to begin a new world, not by building on, but by obliterating the old Worse still, the people as a whole, educators, parents and students, have yielded little by little to the insidious kind of pragmatism which applies the yardstick of immediate utility to every subject in the curriculum As a result, the Wisdom subjects are giving way all along the line to the merely informational Theology went overboard many years ago Philosophy flourishes in outline form as a species of cultural history Metaphysics has become a Roman Catholic aberration Literature, while still conspicuous in the catalogs, has become in practice more and more the science, or the bones of literature Of all the Wisdom subjects which linger today, waging a losing fight with practicality, History alone seems to hold its ancient place But even here, it is not the more important philosophy of history that is regarded with such favor but the enormous mass of information which constitutes its material cause

Largely as a by-product of this worship of utility, we are faced by the problem of over-specialization The same processes which have met with such success in modern American industry have now been applied of late with strange results to the intellectual world A kind of assembly line has been introduced into our universities, where each of our busy educators, like a

factory hand, knows only one operation. One cuts, one fits, one pads, one makes the buttonholes. A dean, a registrar, a department head, a struggling instructor. A strange life that, making intellectual buttonholes for the clothing of the mind! Of course in education as in industry, the result of our efficiency is a very much cheaper suit. But the method has distinct advantages. It certainly increases the sum total of information in the world and simplifies considerably the staffing of an intellectual factory. It is so much easier to find a thousand brand new, shiny minds that know all about some particular fragment of knowledge than to find one great, mellow mind, broad and deep, the kind of mind that was once regarded as the normal goal of a liberal education, the kind of mind still sought by Christian humanism as it strives, in the felicitous phrase of the distinguished Editor of *Thought*, "to develop the intellect, the conscience and the taste in the light of both reason and revelation, with the force of both passion and grace." There is consequently every sign that *Doctrina* is on the increase. Soon we shall have the universe completely tabulated, and no one will know what it means.

In the midst of our Celebration today, therefore, surrounded by distinguished representatives of all that is best in modern thought, we cannot banish the formless fear that this glory of ours is a touch of autumn coloring, reminding us that another winter is at hand. Some pessimistic observers look rather for another ice age that will end our particular cycle of civilization. Would that we could blame some individual tyrant for its approach. Would that we could say "There is only one enemy to destroy, one 'Rattlesnake' to scotch. If Democracy but attacks him now, with so many super-tanks and flying fortresses, vigor will return to our Christian principles. Our churches will be holy and our homes will be chaste again. There will be respect for marriage vows and love for children. Prosperity, hand in hand with social justice, will enter on the scene and educational institutions will return to educational pursuits." But no one so deludes himself except for political purposes. We all

know that the present crop of dictators in the world is a symptom, not a cause. We all know that poor old Europe was already sick unto death long before she decided to end it all with an overdose of modernity. Sometimes we read in Sunday supplements that we are sinking back again into the Middle Ages. Shades of Canterbury and of Chartres! For years past we have been sinking forward into a thoroughly modern chaos, a scholarly and documented chaos, worthy of our most liberal and progressive thinkers. For years past our universities of Europe and America have been hacking away at the twin foundation of their own house. Like men gone mad with pride they have recklessly attacked Christianity and Hellenism as though they could by some legerdemain preserve Western civilization and still destroy the two great traditions on which it rests. For years past wise men have been warning them that if they did not desist from their crazy undermining operations they would bring the roof down on all our heads. Now they have done it. Let us then put the blame exactly where it belongs. This annihilating war of ideas which is closing our hectic chapter of history comes to us straight from the lecture halls of Europe and America. It would have come sooner or later in any event. Our brilliant professors who are long on *Doctrina* and short on *Sapientia* would surely have found some method of destroying us, even though the rulers of the modern world had happily died in their baptismal innocence. As it is, our educators prepared the way for intellectual slavery by giving us, in place of education—bewilderment. In place of Wisdom, and at the expense of the sources of Wisdom, they spread before their students more undigested information than the human race has ever had before, much more than the human race knows how to use at the present time. They produced a glut of facts to which we are not at this time entitled, for no age is entitled, to more facts than it has wisdom to assimilate.

Now that the harm is done, however, no one would have us declare a moratorium on information. But as universities

our role must be the gradual restoration of Wisdom to the world. We must push forward in every line of modern research with continued and breathless devotion, but like the athletes in the old Athenian torch race of Pan, let us not run so fast that we put out the light. For the new world that will be born of all this pain must be "a brave new world," but not brave with the bravery of a dehumanized machine. We want no heroes of the Soviet type to shape our futures for us, reckless heroes who are ready to throw away their lives in defense of indefensible principles which they never understood in the first place. We want the enlightened bravery of Christian Humanism. Our children's children, in this brave new world which we may never see, must realize that they are men, angels, as well as animals, men with powers of imagination, reason, will and capacities for unselfishness that verge on the sublime, men whose fathers often reached the heights before them and left inspiring records for them to read, in Philosophy, in History and in Literature; men who are above all, God's own children, to whom theology should be an alphabet. Far from despairing then, in the growing darkness, the universities of the world should be inspired by the glorious realization that they were never more needed than today because the Liberal Arts were never more necessary, Wisdom never more precious.

PRESERVING THE ROOTS OF LIBERTY ⁴

W H PRENTIS, JR ⁵

Mr W H Prentis, Jr, President of the Armstrong Cork Company of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, delivered this speech before the Joint Dinner of the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of Junior Colleges, at Baltimore, Maryland, January 2, 1942

The address was widely and favorably discussed ⁶

Mr Prentis indicts the liberal college, not because, as President Barr assumes, professionalism has dominated, but simply because the faculty has not given enough instruction concerning "the American system," or "the roots of American liberty" The speaker analyzes at length the historical traditions and gives specific suggestions for procedure in such instruction Finally, he indicates how business should do its part in such education

President Prentis is a thorough scholar, a real thinker and, in addition, is a skilled speaker

The honor and privilege of addressing you tonight convinces me that, despite the sweeping changes we are witnessing in the world these days, the law of compensation is still effective Forty years ago, when I was in college, I had to listen to many a speech by college deans and presidents but little did I dream that I should ever have such a chance as this to get even with them en masse¹

I am happy to be here for two reasons First, because I am glad, as a citizen who is keenly interested in education, to make whatever contribution I can—modest though it will be—to the deliberations of this distinguished organization of yours, and second, because I am, like many of you probably, a beneficiary of the American public school system from kindergarten through college, and my father—a public school man himself—used to

⁴ By permission of the author Text furnished through the courtesy of Mr Prentis and reprinted from the pamphlet, "Preserving the Roots of Liberty," published by the National Association of Manufacturers

⁵ For biographical note see Appendix

⁶ It was reprinted in *Vital Speeches of the Day*, 8 258-62 February 15, 1942

tell me that everyone who was educated at public expense owed a peculiar debt to his country I have no illusion about ever being able to pay off that indebtedness However, the tragic events in Europe in the last twenty years and the grave crisis that we now face in America move me with the earnest desire to do what little I can to promote a wider popular understanding of the foundations of our freedom So I come to you to talk about some of the things I was not taught in college, some of the things that I am convinced every citizen must learn and come to believe in very quickly and very sincerely if we are to preserve the blessings of American liberty to oncoming generations

Our country has spoken in unmistakable terms in these recent fateful weeks The die is cast We go forth once again to make the world safe for its self-governing peoples Regardless of consequences, we have decided as a nation to offer "our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor" on the altar of the liberty of mankind Our first duty is to give full support to our government and its military forces at this hour of crisis Granted that, our ability to win through to a decisive victory cannot be questioned In that connection, it is imperative that we should rekindle the ancient altar fires of freedom in all our people because men fight valiantly only for ideals which they understand and in which they believe Physical armaments are never adequate in themselves alone Intellectual and spiritual ramparts are equally essential You will hear from me tonight, therefore, not about airplanes and tanks and battleships and the multifarious problems of mass production involved in modern war but, instead, regarding the cultivation and preservation of the eternal principles on which our freedom rests

A DEFINITE POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY NEEDED

In this connection a terrible indictment can be justly drawn against American business and professional men, including many

teachers and preachers We have been so smug and complacent We have assumed so carelessly that our liberties were sacrosanct We have so flagrantly neglected the duties of citizenship in a republic We have so completely forgotten that the maintenance of representative democracy requires an exceptionally high degree of intelligent understanding and active cooperation on the part of all its citizens We have been so busy with our personal affairs—so absorbed in material things—that we have tried to live without a political philosophy, and that cannot be done successfully in this country or anywhere else in the world If the average American businessman knew as little about his product, if the average American teacher knew as little about his chosen subject, as he does about his governmental and economic system, the businessman would soon be in bankruptcy and the teacher would not long remain at his professional post of duty We all recognize, of course, that to wage modern war successfully requires the temporary relinquishment of many of our cherished freedoms The devil must be fought with fire Hence it is doubly important that at a time like this every citizen should be on guard and alert lest, when the present emergency is over, we find ourselves with only the empty shell of the Republic we are now giving our lives and treasure to defend History shows that liberty has been lost far more frequently by the complacency, indifference and ignorance of the citizenry themselves than by executive fiat or military conquest Daniel Webster said "God grants liberty only to those who love it and will always guard and defend it"

Unfortunately freedom and physical luxury seem to be congenitally incompatible They have never remained long in political wedlock, but are soon divorced in the court of dictatorship The love of liberty, we must ever remember, was not born in an automobile, lullabied with radio, nourished with quick-frozen foods, raised in central-heated houses, clothed in synthetic fabrics, entertained by movies or educated in palatial structures of granite and marble! It was born in a dungeon—

in the fetters of tyranny The time-worn historical cycle has been From fetters to faith, from faith to freedom, from freedom to folly; from folly to fear, then from fear back to fetters once more We in 20th century America are now about midway in the process Let it not be written of us that having eyes, we saw not, and having ears, we heard not, the plainly written warnings of the past!

I do not blame our schools and colleges for failure to inculcate the philosophic and religious principles on which our government was established in the minds of the present and, shall I say, the past two generations of American citizens After all, the degree of leadership that education can provide in a republic is determined by the current temper of the people We Americans have been so engrossed for the past one hundred years in our physical affairs that we have simply not been interested in government Hence it is no wonder that the study of religion, political philosophy and classical history has gone largely into the discard With all our emphasis on materialism, education has been compelled to follow the crowd and teach concrete facts designed to help us make a living rather than emphasize the abstract principles that underlie and in the long run determine the whole course of human existence But if our Republic is permanently to survive, I am convinced that our schools and colleges must now impregnate the minds of our citizens not only with knowledge of our political institutions, their history and how they work, but also with faith and pride in what these institutions stand for, whence they came and with how much travail of body and spirit they were created.

DOES THE AVERAGE COLLEGE GRADUATE UNDERSTAND THE AMERICAN SYSTEM?

Montesquieu said "A government is like everything else To preserve it, we must love it" How, I ask you, can any human institution be created in the first place and then continue

to exist if no one takes the trouble to acquire faith in it and then is willing to fight for its principles? How can any college or university represented here tonight expect to prosper if its students and its alumni, its faculty and its trustees are not constant crusaders in its behalf? How can any business institution, any church, let alone popular self-government, hope to remain in existence unless its adherents are active and articulate in its support? Yet how many college and university graduates of your acquaintance could in public debate tonight with Earl Browder, Norman Thomas or some well-meaning New Liberal, make even a sketchy defense of the faith of our fathers? The truth of the matter is that the average American has never taken the time to study and understand the principles on which our Republic was founded. Meanwhile, the collectivists have been crying their theories from every housetop. As a result a host of our people have become easy prey for the social theorist who takes them up on a high mountain and shows them the kingdoms of easy living and the will-o'-the-wisp economic abundance that they allegedly can have if they will only follow his fatuous leadership. Too many of us take an attitude toward public questions akin to the newly married husband "who came, who saw, who concurred!" Now, as always, an intelligent, believing and vocal citizenry is the Vitamin A of representative democracy. Obviously, the only way in which that type of citizenry can be developed and the roots of American liberty preserved is through carefully organized and well-directed effort on the part of our schools, colleges and churches, aided and abetted by the motion picture, radio and press.

The free institutions that we enjoy are the products of a culture which, as one historian has put it, "is essentially the culture of Greece, inherited from the Greeks by the Romans, transfused by the fathers of the church with the religious teachings of Christianity and progressively enlarged by countless numbers of artists, writers, scientists and philosophers from the beginning of the Middle Ages up to the first third of the 19th century."

How many of our college and university graduates have any adequate, over-all conception of that culture and of the religious and philosophic concepts from which our freedom stems? Speaking from my own experience, I know that although I was graduated with the degree of Bachelor of Arts from a state university, I was never taught anything specific about the foundations of our freedom nor was it ever made clear to me that our various liberties stand or fall together. What little I have learned of these subjects has been the product of reading and study over the last decade. The mental stimulation, the spiritual uplift and the patriotic pride in my country and its institutions which this study has yielded me, is worth all the effort that it has cost. I know, moreover, from personal experience in addressing scores of audiences, how keenly the average, intelligent American today hungers and thirsts for knowledge of the fundamental concepts on which American freedom depends, from which alone he can derive that burning faith in the ideals of the American Republic which inspired our forefathers. The time is ripe, the field is ready for harvest. The fruits of dictatorship lie stark and hideous before our very eyes—no longer hidden in dusty history books on our library shelves. Will not the colleges and universities of America rise to the opportunity that now presents itself for patriotic service? Will they not effectively meet the challenge of preserving the roots of American liberty to oncoming generations?

THE ROOTS OF AMERICAN LIBERTY

As you know better than I, the roots of American liberty are sunk deep in philosophic and religious soil. They go down to those far-off days in ancient Greece when men sought to discover the requirements for living a good life in a republic of free men, and to those brief years of Christ's ministry in Judea, proclaiming the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. At the very base of the taproot we find Socrates and

Aristotle Then the life-giving sap of their basic thinking vitalizes successively the minds of Cicero and Lucian, St Augustine, William of Ockham, John Wyclif, Erasmus, Calvin, Montaigne, Thomas Hobbes, John Milton, John Locke, Adam Smith, most of the founders of our government here in the United States and, more recently, Emerson and William James These philosophers have always held in broad terms that there is a vital relation between freedom and reason, that an act is voluntary if the person concerned is not coerced by anybody and is old enough to understand the meaning of what he is doing Freedom, in other words, is intelligent behavior Thus emphasis is placed on understanding and on the development of reason and intelligence And society has been organized on the basis of a meeting of minds and of mutual respect

Three great historic currents of thought combined to foster and develop this concept among the English-speaking peoples First, the Nominalist philosophy of the 14th century, second, the British Reformation two hundred years before Luther, and third, the revival of classical learning in England in the 16th century

Neither the time nor the occasion permits an extended discussion of these three momentous movements and it would be presumptuous for me to attempt to do so anyway before this audience Suffice it to say that the English monk, William of Ockham, the founder of the Nominalistic school of philosophy, postulated the fundamental tenet of English and American liberalism—individualism—about the year 1325 when he taught at Oxford Applying that concept to government, the English-speaking peoples have said ever since that the reality of the individual and his concrete experience in a real world must be respected Here is where British thought stands out in stark contrast to the romanticism of German philosophy

John Wyclif placed translations of the New Testament in the hands of the common people all over England, set up "conventicles" where the populace got together for prayer and

worship, and taught that the sacraments of the church meant nothing unless the individual who accepts them knows what he is doing and what they signify. As a result, our forefathers came to the shores of the American continent impregnated with the principles of personal moral responsibility, the right of private judgment and the right of free assembly which, together, filled them with a fervent passion and unshakable belief in the inward spirituality of the individual. They based their political philosophy and their economic system on the concept that there is something about the human spirit that is sacred, that there is a place in the human soul that no government and no man may justly enter, where reside those inalienable rights that the Declaration of Independence later thundered so eloquently to the world.

THE TRIPOD OF FREEDOM

With this religious principle as the foundation, our forefathers erected the tripartite structure—the tripod—on which our individual freedom rests today. First they maintained that if man did possess a sacred personality, he had the right to choose who should rule over him. On that thesis they reared the first supporting power of our edifice of liberty—representative constitutional democracy. Again they argued that since man possessed a sacred personality, he had the right to think, speak, assemble and worship as he saw fit. On that concept they erected the second tower of the structure of American liberty—civil and religious freedom. And finally they reasoned that any man endowed with a sacred personality had the right to possess for himself such portion of the God-given resources of the earth as he could win by honest toil and effort. Thus they asserted every individual's right to private property and economic activity of his own choice, and on that basic tenet they built the third supporting tower of their temple of liberty—free private enterprise. These three towers stand or fall together. Destroy any one of them, and the whole structure of freedom soon collapses.

This whole process was not accomplished haphazardly. It was not the result of chance or circumstance. On the contrary, it was the fruit of generations of thought and sweat and tears and blood. That tripod of freedom is our most precious heritage in America today. How rarely blessed we are as a people may be realized from the fact that of the approximately forty billion human beings who have lived on this earth since the birth of Christ, less than three per cent have ever enjoyed freedom that even approaches the liberty that we enjoy in the United States at this very hour. And all of it goes back to that spiritual principle of the sacredness of the individual soul which is common to all three of your great religious faiths—Judaism, Catholicism and Protestantism—a principle for which the church has fought through the centuries.

FREE ENTERPRISE—A REQUISITE OF AMERICAN FREEDOM

Of course, by freedom of enterprise I do not mean license to trample upon the rights of others any more than freedom of speech means that a man can be legally permitted to stand up in a crowded theater and yell, "Fire" when there is no fire. But free private enterprise with reasonable governmental regulation to insure fair play is an irreplaceable part of our American system of liberty. Without it, none of our other freedoms will long exist. The only alternative is economic planning by government which, as we all know, is far older than free enterprise. In fact, it was the revolt against the older planned economies which gave birth in 1776 and 1789 to both political and economic freedom in America. Despite all the wishful thinking of our doctrinaire planners, the indubitable fact remains that, just as oil and water will not form a chemical mixture because God made them that way, so national economic planning backed by compulsion, and political, intellectual and spiritual freedom are basically repellent and cannot co-exist. For, to carry out any economic program takes time and those in charge would

necessarily have to keep themselves in control during the lengthy period required to bring their plans to fruition. To accomplish that objective those in power—in other words the government—obviously would have to influence or control what was printed in the newspapers, said on the radio, taught in the schools and preached in the churches—at least so far as any doctrine advocated was at variance with the set program of the state. Then, I ask you, what would become of the sacred guarantees embodied in the Bill of Rights? And when they were undermined, what would happen to political freedom—representative democracy? The three legs of the tripod of freedom stand or fall together. Like the Three Musketeers, "It is all for one and one for all!"

If there is one lesson that the history of man's struggle for liberty seems to prove, it is this. The individual who desires the intangible yet very real blessings of political, intellectual and religious liberty must assume a very large portion of the responsibility for his own economic well-being. If he is unwilling to do so and places that burden on the shoulders of government, he will soon find that he has reared a Frankenstein monster whose appetite for control is literally insatiable and which sooner or later will devour all his freedoms in the process of expanding its power. Parenthetically may I add that the private institution of higher learning that seeks the solution of its financial difficulties by securing government support will soon discover that "he who pays the piper calls the tune." As a trustee of two such colleges and one public institution, I am a firm believer in our dual system of higher education, and I earnestly hope that none of us who share that faith will weaken the sources of our intellectual and spiritual strength by selling the birthright of academic freedom of our private colleges for the red pottage of public subsidies.

THE CLASSIC ORIGINS OF LIBERTY

The third factor which I mentioned some moments ago as being responsible for the development of English liberalism

was the revival of classical learning in England in the 16th century To round out this point, we must now turn back to ancient Greece and Rome The Greeks appear to have developed a love of liberty very similar to that which has characterized the English-speaking peoples In the 5th century B C they drove the Persians back across the Aegean Sea and for the first time felt free of the threat of foreign domination and able to develop their own peculiar civilization Almost the first question they asked was "How can we live a good life?"—meaning by that phrase how they could be most happy and free to attain a full measure of intellectual and spiritual maturity This question led to another "What is good?" And since these people could not fall back on tradition or custom or tribal religion for an answer, they were obliged to try to think the question through on their own initiative and make answer on the basis of personal judgment, pioneer thinking and good taste The fruit of their attack on fundamental questions, such as these, lies at the source of the liberal culture of western Europe and America

In Plato's famous parable of the cave in the Seventh book of *The Republic*, he drove home the point that the mental processes of a free mind and those of the herd are as far apart as the poles Such thinking consists not merely in what men believe, but how and why The free man deals with his life in wholly different fashion than does the man whose mind has not been free Such a man has, as Aristotle points out, mastered his passions, tempered his judgment, will either doubt or believe on the basis of evidence only, will neither seek nor shun danger, and in all his relationships exhibit temperance and poise Such is the man, according to the ancient Greek philosophers, who has found freedom through the exercise of wisdom Wherever this concept of the free man has held sway, human life has found dignity and freedom, force has been reduced to a minimum, mutual respect and common counsel have been substituted for coercion; and democratic self-government has developed Aristotle warns us, however, that democracy

tends to evolve into revolution and tyranny. The demagogue eventually appears who excites the passions of the crowd and then lures the people with promises that an abundance of material things will be theirs, if only the existing order be overthrown. How this process Aristotle so accurately describes, is repeating itself in this present day!

Marcus Cicero, who may be regarded as the last great liberal of antiquity, was a great disciple of Aristotle. As consul of the Republic of Rome he crushed the Catiline rebellion. Not long ago I read some of the harangues made to the populace by the leaders of this rebellion, as reported by Sallust. They sounded most familiar. In fact, in their denunciation of capitalists and their demand for the redistribution of wealth, they might have been delivered in Union Square yesterday. Huey Long with his "Every Man a King" or Stuart Chase with his "Economy of Abundance" could scarcely have done a better job.

Although Cicero was voted the title of "Father of His Country," he was unable to save the republic from the proletarian party, directed by one of the shrewdest politicians that has ever appeared in human history, Julius Caesar. Cicero was liquidated in a purge fomented by Mark Anthony and, after that, no man's life or property was safe. Dictatorship succeeded dictatorship, destroying not only the constitution of the republic but eventually all sense of political responsibility among its citizens. More and more planned economy followed, which led to more and more economic confusion. The currency was inflated, there was great unemployment in all the principal cities; no less than twenty per cent of the population were on the public payroll, taxes were so high that the farmers were compelled to turn their lands over to the government. Collective farming was attempted but the government could not get people to work because the proletariat no longer had the desire or habit of labor. The people lost political interest. Few cared to hold office. They would not even fight to save themselves. Finally

the border was opened and the barbarians were brought in to raise crops and man the defenses

It was not until fifteen hundred years after Cicero, that a group of Italians in Florence were able to set up a new republic. There, in an academy on the hillside of Fiesole, men began again to think and discuss questions as did the free men of ancient Greece and Rome. Interest in Cicero was renewed, they read and re-read his inspiring words about liberty. From this center came a new group of scholars—men like Erasmus of Rotterdam—who brought this old but ever new source of intellectual inspiration to the peoples of northern Europe and thus laid the foundations for the Revival of Learning in the modern world. Erasmus, who came to Oxford University to teach, Thomas More and John Milton carried the philosophy of Socrates and Cicero to Great Britain. Cicero became the great exemplar of patrician virtue in the minds of the free thinking liberals of the 17th and 18th centuries in England and America. Roger Williams of Rhode Island and Thomas Hooker of Connecticut were the two men most responsible for bringing the Ciceronian tradition of classical liberalism to America.

It is a significant fact that practically all the prominent New England patriots were educated in the Boston Latin School in Boston, that the Virginia group, Washington, Randolph, Wythe, Henry, Marshall, Jefferson and Madison, all came directly or indirectly under the influence of Dr. Small of Edinburgh University, who taught logic and literature at William and Mary College in Williamsburg for a decade or two preceding the Revolution. In these schools our forefathers became acquainted with Socrates and Aristotle and the great English political philosophers of the 17th and 18th centuries. Nowhere is Ciceronian influence more evident than in *The Federalist Papers* of Hamilton, Madison and Jay. Jefferson states frankly that the Declaration of Independence contains no new ideas but rests on "the elementary books of public right, as Aristotle, Cicero, Locke, Sidney, etc." Our founding fathers had a

political philosophy They believed in it and knew how to defend it As an eminent American educator has said "The retention of this philosophy of freedom is the issue on which the survival of our republic will be determined"

HOW THE AMERICAN COLLEGE CAN PRESERVE THE ROOTS OF LIBERTY

Yet as Walter Lippmann pointed out in a cogent address not long ago. "A graduate of our modern schools knows only by accident and by hearsay whatever wisdom mankind has come to, in regard to the nature of men and their destiny" Thus the crux of the appeal that I bring tonight to you—the directing heads of our institutions of higher learning—is this Dare we leave the preservation of the roots of liberty any longer to accident and hearsay? Is it not high time to plan purposefully and effectively to the end that no man or woman shall be graduated from any institution of higher learning until and unless he or she has acquired an over-all working knowledge of the philosophic and religious principles that underlie the American Republic? To carry out such a plan little or no expense would be involved No new endowments would be required For there is not an institution in this Association that does not presently offer in its departments of history, government, economics, sociology, philosophy and religion, courses of study that embody all or virtually all of the root principles on which our American system rests Exploration by a patriotic curriculum committee might reveal a few missing lines here and there, certain points that should be emphasized and coordinated with the related facts in other courses To make room for such a comprehensive program might necessitate some sacrifice on the student's part of certain subjects of less importance at this critical period in our nation's history By and large, however, the preservation and cultivation of the roots of American liberty, so far as our colleges and universities are concerned,

would involve nothing more than the willingness to sink departmental and professional jealousies in a wholehearted, concerted effort to lay out a well-rounded program of required courses that would provide every student with an adequate knowledge of and faith in the eternal concepts on which history shows men may associate themselves to enjoy permanently the blessings of freedom. The mechanics of government change and will continue to change, but the principles on which popular self-government can continue to exist are immutable and unalterable—at least until the millennium doth appear.

THE THREAT TO ACADEMIC FREEDOM

In becoming protagonists of the principles on which the American Republic rests, our institutions of higher learning would not only perform a patriotic duty but protect their own interest as well. This is true not only in respect to privately endowed colleges, but also those that are supported by public funds. The fate of the great universities of Germany, for example, is a sad object lesson for us all. When political or economic freedom disappears, academic freedom goes too. The physical threat to the continued existence of our privately endowed institutions, as the yield on investments grows steadily less, and taxes take more and more from individual incomes, is too obvious to require comment. The intellectual threat—if I may use that phrase—to our publicly supported institutions as the State assumes more and more economic and political power, is equally ominous.

WANTED—POPULAR BOOKS ON THE ROOTS OF LIBERTY

May I call your attention to the surprising fact that there is no single book available today that deals adequately and enthusiastically with the roots of American liberty from a historical,

philosophical and religious viewpoint. Scores of volumes setting forth the alleged virtues of collectivism can be had in any book store. But it is a striking commentary on the complacency of the academic mind in respect to the blessings of freedom provided by the American system that no comprehensive discussion of these principles for popular consumption is presently to be found within the covers of any single volume I have been able to discover. Would that the present crisis might stir as many vigorous patriotic pens into action as have been wielded by the collectivist brethren of the academic world in decrying the achievements of the American Republic and advancing their own starry-eyed theories of government and economic organization!

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF BUSINESSMEN

If the roots of liberty are to be preserved in America, we businessmen alumni of the institutions you head, also have a definite responsibility to discharge. *Operibus noscitur*. We businessmen must be shining examples of civic virtue, using that phrase in its classic sense. We must eliminate unethical practices in our own enterprises so that business can always come into the court of public opinion with clean hands, we must be keenly conscious of the social significance of our day by day decisions, we must be good stewards of the responsibilities with which individual freedom has entrusted us, we must steadily seek ways and means of regularizing employment and cushioning the effect of advancing technology on the lives and fortunes of our workers, we must raise the standard of living by passing along the benefits of improved technique and quantity production through lower prices and higher wages, we must constantly endeavor to create better conditions of employment by the elimination of health and accident hazards, we must take an active part in public affairs, we must seek to be economic statesmen rather than mere businessmen.

We live today in the shadow of war. We live to see helpless civilian populations blotted out as death rains from the sky. We live to see the sanctity of treaties and contracts violated at the caprice of willful men. We live to see the culture and art of nations degraded by the sort of tyranny and cruelty that characterized the Dark Ages. We live to see old symbols of honesty, sincerity and character mutilated under the heel of brutal military power. In the midst of such chaos, when moral and intellectual ideals are obscured and stained with crass selfishness and overweening ambition, when bewildered peoples eagerly grasp at the tenuous straws of alleged economic security offered by strongly centralized governments, when those who sit in the seats of power are themselves confused and distraught, when, as Emerson said, "Things sit in the saddle and ride men," America must turn again to the root principles of her liberty for national salvation.

FRONTIERS FOR YOUTH ⁷

GEORGE D STODDARD ⁸

Professor George D Stoddard, who took office on July 1, 1942, as New York State Commissioner of Education, gave this Commencement address at St Lawrence University, on June 8, 1942. Some 120 undergraduate degrees were given. Dr Stoddard received the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws. Mrs Pearl Buck, Secretary of Commerce, Jesse Jones, John A Ross, Jr, president of Clarkson College of Technology, and Malcolm MacDonald, high commissioner of the United Kingdom to the Dominion of Canada, were also honored with degrees.

The speaker hastened to identify himself with his graduation audience and to raise with them and partly to answer their immediate questions concerning the war situation. College students, after Pearl Harbor and in early June when this speaker was before them, were still asking themselves whether they should immediately enlist in the army or other military forces, or whether they should wait for the draft, or, in the case of those young men who for one reason or other might be exempt, whether they should go on for graduate work, or whether they should enlist at once in industry. Furthermore, these young men were asking how they should best prepare for their role in the post-war world. Just what were the educated youth fighting for? ("For such a price as we are paying, and are about to pay, anything less than a thorough regeneration of the nations that have attacked us would make the game not worth the candle") If the youth of the land are to help the generation regenerate the nations ("who occupy the frontiers on every side"), how are we to proceed? The speaker stated specific issues including the problem, how are we to change young Nazis into genuinely cooperative citizens? The speaker became concrete as he answered some of the questions ("a thorough knowledge of language is an open-door to the understanding of people's minds and hearts, it reveals what they know, and do and fear and trust")

A student investigator of this address will take account of the educational philosophy of the speaker and contrast his approach to educational problems with that of President Gannon, of Fordham. Both educators no doubt subscribe to the philosophy of "wisdom above knowl-

⁷ Reprinted by permission of the speaker. Text furnished through the courtesy of Dr Stoddard.

⁸ For biographical note see Appendix.

edge," but the new Commissioner of the State of New York was obviously more concerned with "social change" and with some practical formula for orienting youth and the post-war world

The structure of the speech, its oral pattern throughout, its unexpected turns of language, through which the speaker combines colloquial directness with academic reserve, its significant insight into the problems of post-war racial and cultural adjustment, suggest interesting lines of investigation for the study of the speech

Dr Stoddard was an intercollegiate debater at Pennsylvania State College and a member of Delta Sigma Rho, honorary collegiate debating fraternity As a progressive thinker, and as a speaker, he has been outstanding among the younger educational authorities in the United States Whether he follows a prepared manuscript in delivery or extemporizes, he articulates closely with his listeners, analyzes his subject clearly, illustrates it graphically, and sometimes illuminates it with unexpected bits of restrained humor

I

A few years ago young men complained bitterly and with justice that America had not really considered them important By the millions they idled their time, out of school and out of work—for the hard-pressed family a drain on finances, for the community an ever-present, unquiet conscience Now, on the surface, much has changed The young must be important, since they are so badly needed Boys who are still treated as children by fond parents are carrying out tough and deadly assignments

The question is, are we experiencing a true change of heart? The answer, I believe, must lie not in an avalanche of words but in the quality of our plans and blueprinted programs Let us examine a few weather-signs, seeking a way in which old and young can work side-by-side in the days ahead

It is no longer news that the world has grown small, but it would be news if a single state or country were to take full account of this phenomenon In America the process began with the expansion of railroads, the Middle West became an overnight trip from the eastern seaboard The evolution was

hastened and brought down to every village and farm by the automobile. In the meantime telegraph and telephone brought everybody within reach of friends and associates, they made over-the-fence neighbors of us all. The radio came in as a godsend to the stay-at-home, parents found a way to let young people have their cake and eat it—the night club moved full blast into Victorian drawing rooms, and with it outlandish noises and speech patterns. It is true that after a while, many persons grew tired of advertising and resistant to silky suggestion, they took to the road again. But the great mechanical master of space and time is the airplane. Just as the automobile made obsolete thousands of counties and tens of thousands of one-room schools, so the airplane makes some states appear too small to afford a good landing field. In future, they will be served by large numbers of little pick-up planes that will gather customers like so many milk bottles.

The new frontier that eager Americans have sought is made possible by these marvelous machines of communication and travel. There is an unexplored, undeveloped, unenfranchised world, closer to us than the northwest territories were to the thirteen colonies. It is not a world to be conquered by military strategy or super-salesmanship, it is not to be conquered at all. The only hope for people who lack so much, whether in South America, Africa or Asia, is that they will accept a realistic combination of economics, science, and democracy. We can help them directly and through education toward the fullest development of natural and mechanical resources, relying upon invention, organization, production, and exchange. All this is possible only to the extent that a scientific technology replaces human drudgery. We must foster democracy for the simple reason that without it no military victory will endure. The fundamentals in democratic government—the freedom of speech, of assembly, of worship, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, the supreme worth and dignity of the individual human being—these can be reconciled with many,

but not all, the cultural and religious practices in a dozen disturbed countries. In the few, dramatic cases of complete contradiction to democracy, as in the tenets of nazism, fascism or primitive religion, this war will decide the issue. It would be a miserable and futile victory if the conflict came to a full stop with nothing determined except that the United Nations had mobilized superior resources. It would be more, but not enough, to know that we had been willing to pour out these riches in defense of our land. The time is approaching when citizens of all nations, knit together, even if involuntarily, by the forces of modern science, must adjust thoughts, habits, and standards of living to the world as a whole. We can no longer cherish our private, personal, highly Americanized concept of peace and progress independently of other nations. Paradoxically we can become rugged individualists only in the service of a common good.

When this war is over we shall see more clearly than now the *economic* value of personal services of every description. It should not take many post-war years to replenish the stock of houses, cars, and domestic goods, for there will be a tremendous release of machine power and trained manpower. We should soon get enough food, clothing, and equipment, together with a surplus for export. This leaves as a major outlet for man-hours the development of the personal and educational arts. No single gadget or machine can take the place of a hundred teachers. As we extend education, and its allied ventures, upward, downward, and outward we shall find work for willing minds—a magnificent opportunity whereby youth can serve and be served. Compared to wartime budgets, the cost will be low—in the long run, it will be completely offset, provided the raw materials of childhood are truly fashioned into strong, intelligent, and productive adults. With men, as with materials, the tragic economic waste creeps in with underdevelopment and low quality—with a stubborn refusal to view wealth as an exchange of goods and services.

It is helpful to accept a few axioms and postulates. For us, a decent living implies certain standards in nutrition, health, housing, education, recreation, and social protection, it includes the right to earn a share of wealth that can be exchanged for these privileges. It leaves to the individual a large measure of choice as to priorities and commitments, in normal times a child may choose to give up all his sugar in order to add to a stamp collection. There is no evidence that we can attain the higher reaches of democracy or Christianity if we run counter to these demands for personal security. On the other hand, these necessary conditions of a free state are far from sufficient. The men who fight wars may have all they want to eat, their hunger may be for the attention and the love of their fellow men. They respond to the expectations of relatives, friends, fellow workers, and fellow citizens, a good part of the time, they play "follow-the-leader."

For hundreds of millions of Asiatics the love of family and of friends has been associated with common devotions and sacrifices. General problems in economics and agriculture have been too difficult for the untrained masses they have starved in the midst of a potential plenty. But the war will open the eyes of all the East, the Chinese soldier, according to Mr. Owen Lattimore, one of Chiang Kai-Shek's advisers, is fully aware of its fundamental purpose. China, under fierce heat, is melting down into a tremendous, unified, forward-looking nation—one of the truly great powers. Similarly, the ferment in India is not likely to subside, but to spread and intensify. The dense populations in the Pacific islands are rich in resources and manpower, given inspired leadership they may yet solve the problem of combining industrialization with artistic and cultural traditions.

Since all these peoples, taken together, outnumber Americans and Europeans, let us hope that they will be kind to minorities! We have much to learn from each other, and the lessons have scarcely begun. The East cannot, for example,

produce children and establish populations in disregard of the wealth available to sustain families at acceptable levels of living, it cannot develop spirituality as a pathological substitute for the good things of life on earth. That is, it cannot, if the supreme aim is to unite Eastern and Western civilizations in a common cultural flow that will enrich mankind. On the other hand, we cannot afford to remain ignorant or contemptuous of Oriental values, or deny the evidence of art, literature, and humanity with which the East is saturated. Between the all-American go-getter and the contemplative mystic, there must be some ground that the rest of us can occupy.

II

This war, like all other wars, leans heavily upon the endurance and ingenuity of individual men. No machine can quite replace the extraordinary fighting power of the hardened veteran. This has been demonstrated in China, Russia, and the Philippines, the management of guns, tanks, trucks, planes, and ships under combat conditions is itself a complex business that demands the last ounce of reserve power. Any physical, mental, or emotional weakness—any tendency to “crack up” under pressure—will weigh against the local success and, in the long run, against a victorious campaign.

There is another kind of individual preparedness that we are learning about, and we are learning fast, for it is consistent with American tradition. In common speech, if you want to survive *you have got to be good*. How can our aviators grow (grow fast, or not at all) into all-star performers?

Fortunately, we turn out the best athletes in the world, they attain standards in amateur and professional performance that arouse universal admiration. In baseball, football, track, basketball, boxing, swimming, golf and tennis we expect to win, most of the time, over the combined efforts of the rest of the world. We never play a game or enter a contest in a desultory fashion,

the effete concept of "who cares who wins" has always been repugnant to American youth. We have demonstrated—and this is a peculiar contribution of American sports—that one can combine the intense will to win, backed by incredible skills, with a deep-seated regard for the rules of the game. It is this aptitude we need now for warship, tank, and plane. Anybody who has ever seen a high school boy or a college student "go out for" athletics has confidence in the outcome. These boys will learn fast and go far. They will develop to the highest pitch that esprit de corps that wins battles. They will go in and fight as a team, they will not stop until the whistle blows.

Some college students of today will be in this firing line, they are already pointed toward it, and there is no turning back. For others, for most of the women, and I truly hope for most of the men, there is a less glamorous but equally important choice. Upon this choice depends the supreme mobilization of our technical and industrial power. It calls for the finest minds with a maximum of training, devoting long hours in busy laboratories and offices to the great tasks of invention, production, and distribution. It is horrible to contemplate, but it cannot be dodged. If there are surer, deadlier means of waging warfare, ways that will give us the upper hand, our scientists and technicians must discover them first and apply them to the enemy. To do less than this is to sacrifice our own men and to risk disaster. We must have an attack based on science and a counterattack for everything that enemy laboratories can bring against us. We cannot afford to stop research, we cannot lean back on any Maginot line of things already produced or knowledge already gained.

To leave for war or to stay at home may be equally patriotic and equally warlike. The graduate student, piling up his knowledge of physics, chemistry, or metallurgy, is already in the war, although, like the doctor, dentist, or machinist, he cannot afford to shoulder a gun. England has scoured the enlisted ranks to bring back for special training the small

percentage of men who are good enough to reach high levels of technical and professional service. But the college student is human. Friends, relatives, and associates may unconsciously apply pressure toward dramatic, immediate, in-the-army service. If the decision is sound, the student who stays on, like the worker who sticks to his lathe, needs social approval. The army and navy have been slow to sense this psychological situation, but they are making up for lost time. Henceforth many students may remain in college and be, at the same time, in the armed forces. Perhaps in the near future uniforms, wages, and the morale that comes from a unified command will eliminate the last remnants of discrimination between those who serve on the college campus and those with "destination unknown."

In some countries the idea of safe refuge has been abandoned, certain English and German towns are hotter than the fighting front. While this could happen here, it need not, in order to validate the principle that wherever we are, that is the place to serve, whatever we are called upon to do, that is the measure of our courage. The concept of moral fiber, dear to older generations, but viewed with suspicion nowadays, has always involved a psychological paradox: the hardest victory comes from within, it characterizes the doctor, the nurse, the patient, the parent, the student, the worker, or the soldier quietly arranging his thoughts before the battle. At such times glamour and the drumbeat are in a world apart.

This is more than a war for survival, if we mean only the protection of our land and our lives; it is a war of social institutions and social ideas—a head-on clash between incompatibles. We can win or we can knuckle under. This war will not end with the laying down of arms, nor with soft words from beaten dictators seeking what they regard as a well-earned breathing spell. *The war, in its ultimate purposes, is a never-ending war.* It will persist in a new phase when the enemy is stopped on the field of battle. It will go on, whether we like it or not,

either as a stealthy preparation for another gigantic conflict or as a re-interpretation of history

The true and lasting victory will be achieved in the realm of economics and culture patterns. It is the kind of victory that calls for cultural preparedness—for a plan of re-education wherein hateful ideas will be abandoned by several hundred million persons. It calls for the guidance, chiefly under American auspices, of the youth of Germany, Italy, and Japan, at first with the consent and finally with the active support of their elders. This will be the greatest educational task in history and it should be so regarded, for it will follow the most disastrous period of malice, misery, and blood-letting that the world has ever known. For such a price as we are paying, and are about to pay, anything less than a thorough regeneration of the nations that have attacked us would make the game not worth the candle. It is moreover the only means offered for extending economic and social aid to our present enemies. We shall not be willing to feed the tiger unless he consents to a reasonable amount of domestication.

III

I should like to propose a few questions, which we may soon be called upon to answer

- (1) How do we go about changing an ardent, eighteen-year-old, super-saturated Nazi into a citizen acceptable within a framework of science, sanity, and democracy?
- (2) Are present methods of educational psychology, guidance, and mental hygiene suitable for this task?
- (3) Assuming that military and naval forces remain in occupation, how many American workers, teachers, and technologists will be needed to carry on this task? What should be their special qualities, skills, and experiences?
- (4) Can we utilize the common needs of conquered people, as in nutrition, health, and work opportunity as a

legitimate motivation for ideological reform? Under such conditions can we restore to these people, in the permanent absence of military force for other than policework, self-respect as individuals and social belongingness as communities and nations?

In short, if, paraphrasing lend-lease, we accept the idea that we shall undertake to guide, educate, and reform any nation whose social reconstruction is deemed essential to America's welfare, what resources in materials, methods, and trained manpower are available for this tremendous assignment? This question concerns every college and every college graduate. We cannot enjoy the riches of American life unless people over the world think, on the whole, as we do, building upon these like thoughts a world community given over to free commerce and to the arts of peace. A sick Paris is a sick New York, a miserable India is an unsafe America.

After the Civil War, the classic advice of Horace Greeley was, "Go West, young man!" That is good advice today. Go west, until you strike the Far East, for it is close at hand; go south, until you approach Antarctica, go east until you reach the crowded and baffled people of Europe or the great hump of the African continent. Right now, no place is beyond the bailiwick of the American soldier—his wit, slang, and general efficiency, his ice cream and chewing gum, his special way with the girls—all these are known in the far corners of the world. The trained, clean-cut, hard-hitting, well-educated, good-natured American is our finest export—the best example we have of the meaning of democracy. He will win battles and he will win people to his side—if we give him a chance.

To the college-trained young man or young woman the present crisis truly opens up a frontier. It means learning, here and now, what is good about our civilization, and what is headed for discard. It means understanding ourselves, with a new pride in what America can accomplish when it really digs its

toes in It means cleaning up many a mess at home new thought for the poor, the sick, the nonwhite, and the unemployed It means less of overt charity and sanctimony and more of downright friendliness and companionship

Now is the time to take up world progress where the explorers, fortune-hunters, and imperialists left off There are worlds to conquer in a geographic sense Airways are different from seaways; there are technical problems to solve if the world is to become a single, vast network of serial transport But the important question is When we get physically to where we are going, what are we supposed to do? Boast about ourselves? Sell something? Settle down on the alien fringe of countries as a constant reminder of the white man's privilege? All this has been tried before it leaves the involuntary host apathetic or hostile, it enfeebles the parasite

To change all this, in theory and practice, is to call for curriculum reforms I note that American universities are offering intensive courses in certain foreign languages that have been neglected in Arabic, Burmese, Chinese, Dutch, Finnish, Modern Greek, Hindustani, Hungarian, Icelandic, Japanese, Korean, Kurdish, Malay, Mongolian, Pashtu, Persian, Portuguese, Russian, Siamese, and Turkish This fall two of our most distinguished institutions, Brown University and Columbia University, will offer courses in elementary Pidgin English! The magazine *Asa* reports that "The one American known to have a good command [of Siamese] found several agencies of the government competing for his services, he was consequently unavailable for teaching even if teaching the language had been his principle interest—as it was not"⁹

These languages, and others more familiar to American students, are essential in the program of international education that I have been sketching A thorough knowledge of language is an open door to the understanding of people's minds and

⁹ Graves, Mortimer. "Oriental Languages and the War Effort" *Asa* June, 1942 42 376

hearts, it reveals what they know and do and fear and trust. It offers a bridge from our way of life to theirs—a bridge that can support two-way traffic. Mathematical forms, chemical symbols, machine designs—all these are a scientific Esperanto, they encourage free intellectual movement across national and social barriers. They are really the same in any language, we are discovering that they can be mastered by young persons just up from the primitive. True cultural exchange, including these technical forms, but reaching up into psychology, society, art, and religion, is a longer, less sure process (as indeed it has been at home), it demands always for its promulgation a certain amount of leisure, a repository of knowledge, and a cluster of devoted scholars to teach the young.

At certain levels which can be entered at once by the initiate, science shades toward the more general, thus becoming philosophy, and it accepts uncommon or unique facts, thus partaking of art and personality. In countries cool toward modern science there have been developed nevertheless artistic, social, and religious forms in which general laws are recognized. Their leaders can easily take up science and technology, they can meet us halfway. What Eastern culture will bring to the West and how much it will gain in return, I shall leave to authorities in this fascinating field. It is enough to know that we cannot survive unless Russia and China win, that we are lost unless Japan is first subdued and then literally re-formed. From such close, dead-earnest contact we should learn fast.

In this generation it is our peculiar destiny to spread out over the world, bringing to the homefires not captives but new ideas and new friends. Let us make the most of it. Let us give others something we have found good and nourishing after five generations of experience. Let us accept from others, with grace and sincerity, what appears to be good in promoting the general welfare. Perhaps we shall find all people acceptable in our sight, perhaps, if we are lucky, we shall ourselves be accepted as equals.

HOW CAN OUR SCHOOLS MEET THE WAR EMERGENCY?¹⁰

STRINGFELLOW BARR¹¹

Dr Stringfellow Barr, President of St John's College, Annapolis, Maryland, gave this talk as part of the program of America's Town Meeting of the Air, broadcast from the Horace Rockham Memorial Auditorium, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, on January 29, 1942. The discussion was carried over the stations of the Blue Network. Others on the program were Dr William F Russell, Dean of Teacher's College, Columbia University, Dr James D Edmonson, Dean of the School of Education, University of Michigan, and Dr Frank Cody, Superintendent of Schools of the City of Detroit.

Preceding President Barr, Dean Russell, of the Teacher's College, advocated the teaching of "patriotism red hot. I advocate teaching us to love our country and to give Uncle Sam an educational pat on the back and a loving hug." President Barr's speech is interesting as a compact statement of the argument from his point of view. The talk illustrates the newer trend toward such specific presentation of an idea. The style, too, is concentrated—simple, almost abrupt both in the selection of words and in sentence structure. Little supporting evidence is offered for the ideas. But the speaker's style is animated and persuasive.

The talk distinguishes clearly between liberal and special training and defines adequately the aim of the liberal arts college. The uniqueness of President Barr's utterance lies in his proposition that the "liberal arts college should admit all young men and women, who, with proper preparation, are willing to submit to its discipline." In other words, President Barr apparently proposes that we admit everybody. Furthermore, he proposes that we should not stop them "so long as they are learning and want to go on learning."

The issue is thus raised as to whether all students should be admitted to colleges, whether the financial expenses of such a program would justify it, or whether the author, himself, does not beg the question when he agrees that only those should be admitted who have "proper preparation." "Proper preparation," according to the definition

¹⁰ By permission of the author and of the American Educational Press, Inc., Publishers. Text taken from *Bulletin of America's Town Meeting of the Air*, v 7, no 15, February 2, 1942.

¹¹ For biographical note see Appendix.

of Woodrow Wilson and other expositors of the liberal arts college, would mean a thoroughness of training that would probably eliminate at least three-quarters of those who otherwise would enter the liberal arts gates

The social and political emphasis, as reflected in this address, the proposal to educate all the citizenry in this liberal fashion, is extremely modern. The point of view of St. John's President suggests that that institution, which, according to popular understanding, is a place where students concentrate upon the reading of the great books of the world, is after all not a home of reactionism but rather of a highly modern movement in education.

In war, as in peace, this republic asks of its schools and colleges two types of instruction: liberal education and special training. All its citizens need liberal education because all its citizens are human beings. For education in the liberal arts, in the arts of thinking, deliberating, reasoning, speaking, and listening is necessary to free men if they propose to preserve their freedom and to use it responsibly. The men who founded our republic knew this. We have forgotten it. May the scourge of war remind us of our heritage.

In addition to being citizens, the men and women of this republic have special occupations which demand special training. Much of this special training they can best obtain by apprenticeship in office and factory from those who already possess it.

Not every citizen's occupation requires advance training in a vocational school. It may require only experience and the power to think well about that experience. But every citizen requires a liberal education in order that he may think well—not merely that he may think well about the occupation which he, but not all men, follows, but that he may think well about the common problems which confront all citizens of a free society, whether in war or in peace. No slave should receive a liberal education, whether he be a serf, a chattel slave, a wage slave, or the subject of a totalitarian state. Slaves should be given vocational training, for slaves are not men in the full

sense, but tools of other men. In a slave society, only the masters should be liberally educated. The Greeks knew this. The Middle Ages knew this. The founding fathers knew this. We have forgotten it. May the war remind us of our heritage.

We have forgotten. We have laid the responsibility of citizenship on almost every adult's shoulders. But we still prattle about this or that boy or girl "not being college material." It took an English Tory to tell us, decades ago, that we "must educate our masters." Are we Americans masters and slaves, lords and serfs, party members and noncitizens? We prattle about our liberal arts colleges "educating for leadership." And who, pray, shall choose these leaders wisely? Who shall follow them wisely? Those who were "not college material"? Those who were not given a liberal education on the supposition that since, forsooth, they had no minds to educate, we merely trained their hands for a vocation? Idle snobbery. For a self-governing society, dangerous snobbery.

May the crisis that faces free men throughout our world today force us to remember and to reassert our goal. Education in the liberal arts is the right and the necessity of every citizen in a free society. In war, as in peace, we cannot afford a stupid citizenry.

The liberal arts colleges should admit all young men and women who with proper preparation are willing to submit to its discipline. It should stop admitting, or pretending to admit, only the most brilliant. It should stop prescribing for the others an education limited to vocational training. Nor should we drop from college those who commit no graver crime than falling below an arbitrary standard of performance. Not so long as they are learning, and want to go on learning. The purpose of the liberal arts college is not to classify the intellectual powers of young citizens, but to improve those powers as far as native capacity will permit.

I am only too aware that our colleges of liberal arts, with their specialized subject matters and their confused and con-

flicting purposes, are no longer as well fitted as they once were to meet the common needs of all students. Let the war remind them to find again the subject matter and disciplines appropriate to that task. If they stop trying to guarantee commercial success to their alumni—commercial success in Wake Island or in the Bataan Peninsula, if they stop trying to provide useful social contacts, ivy-clad culture, and four years of happy training in irresponsibility, insolent thinking, and shrewdness in dodging difficulties, if they stop offering their scores of "useful" courses that turn out not so useful after all, if they stop trying to supply these interesting services to the community, they will have plenty of time and energy left to educate in the liberal arts. They will be able again to free the mind through discipline as their athletic coaches now free the body through discipline.

The crisis which, after far too much delay, we were finally forced by Pearl Harbor to recognize, has already taught us many things and will doubtless teach us many more. It has produced a temporary need for various types of vocational and specialized training. But the crisis has taught us another thing that is not temporary.

By betraying the ideals upon which our republic was founded, and by not pushing them still further, we Americans bade fair to lose them forever. By our disuse of them, as by our misuse of them, we all but forfeited our heritage. We, the descendants of keen-eyed revolutionists who dared insist on the rights of the common man and on the necessity to free those powers of human reason common to all men, had begun timidly to doubt that such a goal should ever be achieved, had begun to conceive of the average man as a clever animal, merely to be trained to his task, so that, like other domestic animals, he might produce more and thereby win the right to better fodder, a better stall. This higher standard of living was fast becoming our vaunted "American way of life."

But it is not the American way. And if the danger that threatens our existence should frighten us into giving up our

fathers' dream of liberal education, should fluster us into substituting for it an expanded program of vocational training, then we shall have lost the war, no matter whose the military triumph. The failure of liberal education in America condemned us last year to a public debate on the war that was worthy of the Children's Hour. We were a nation paralyzed by its own false reasoning, by its own political irresponsibility, its own lack of civic virtue. From that paralysis our enemies have saved us. We live again.

■

RELIGION AND THE WAR

GOD'S MYSTERIOUS EDUCATOR ¹

HENRY SLOANE COFFIN ²

President Henry Sloane Coffin, D.D., of Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y. gave this sermon in the Union Chapel, on February 1, 1942. It exemplifies the highest standards in sermon composition. The preacher, unlike some of his liberal colleagues, prefers to use a text and to make its theme the referent for his sermon. The thesis of the utility of adversity (in this case the world's most catastrophic war) the preacher presents with fresh insight. He illustrates his proposition not only from Shakespeare, the Bible, and history but abundantly from the economic, social, and political movements accompanying the present war (for example, the new concern for the rights of the Negro).

The sermon is original not only in its appropriation and unexpected interpretation of a text and its strong reinforcement through vivid and concrete illustrations, but in its logical pattern. The speaker traces the causes of the American spirit that brought us to our present woes, he analyzes both causes and effects with such penetration as to set the sermon apart as a philosophic address.

For years Dr. Coffin has been in demand as preacher before college audiences, at religious conferences, before community clubs. In popular estimate he embodies the spirit of his liberal seminary, which aims to interpret its thinking and message to the changing American civilization and yet to abandon nothing of its essential mission of providing highly trained, genuinely religious leaders.

As in the case of all good sermons the rational mood here is strongly reinforced by the preacher's emotional-imaginative view of his material and of his audience.

Furthermore, the sermon arrangement or structure is well marked. The problem is unfolded, at first inductively, and then deductively. The analysis is succeeded by a constructive solution, no doubt clear and satisfying to his listeners.

¹ By permission of and through the courtesy of President Coffin. Text furnished by the speaker.

² For biographical note see Appendix.

The speaker, occasion, audience, and sermon are blended in mood to produce a strongly persuasive pulpit address

The speaker's language, too, is refreshingly free from the usual theological or orthodox vocabulary Dr Coffin has long had a reputation for both originality of thought and of style This sermon is no exception

Dr Coffin's delivery is energetic and sincere His tones have no trace of the "sermonic" or artificially "didactic" Sincerity and enthusiasm are reflected in his vocal inflections, his facial expressions, his gestures At times he reads somewhat closely from his manuscript, at others he talks with complete extempore skill and with a minimum of notes As former pastor of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church he preached from manuscript and with more profundity to his more "upper class" morning congregation, for his less wealthy and more humble evening listeners, he spoke simply and extemporaneously He wisely and effectively adapted his technique to his auditors

1 Timothy 1 19,20 "Holding faith and a good conscience, which some having put away concerning faith have made shipwreck, of whom is Hymenaeus and Alexander, whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme "

What a strange and horrible educator for a Christian apostle to select—"whom I delivered unto Satan that they might learn " Who would anticipate any beneficial results from the devil's schooling? We should suppose that his graduates would be adept in iniquity—proficient blasphemers Can anyone imagine conscientious parents employing the devil as tutor for their hopeful Hymenaeus and Alexander? What Board of Trustees would elect him to a post on a faculty? What student would choose from a university curriculum courses in a department over which he presided?

To be sure Hymenaeus and Alexander were not hopeful pupils They were incorrigibles, who had made shipwreck of faith and conscience, so that desperate measures were justified with them But who would pick Satan as a likely instructor even for the toughest group in a reformatory? Yet St Paul delivers these obdurate scholars to Satan "that they may learn not to blaspheme "

The presence of evil in God's world has always been a baffling mystery to the thoughtful. Whether you conceive evil personally or impersonally, whether you regard Satan as a personality or a personification, here is this sinister factor, more subtle, more potent and far worse than any man or woman—a factor which assails and seduces, which gets into and possesses, individuals and nations, and impels them to courses more malicious, more cruel and more destructive than they intend. And this force not only exists in God's world, so that He cannot be cleared of responsibility for it, but according to His revelation in the Bible, it is employed by Him. In the ancient story of Eden the serpent is one of God's creatures. In the prologue to the Book of Job the Almighty Himself gives the patriarch of Uz to Satan's terrible schooling. In the Gospel the Spirit of God leads Jesus to receive a course in Satanic temptation to equip Him for His career. And our Lord Himself pictures Satan as asking for Simon Peter, and to our amazement that hideous request is granted. "Simon, Simon, Satan hath obtained thee by asking, that he might sift thee as wheat." Jesus considers it a perilous education. "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not." But He is astonishingly confident of favorable results. "Do thou, when once thou hast turned again, establish thy brethren." And St. Paul, in an obscure passage in another of his letters, writes that "in the name of the Lord Jesus" he has delivered over a certain member of the Corinthian Church to Satan for the destruction of the flesh that the spirit may be saved. Satan an agent in salvation—how amazing!

While the Bible is at pains to make us dread and abominate the malignant figure of the tempter, the enemy of souls, it gives the devil his due, and represents him as a useful though very terrible and menacing educator.

Now the Bible is the Divine interpreter of human life. Unquestionably this diabolic element plays a vast role in history

and in the personal experiences of men and women. And its effects are often educational.

Our greatest dramatist thought so. Shakespeare's *King Lear* is an arbitrary, over-bearing, self-centered old man. The experiences of a long life have apparently taught him little in considerateness or self-control. With no sense of social obligation, he takes it into his head to divest himself of the burden of ruling a kingdom, and proceeds to divide the realm between his daughters. With hasty bad judgment he misunderstands and banishes the daughter who loves him, and trusts himself to Goneril and Regan. He has made shipwreck of conscience and faith. In the hands of his two elder daughters he finds himself delivered to Satanic lovelessness. But how much he learns from that terrific discipline! He knows how not to be unthoughtful, not to be self-sufficient, not to domineer. He goes through an appalling curriculum, and although any who care for him would not "upon the rack of this tough world stretch him longer," we cannot help concluding that it was well for him that he was stretched on even so torturing a rack. A heady tyrant has been schooled into a kindly and appreciative old man, who commands our sympathy.

Does not this spiritual interpretation open up for us an insight into such an overwhelming catastrophe as that which has overtaken our generation? For centuries God has been seeking to enlighten nations, to discipline them out of aggressive self-aggrandizement. Any reader of the history of diplomacy sees an ugly narrative of greed and fear, of lying and bluffing and terrorizing, of grabbing and exploiting. Mr Gladstone, who knew international politics at first hand over a long public career, wrote

The history of nations is a melancholy chapter that is, the history of governments is one of the most immoral parts of human history

The calamity of this world war, when one considers the events which succeeded the last world war, looks like a blunder which

statesmen of any intelligence should have avoided. And it is far more shocking than a blunder. It exposes nations, and our own among the chief, who made shipwreck of conscience when they refused to take the responsibilities of keeping the world in order and providing and working the means of peaceful change. It shows up a whole generation who lacked sufficient faith in God to believe that a friendly commonwealth of peoples is His will, who were unready to make the sacrifices of national sovereignty and national interest to achieve it, and who selfishly pushed their own prestige and prosperity regardless of those of others. Such throwing overboard of conscience and faith, such stupidity and spiritual obtuseness, is now sending the great part of mankind through the hellish schooling of war that nations may learn not to blaspheme justice and mutual consideration and fellowship. "O, sir," as the moral is pointed at the end of the Second Act in *King Lear*

O, sir, to wilful men
The injuries that they themselves procure
Must be their schoolmasters

Satanic discipline appears a New Testament interpretation of this world tragedy

If this be so, what is it that we are meant to learn from it?

How swiftly our country has resolved that it is essential that all its citizens pull together in a national effort! No individual is to be allowed to grow enormously wealthy and none is to be let starve. There is to be careful planning in the production and distribution of goods. If workers are thrown out of employment in a curtailed industry, every attempt will be made to shift them to another more vital. Every worker will have assurance that his toil counts as public service. Precautions are taken to ensure the least possible waste of anything which the country requires. We believe that there is work for all, and that we have resources to provide housing, food, clothes

and the essentials of a decent and fairly comfortably life for all, and we are agreed that this should and shall be done

Undoubtedly in an emergency restrictions are placed on initiative and freedom which obstruct social advance. There is not elbowroom for the experimentation by which individuals sometimes hit on most valuable devices and inventions and open up new industries. But there is undoubtedly social advance in providing for many who are overlooked in ordinary times, and in supplying many others with a chance to make their contribution to the common good. There is also a patriotic stimulus to inventiveness. It may likely be unwise to continue such tight controls into the days of peace. But in this unwelcome school are we not being taught that the whole nation must take thought for the employment and for the quality of life open to all of its inhabitants? If we uproot thousands and move them from their homes in order to carry on war industries, we assume that their housing and other basic necessities shall be assured and we can assume, let us hope, that the Church will supply its message to them and others. Should we do less for migrant workers in peacetime? If we are shown that our Negro fellow citizens are discriminated against in war industries or in the armed forces, we recognize the injustice of it. Are we not being taught by Satan's war not to blaspheme the image of God in our fellow men? Is it not being brought home to us that we shipwrecked conscience in our indifference to the conditions under which hundreds of thousands have had to live in this rich land? That we denied the faith we professed in a Father to whom we prayed "give us our daily bread," and who has been waiting to answer that prayer for the entire family of His children and has been frustrated by the thoughtlessness and callousness of sons and daughters who did not sufficiently care how their brethren fared?

More than this as to both shipwrecked conscience and faith, are we not being put through a specially needed course in fel-

lowship with other peoples? That happy phrase "the united nations" stands for something which ought to endure and grow. We have been told again and again that the world has shrunk and become one neighborhood, that every people is tied with every other in health (for disease ignores frontiers), in trade, in finance, in a hundred ways, so that whatever any one people does or suffers affects all the rest. But we have been obstinately unteachable, and have gone our own independent way. It was our American shipwreck of conscience that doomed the League of Nations and predestined the best things in the peace settlement to failure. Now a patient God has put us back into Satan's dire classroom to try to get into our dull heads and stubborn hearts that we dare not blaspheme our divine family ties in His world household. We are pooling resources and planning to send them where they are most needed. What elementary commonsense! Is not this the kindergarten lesson for little children to train them to live together? And yet recall how recently the major powers were set upon economic nationalism. Think of the tariff barriers; think of the manipulating of a nation's currency in silver or gold to gain trade advantages or even to hold the vote of the silver bloc, think of the cut-throat competition between nations for raw materials and markets. These have been potent factors in bringing on this world catastrophe.

Does not this same cramping localism curse the Church? How hard it is to induce our various communions to associate their inherited traditions in common witness, worship and work! How ingrained in congregations is parochialism, so that missions are put off with a beggarly residue after the budget for expenses is met! How narrow the vision of ministers and people who rarely feel obligation for a world for which Christ died, and as rarely seek fellowship with the whole Body of Christ throughout the earth that they may apprehend with all saints the fulness of God.

Have we learned either in State or Church not to think nationally? If we have not, God help us. We and the rest of mankind will be kept under Satan's tuition until we learn. At the end of this struggle there must be a supra-national organization of mankind to foster justice, guarantee order, advance the well-being of every people, or we shall have another crop of Hitlers. And despots have a way of getting worse. It is a long step down from the Kaiser and his entourage to Hitler and his gangsters. We human beings are not given the option of learning or not learning in this earthly schoolroom where a wise and loving God resorts to such severe educational methods with uncooperative pupils. We must learn or perish.

The reason why we have not been concerned for all our fellow countrymen or been willing to accept responsibility for the whole of mankind in State and Church is just that it was troublesome and demanded sacrifice. Well, what could be more interfering than war, upsetting every family and individual in our land? And what could demand more in taxes, in doing without conveniences, in the offering of the lives of millions of our young men, in the anxiety and heartache and tears of those to whom they are most dear? Yes, we refused to make sacrifices for justice and for peace, for conscience and faith. It is a strange thing that we Christians look at our Lord adoringly and long to be like Him, that we read in our Bibles that He was perfected through suffering, and that we fancy we shall be matured into His likeness by some less painful process, that without tribulation our land and our church shall enter the Kingdom of God.

The late Justice Holmes, speaking of the education given by war, wrote.

I hope it may be long before we are called to sit at that master's feet. But some teacher of the kind we all need. In this snug, over-safe corner of the world we need it, that we may realize that our comfortable routine is no eternal necessity of things, but merely a little space of calm in the midst of the tempestuous, untamed streaming of the world.

That phrase of this distinguished jurist, a realistic liberal—"the tempestuous, untamed streaming of the world"—is the modern connotation of the Biblical Satan. We have spoken of evil as God's agent, but the Bible suggests that he is an agent who gets out of hand. Evil becomes a mystery, a problem, and an antagonist to God. Recall our Lord's shuddering statement as He faced the forces which were hounding Him to the cross: "This is your hour and the Power of Darkness," or that other phrase He used in prayer "the Prince of this world." Recall St. Paul's conviction that Christians wrestle "not against flesh and blood"—and God knows the human factors on a world scene such as we confront, and the human factors of our inherited and environing and indwelling passions, instincts, motives, prejudices, "complexes" are fiendish and frightening enough—but beyond "flesh and blood," he saw "principalities, powers, the rulers of the darkness of this world, spiritual wickedness in high places"—a whole diabolic hierarchy of forces beyond any ordinary human badness. People in mobs are possessed and swayed by factors more savage and brutal than can be found in any one of them. There is a collective malevolence and ferocity in nations, races, classes, groups vastly more terrifying than we can discover when we ask "What is in the worst man?" This is that "tempestuous, untamed streaming of the world."

And there is perversity and painfulness in subhuman forces with which man has to struggle, which impress us as fiendishly hostile to us and to the good Lord of creation. What will you make of certain of the diseases like cancer to which we are subject? Or more mysterious yet how account for mental defects and aborrations by which a child is born an idiot or a fine intelligence is turned into a homicidal lunatic? St. Paul, facing a crippling handicap, calls it "a messenger of Satan to buffet me." His prayers for deliverance from it are unanswered. But he is assured that God's grace is sufficient for him to endure it and go on with his toilsome service for God and man.

Yes, life—physical, mental, social—has in it this “tempestuous, untamed streaming,” this Santanic factor. We encounter it in countless malign forms. And war is its outbreak on a huge, hideous and most horrid scale. We believers in the sovereignty of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ are confident that no force, however awful, is beyond His control, or even beyond His employment of it for blessed ends. But when we think of the ugly and cruel elements in war, elements that represent the worst in man and worse than his worst, we may well believe it a monster untamed by God, with which He struggles that He may end it, even while He employs it. Do you remember what Jeremiah hears God saying of the bloody idolatry of those who burnt their sons with fire for an offering unto Baal? “Neither came it into My mind.” It was too odious and too shocking for even the All-knowing to have fancied or contemplated.

Such is the education, resorted to under extreme circumstances with problem pupils. And we are enrolled in this perilous school that we may learn not to be selfish. No question about the magnificent sacrifice some scholars achieve in its repulsive classrooms. It has helped to produce glorious characters. The Captain of our salvation learned His final lesson under the tutelage of the power of darkness and accomplished earth’s most mighty victory. And He comes in closest fellowship with all who drink the cup of pain for the liberation of the enslaved.

But be sure we notice that Hymenaeus and Alexander were only put under this execrable educator after they had made shipwreck of faith and conscience, and that the apostle expected them to learn merely a negative lesson—“not to blaspheme.” Satan’s school is intended for unlearning rather than for learning. This tragic war will not of itself teach us anything of what we should do for the upbuilding of our country in righteousness, or for the creation of a commonwealth of nations, nor will it lift our own characters to a godlier level. It may easily do the

reverse, and leave our country morally debased, mankind in a sorer plight, and render you and me more devilish than it found us. We cannot blink the hazardous quality of the education it affords. It is the devil's education. Faith and a good conscience are learned in the school of Christ, and the variety of faith and conscience which He offers can be learned nowhere else. Happily even in the classrooms where this other education is in full swing Christ is at hand to teach us. While darkness is over the earth, the cross is here. The Crucified makes His appeal through the blackness and the jeering of hostile and taunting voices. "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Myself." Amid this convulsion which is shaking everything around and within us, can we not feel His spell? If we respond to Him, it will be under the leadership of His spirit with His mind controlling our every thought, that we shall learn the things which belong unto our peace, and to the peace of our poor Satan-tortured world.

■

AMERICA AND POST-WAR LEADERSHIP

EIGHT COMMON PRINCIPLES FOR A BETTER WORLD ¹

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT ²

On August 21, 1941, the speaker pro-tem of the House, Clifton A Woodrum, of Virginia, laid before the House this message, which was read by the clerk and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs

More than a week before the President and Prime Minister Churchill, of Great Britain, met "at sea" in the North Atlantic, shuttling between the "USS Augusta" and the battleship "HMS Prince of Wales" With their advisers they spent several days examining the problem of supply of munitions of war under the Lend-Lease Act for the armed forces of the United States, of Great Britain, and, of the other Allied nations An official statement of "the Atlantic Charter" was issued from the White House on November 14, 1941

The entire world commented at length on the character of the charter Supporters of Roosevelt and Churchill pronounced it a "statesmanlike" document that paved the way for close British-American collaboration and for the defeat of Germany Critics, especially American isolationists, denounced it as vague or as committing the United States to a war "with which we have no concern"

Over a week ago I held several important conferences at sea with the British Prime Minister Because of the fact of safety to British, Canadian and American ships and their personnel no prior announcement of these meetings could properly be made

¹ For text see *Congressional Record*, v 87, no 154, p 7387, August 21, 1941 See also House Document, No 358

² For biographical note see Appendix

At the close a public statement by the Prime Minister and the President was made. I quote it for the information of the Congress and for the record.

The President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, have met at sea.

CONSIDER DANGERS OF CIVILIZATION

They have been accompanied by officials of their two governments, including high ranking officers of their military, naval, and air services.

The whole problem of the supply of munitions of war, as provided by the Lease-Lend Act, for the armed forces of the United States and for those countries actively engaged in resisting aggression has been further examined.

Lord Beaverbrook, the Minister of Supply of the British Government, has joined in these conferences. He is going to proceed to Washington to discuss further details with appropriate officials of the United States Government. These conferences will also cover the supply problems of the Soviet Union.

JOINT DECLARATION AS DRAWN UP

The President and the Prime Minister have had several conferences. They have considered the dangers to world civilization arising from the policies of military domination by conquest upon which the Hitlerite Government of Germany and other governments associated therewith have embarked, and have made clear the steps which their countries are respectively taking for their safety in the face of these dangers.

They have agreed upon the following joint declaration:

Joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

FIRST, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other,
SECOND, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned,

THIRD, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live, and they wish to see

sovereign rights and self government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them,

FURTHER RIGHTS OF ALL NATIONS

FOURTH, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity,

FIFTH, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement and social security,

SIXTH, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want,

SEVENTH, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance,

MUST ABANDON USE OF FORCE

EIGHTH, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons must come to the abandonment of the use of force

Since the future peace can be maintained if land, sea or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential

They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments

(Signed) FRANKLIN D ROOSEVELT

(Signed) WINSTON S CHURCHILL

The Congress and the President having heretofore determined through the Lend-Lease Act on the national policy of American aid to the democracies which east and west are waging war against dictatorships, the military and naval conversations at these meetings made clear gains in furthering the effectiveness of this aid

Furthermore, the Prime Minister and I are arranging for conferences with the Soviet Union to aid it in its defense against the attack made by the principal aggressor of the modern world—Germany

PROGRAM DEFIES ALL OPPOSITION

Finally, the declaration of principles at this time presents a goal which is worth while for our type of civilization to seek

It is so clear cut that it is difficult to oppose in any major particular without automatically admitting a willingness to accept compromise with Nazism, or to agree to a world peace which would give to Nazism domination over large numbers of conquered nations

Inevitably such a peace would be a gift to Nazism to take breath—armed breath—for a second war to extend the control over Europe and Asia to the American Hemisphere itself

It is perhaps unnecessary for me to call attention once more to the utter lack of validity of the spoken or written word of the Nazi Government

It is also unnecessary for me to point out that the declaration of principles includes of necessity the world need for freedom of religion and freedom of information

No society of the world organized under the announced principles could survive without these freedoms which are a part of the whole freedom for which we strive

ISOLATIONISM AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS³

WENDELL L WILLKIE⁴

This address was given at the 147th Commencement of Union College, Schenectady, New York, on Monday morning, May 11, 1942. Mr Willkie was designated as "Honorary Chancellor" of Union for 1942.

Mr Willkie, before and after Pearl Harbor, continued to give his full support of the administration's war program⁵.

On December 20, 1941, over the Columbia Broadcasting System he urged national unity in waging the war ("We must face this struggle, not as men of party—but as Americans—free Americans—determined to do whatever is necessary that freedom may be strong enough to win"). On January 13, 1942, at a dinner of the United States Conference of Mayors, Washington, D C, he stated that "the price of victory at best will be high," and proceeded to one of the best addresses of his career. On February 12, 1942, at a Lincoln's Birthday dinner, in Boston, he again urged national interest above that of party and called for the immediate mobilization of our entire national resources ("This is the day for tough and resolute men"). On April 23, 1942, at Rochester University he analyzed with great insight China's heroic part in the struggle.

In line with his philosophy toward the war, Mr. Willkie at Union College took a forthright stand in condemnation of those who scuttled the League of Nations ("I was a believer in the League"). By implication he would revive that organization. At any rate he spoke without ambiguity ("This is no time for ambiguity") in favor of the "creation of a world in which there shall be an equality of opportunity for every race and every nation."

The quality of Mr Willkie's speeches has greatly improved since November, 1941. He is more direct and less clumsy in his language usage, and is improved in his delivery over the radio or before visible audiences. Whether readers of this speech will agree with the speaker's

³ Text furnished by and through the courtesy of Mr Willkie

⁴ For biographical note see Appendix

⁵ See *Representative American Speeches 1940-41*, for Wendell Willkie's "Speech of Acceptance" p 93-112

interpretation of the history of America's rejection of the League is another matter. A speaker of the personality, platform leadership, and international outlook possessed by Willkie is to be strongly reckoned with in future American national life.

You young men are about to enter into the affairs of a world torn by a hideous war. Large portions of it are dominated by intolerance and hate. An adventurer still rules the greater part of Europe as a military overlord, and the octopus of Japan, grown more menacing by feeding in fresh waters, extends its tentacles over the rich resources of the Far East.

Yet it was only a short time ago—less than a quarter of a century—that the democratic nations, including our own, gained an outstanding victory over the forces of conquest and aggression then led by Imperial Germany. We believed that we had attained peace for our time, at least. We believed that for a long period to come the world would not again be plunged into one of those appalling, devastating, all-embracing conflicts. Somewhere along the line—and certainly we cannot escape our share of the responsibility—there has been a shocking failure to uphold and secure the world peace that had been won at such great cost and sacrifice. You as young men, must analyze that failure if this present war is to be anything more than just another season of blood-letting, if a prostrate civilization is to be lifted up and given purpose and meaning, beyond merely the restoration of its vigor for renewed combat. That is all we did in the twenty-one year period between 1918 and 1939. You must not repeat our mistakes.

Our own history furnishes, I believe, the clue to our failure. One of its most obvious weaknesses in the light of what is going on today, is the lack of any continuity in our foreign policy. Neither major party can claim to have pursued a stable or consistent program of international cooperation even during the relatively brief period of the last forty-five years. Each has had its season of world outlook—sometimes an imperialistic

one—and each its season of strict isolationism, the congressional leadership of the party out of power usually blindly opposing the program of the party in power, whatever it might be

For years the intellectual leadership in both parties has recognized that if peace, economic prosperity and liberty itself were to continue in this world, the nations of the world must find a method of economic stabilization and cooperative effort.

These aspirations at the end of the First World War, under the leadership of Woodrow Wilson, produced a concrete program of international cooperation intended to safeguard all nations against military aggression, to protect racial minorities and to give the oncoming generation some confidence that it could go about its affairs without a return of the disrupting and blighting scourge of war. Whatever we may think about the details of that program, it was definite, affirmative action for world peace. We cannot state positively just how effective it might have proved, had the United States extended to it support, influence and active participation.

But we do know that we tried the opposite course and found it altogether futile. We entered into an era of strictest detachment from world affairs. Many of our public leaders, Democratic and Republican, went about the country proclaiming that we had been tricked into the last war, that our ideals had been betrayed, that never again should we allow ourselves to become entangled in world politics which would inevitably bring about another armed outbreak. We were blessed with natural barriers, they maintained, and need not concern ourselves with the complicated and unsavory affairs of an old world beyond our borders. As a result, along with all the other democratic nations, we did nothing when Japan invaded Manchuria, though our own Secretary of State, Henry L. Stimson, expressed his outrage, we with the other democracies sat by while Italy wantonly invaded Ethiopia and we let Hitler enter the Rhineland without even a protest.

We shut ourselves away from world trade by excessive tariff barriers. We washed our hands of the continent of Europe and displayed no interest in its fate while Germany re-armed. We torpedoed the London Economic Conference when the European democracies, with France lagging in the rear, were just beginning to recover from the economic depression that had sapped their vitality, and when the instability of foreign exchange remained the principal obstacle to full revival. And in so doing, we sacrificed a magnificent opportunity for leadership in strengthening and rehabilitating the democratic nations, in fortifying them against assault by the forces of aggression which at that very moment were beginning to gather.

Even as late as 1938, we concentrated on domestic reform.

All of this happened when you were too young to be concerned with the nature of our leadership. The responsibility for it does not attach solely to any political party. For neither major party stood consistently and conclusively before the American public as either the party of world outlook or the party of isolation. If we were to say that Republican leadership destroyed the League of Nations in 1920, we must add that it was Democratic leadership that broke up the London Economic Conference in 1933.

I was a believer in the League. Without, at this time, however, arguing either for or against the provisions of the League plans, I should like to point out to you the steps leading to its defeat here in the United States. For that fight furnishes a perfect example of the type of leadership we must avoid in this country if we are ever going to fulfill our responsibilities as a nation that believes in a free world, a just world, a world at peace.

President Wilson negotiated the peace proposals at Versailles including the covenant of the League. Upon his return the treaty and the covenant were submitted to the United States Senate for ratification. And there arose one of the most dra-

matic episodes in American history I cannot here trace the detail of that fight which resulted in rejection on the part of the United States of world leadership Let me, however, try to give you the broad outlines of the picture

First, as to the Senate group, the so-called "batallion of death," the "irreconcilables," or the "bitter-enders" Here was a faction that had no party complexion In its leadership the name of the Democratic orator, James A Reed, occupies as conspicuous a position as that of the Republican, Borah At the other extreme was the uncompromising war president, Woodrow Wilson, who insisted on the treaty with every "i" dotted and every "t" crossed Between them were the reservationists, of various complexions and opinions, and of both Republican and Democratic affiliation

We do not know today, and perhaps we never shall know, whether the Republican leader of the Senate, Henry Cabot Lodge, whose name we now associate with the defeat of the League, truly wanted the League adopted with safeguarding reservations, or whether he employed the reservations to kill the League Many may have convictions on this point, but I doubt that anyone has conclusive knowledge Even his close friends and members of his family have reported contrary opinions on the subject

But we do know that when this question passed from the Senate to the two great political conventions of 1920, neither of them stood altogether for or altogether against the treaty as it had been brought home by the President The Democratic Convention in its platform did not oppose reservations The Republican Platform adopted a compromise plank which was broad enough to accommodate those of any viewpoint respecting the particular Woodrow Wilson covenant There were many firm supporters of the League in the Republican ranks They found the platform altogether ample to give them standing room, while the anti-League delegates found safe footing there too.

Forgive me if I rehearse this old story in too great detail. The point I want to make for you young men today is that the American people were altogether confused about the treaty issue and about the position of the respective parties on it. Many of their leaders talked two ways.

The platforms were ambiguous, the parties had no consistent historical position about the cooperation of the United States with other nations. The confusion was doubled by the attitude of the Republican candidate, Warren Harding. There was no doubt that Cox's position on the Democratic ticket was a fairly definite support of the Wilson treaty, though his party platform left open the possibility of reservations and many of the Democratic leaders were openly in opposition. But no one was certain whether Harding was merely pulling his punches against the League or whether he intended to support it aggressively upon election, in a modified form. In private conversation, he gave each man the answer he wanted and of his speeches, the Republican National Committeeman from California, Mr. Chester H. Rowell, said

One half of the speeches were for the League of Nations if you read them hastily, but if you read them with care, every word of them could have been read critically as against the League of Nations. The other half were violent speeches against the League of Nations if you read them carelessly, but if you read them critically every one of them could be interpreted as in favor of the League of Nations.

It was not until after the election returns were in, that Harding spoke frankly of the League as "now deceased."

I am satisfied that the American people never deliberately and intentionally turned their backs on a program for international cooperation in an organization for maintaining world peace. Possibly they would have preferred changes in the precise Versailles covenant, but not complete aloofness from the efforts of other nations. They were betrayed by leaders without convictions who were thinking in terms of group vote catching.

I do not want to see that same thing happen again. If our isolation after the last war was a contributing factor to the present war and to the economic instability of the past twenty years—and it seems plain that it was—a withdrawal from the problems and responsibilities of the world after this war would be sheer disaster. Even our relative geographical isolation no longer exists.

At the end of the last war, not a single plane had flown across the Atlantic. Today, that ocean is a mere ribbon, with airplanes making regular scheduled flights. The Pacific is only a slightly wider ribbon in the ocean of the air, and Europe and Asia are at our very doorstep.

You are citizens now and it will be your responsibility to defend your country not only with your guns but by your votes. The men elected to public office in the next year or two may well be holding their offices during the making of the peace. As after the last war, those in Congress will determine the legislation affecting that peace. Those in other high offices will profoundly affect the attitude of their respective parties toward it. As citizens who may be called on to give your very lives to preserve your country's freedom, for God's sake elect to important office men who will not make a mockery of that sacrifice. Make sure that you choose leaders who have principles and the courage to state them plainly. Not men who examine each shift of sentiment and watch the polls of public opinion to learn where they stand. I beg of you, vote for straight-out men—not wobblers. This is no time for ambiguity.

I am confident as I stand here now, that the sentiment in every city and every town and in almost every homestead of this entire land, is that when we have won this war—and by that I mean when we have completely subdued those whose will and practice would be to enslave the world—when we have thus freed ourselves from threat of slavery and many millions from its very bonds—we have only cleared the way for our real task.

We must then use the full force of our influence and enlightenment as a nation, to plan and establish continuing agencies under which a new world may develop—a world worth the fight and the sacrifice we have made for it

For America must choose one of three courses after this war—narrow isolationism which inevitably means the loss of our own liberty, international imperialism which means the sacrifice of some other nation's liberty, or the creation of a world in which there shall be an equality of opportunity for every race and every nation

THE AMERICAN PLAN TO PREVENT WAR ⁶

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER ⁷

President Butler delivered this address at the 188th Commencement of Columbia University, on June 2, 1942. Year after year President Butler, in his eightieth year in 1942, continues to give public speeches that measure up well with the long list of his earlier addresses on educational and especially on international themes ⁸

In this Commencement address the speaker reviews, as he has often done, the Hague Conference and the subsequent failures of international machinery for peace. The speaker, for all his hopes of peace, is a realist ("In the face of a situation such as this, there is absolutely no sense in talking of peace until the struggle for the defense of civil, economic and political liberty is won"). Interestingly enough he reverts to the idea of a "League to Enforce Peace" and sees the only guarantee of such peace in pooling the international military resources (at least those of Great Britain and the United States) to destroy future Nazi conspiracies against that order of brotherhood. He is thus more specific than Willkie and identifies such code with good American history. Readers of this speech will explore the possibilities of such a proposal and, no doubt, will sharply divide concerning the practicability of attempting to establish in 1950 the Resolution of 1910.

When the nineteenth century came to its end and the curtain rose upon the twentieth, the hopes of men were high that a path had been found over which they might move forward toward a world of prosperity and of peace. It was the famous Rescript of the Czar of all the Russias, made public on August 12, 1898, and the sympathetic response given to it by the governments of the world which stirred the hearts and minds of men to believe that something real and truly progressive was about to be accomplished.

⁶ By permission of President Butler and through the courtesy of Dr. Frank D. Fackenthal, Secretary of Columbia University.

⁷ For biographical note see Appendix.

⁸ See *Representative American Speeches 1938-39*, p. 11-17, for Introductory Note and text of "Why War?"

The first Hague Conference—that held May 18-July 29, 1899—assembled in this spirit of hope and of faith. In particular, the people of the United States, represented by a delegation of exceptional ability and high character, were confident that some important steps toward effective international cooperation were now to be taken. Unhappily, as the published record of the proceedings of that first Hague Conference makes clear, it was the influence of narrow-minded, technical and merely gain-seeking objections to any such comprehensive plan of international action as the Czar had proposed which brought about what was to all intents and purposes the tragic failure of that conference. Its only practical and definite result, achieved by reason of the untiring efforts of the American delegation, was the establishment at The Hague of a Permanent Court of Arbitration. This was a step in advance, but only a short one.

The difficulties which confronted this conference in its attempt to formulate and adopt a policy of truly constructive progress in the field of international relations were almost entirely the result of that gain-seeking economic nationalism which several of the more important nations of Europe accepted as the natural and appropriate expression of their independent sovereignty and their national ambitions. Out of such a situation as this there quickly developed international economic friction and economic antagonism which shaped with increasing force the policies of not a few of those nations.

In the United States also, economic nationalism gained new authority in matters of public policy. Despite the ringing declaration of President McKinley, made when at the very height of his leadership, that "the period of exclusiveness is past," the Congress of the United States proceeded during the next quarter-century to adopt policies of still stronger international trade restriction that added fuel to the fire which had already begun to burn in Europe and which paved the way for the disastrous business depression which came to the people of the United States in the autumn of 1929. In Great Britain,

Joseph Chamberlain put his personality on the side of these economic barriers and greatly influenced British public opinion. In Germany, the government and many of the large business interests felt that they must enter this struggle with vigor and prepare themselves for whatever might result from it, be it war or peace. If a personal word may be pardoned, from 1905 to 1913, it was my privilege to serve as confidential and, of course, wholly unofficial intermediary between the German Emperor and the leaders in the Liberal government of Great Britain—Asquith, Grey, Haldane and John Morley—in the hope that they might at least lessen the differences of opinion and of policy which, if continued, were almost certain to lead to war. Despite the fact that the Emperor himself and the leaders in the government of Great Britain did not desire war, but rather greatly feared its possible results, the forces at work beneath the surface continued to extend and even to multiply their power until the climax which came with the collapse of August 1, 1914.

Then followed more than four years of desperate and destructive military struggle which was so severe that, when it came to its end, it seemed almost certain, so convincing were its lessons, that now at last the nations would be prepared for that form of international cooperation which would reduce or perhaps even remove the possibility of the renewal of any such armed contest.

The story of what happened at Versailles and afterwards at Geneva is well known. Statesmen of vision in every land looked forward with the same spirit which had animated the American delegation to the first Hague Conference twenty years earlier. The bitterness of the struggle through which they had all passed of course made international agreement difficult, but the destruction which that struggle had caused in human life and in human savings made such agreement seem an absolute necessity. The various happenings which followed are so recent as to be a matter of familiar history. It was tragic that such outstanding leaders as Briand of France and Stresemann

of Germany, who worked together earnestly and with high intelligence to bring about international understanding and international cooperation, should have passed from earth at the very moment when the continuance of their lives seemed essential to world peace. Internal dissensions in several lands and internal revolutions on the continent of Europe brought new antagonistic forces into existence, both economic and political. It was these forces which turned to arms, to navies and to the air, to establish first of all their control at home. Then they were ambitious to extend that control over parts of the world beyond, far beyond, their own national boundaries. The obvious and necessary result of such developments as these meant a return to world-wide military struggle. It is that struggle which we are witnessing today.

This war has taken the form, not of a contest for national independence or for national security on the part of any of the aggressive powers, but for world control. This is particularly obvious in the policies of two peoples, the Nazi Germans and the Japanese. Neither of them shows any concern whatever for those fundamental principles of civil, political and religious liberty which have marked the progress of the Western world for more than five hundred years. Their purpose and their hope are to establish absolute economic and political control over a large portion of the earth's surface by armed force and by its most brutal use. The fact that these governments are among those which formally signed an international agreement, in which sixty-three nations joined, to renounce war as an instrument of national policy is only referred to by them with sarcasm.

This world war, whether economic or military, has now extended over fully a third of this twentieth century. The future historian will take note of the fact that, no matter what may have been the hopes and the promises of governments and of men, this is a twentieth-century world struggle of unprecedented magnitude and determination. In the face of a situation

such as this, there is absolutely no sense in talking of peace until the struggle for the defense of civil, economic and political liberty is won

Every effort of free men and of their governments must be turned to the achievement of this victory as quickly as possible, despite the appalling cost in human life and in human savings. Liberty is not only worth fighting for, but it must be fought for when attacked by armed force

The minds of forward-facing men and their governments must now go back to the problems which were so earnestly considered at the beginning of the century. In the light of these problems and of these happenings one must be prepared, when victory for liberty shall come, to propose and to establish a plan of international cooperation which will so far as is humanly possible bring about prosperity and peace. Preparation for peace is even more important than has been preparation for war.

If the representatives of the government of the United States took the lead in quiet and unobtrusive fashion at the first Hague Conference of 1899, surely it is becoming that they should again take that leadership so soon as armed hostilities shall end. The path has been clearly marked out for them by the acts of their government and by the words of their official spokesmen. McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Elihu Root, Taft, Wilson, Harding—and now Franklin D. Roosevelt—have all declared themselves with emphasis and definiteness in favor of world organization for prosperity and for peace. Both great political parties have time and again made similar formal statements in their platforms.

The simplest statement of what may be called the American Plan is that declaration made by the Congress of the United States in the Joint Resolution adopted in June, 1910, to which attention has so often been called and to which attention should continue to be called until it is definitely and successfully acted upon by American public opinion. These are the words of that Resolution, adopted, let it be said once more, by the unan-

amous vote of both Senate and House of Representatives—no Republican and no Democrat dissenting—and signed by President Taft on June 25, 1910

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a commission of five members be appointed by the President of the United States to consider the expediency of utilizing existing international agencies for the purpose of limiting the armaments of the nations of the world by international agreement, and of constituting the combined navies of the world an international force for the preservation of universal peace, and to consider and report upon any other means to diminish the expenditures of government for military purposes and to lessen the probabilities of war

The text of this Resolution cannot be printed too often since it is apparent that it would still be news to most of the world

It is this American Plan, supported by the principles of our Federal Constitution and its Bill of Rights, which should lead the way to world prosperity and world peace when this war shall be won

"WHO SAYS IT CAN'T BE DONE?"⁹

D F FLEMING¹⁰

Dr D F Fleming gave this fifteen-minute broadcast over station WSM, Nashville, Tennessee, on June 10, 1942, at 10 15 P M, Central War Time This was one of a weekly series by this speaker, on the general topic, "America and the World Crisis"

As on several previous occasions, Dr Fleming talked of the post-war world More specifically than is true of the other speeches in this volume that argue this theme, this lecturer attempted to refute the practical arguments against world government

Will such international machinery prevent war? The argument Dr Fleming presented is vigorous and direct To him it was a matter of organization or "death" Is the refutation adequate? With equal aleitness he attempted to reply to the proposition that "nothing can be done to prevent economic depressions" He cited by analogy the achievements of our preparedness program from December, 1941, to June, 1942

The speech is well-organized, concrete, persuasive It will bear study as an example of short radio addresses that frankly set out to increase national morale through information, persuasion, and inspiration

In these broadcasts I have talked a good deal about the future I do so again tonight because I am convinced that our whole success and happiness depends on foreseeing the future and managing it I do not mean, of course, that we can foresee everything in detail or control the course of all future events What I do mean is that we can identify the main forces with which we have to deal and that we can govern the operation of these forces to a large extent

Let us consider the two things that people are most skeptical about preventing war and preventing economic depressions Most people apparently still take the view that the job of preventing war is too big "War is as old as humanity," they say

⁹ By permission of Prof D F Fleming Text provided through the courtesy of the speaker and of Station WSM, Nashville, Tennessee

¹⁰ For biographical note see Appendix

dolefully, "it has always been with us. How can you hope to abolish it?"

To this the answer is that we have never tried. A league of all the nations was organized for the purpose after the last war, but we thought we didn't need it. We said it might cost us something to belong, that we might have to send our boys abroad again. All sorts of jungles and deserts were mentioned as likely places to which our boys might be sent by this league of nations. So we stayed out of the league and let world politics drift as they would.

When the Japanese began the present world war, on September 18, 1931, we were really alarmed, but not to the point of joining with other nations even in economic sanctions. That would be too risky, we might get into war. We saw clearly that appeasement of Mussolini and Hitler in Europe was both futile and dangerous, but we were no more willing than the French and British to take the swift, strong measures which would repress these international gangsters. Instead, we hastily built around ourselves a paper barricade of neutrality laws and vowed that we would ignore the whole business.

The result is that we have had to go to war totally and completely. We have already appropriated more than 200 billion dollars for war and are mobilizing more than 5,000,000 men to fight in every part of the globe. Our boys are already fighting in every bad climate that the earth affords.

This is what we get by drifting. Could we be any worse off if we took a hand in controlling world events? The answer is obvious, but there is more to it than that, for the constantly accelerated improvement of the engines of destruction makes it absolutely imperative that we prevent future world wars. Either we will do that or the globe itself will be devastated and barbarized in a succession of world wars, each worse than the last.

Nevertheless we shall fail if we undertake the job of organizing the world against war half-heartedly, doubting in our

own minds that it can be done. The outcome will be determined by what we think—we and the British, the Russians and the Chinese and all the others who have suffered so deeply from this war. If we understand that the world has become so small that its political organization is a matter of life and death, it will be done, and successfully.

Then there is this matter of living in helpless fear of the economic cycle. Up until ten years ago it was economic heresy to dispute the sway of "boom and bust" over us. Nobody could repeal the vast, inscrutable economic laws which made everything go up and come down again with a crash. It was considered even to be wicked to tamper with these immutable economic laws. When a devastating depression came, in 1929 and after, we were told that we must suffer it out—and we did, until the suffering got so bad that we simply had to do something. Then we tried many things, some of which worked, and some of which didn't. But the total result was to lick the depression.

Then the war came closer to us and the President called for 50,000 airplanes a year, ten million tons of ships and everything else in proportion. Our production chiefs shook their heads and said they would try, but of course it couldn't be done—it was impossible.

Tonight everybody knows that the impossible has happened all over the United States. The President's highest goals will be achieved and they are well on the way to being doubled. We have surpassed every industrial achievement ever thought of before. The whole continent throbs with our activity. Everybody has a job. Nobody doubts that we can do it. We are on our way to producing the greatest lot of weapons of war ever assembled on this planet.

We have discovered that when there is a plan and a will behind it, we can do anything. Can we remember that? Or must we shortly have a post-war boom ending in a bust? Will people bob up all over the country saying "Now no more planning, no more controls, that is all right for war but it is bad

for our initiative in peacetime Down with government planning! Let us do as we please again”?

Or shall we say “We have learned something We know that our economy can be controlled for purposes of war and destruction Now let there be plans for keeping our people employed in producing useful things”? I say for “keeping” our people employed, for there will be no lack of demand for consumption goods when the war is over The danger will lie in the overproduction of many things and in the spread of the gambling spirit It was the speculative mania which lured us to disaster in 1929 and that can happen again There will be plenty of us who will want to get rich quick and everybody out of my way—especially those bureaucrats in Washington Our Congress lately reduced the appropriation for the National Resources Planning Board from \$1,400,000 to \$1,000,000 and then to \$400,000 Said the Congress “We don’t want any great central planning agency, surveying the whole nation and its resources, making plans for their orderly development in a way to keep everyone employed all the time Just turn us loose again”

There is, therefore, real danger that we will relapse again into “boom and bust” nationally and into “drift and take it” internationally A recent *Fortune* poll indicated that 44 per cent of us would like nothing better than to retire into national isolation again after the war

But if we again find ourselves living in a chaos of war and depression each prompting the other, let us be clear that the fault is in our own minds We have proved that we can do almost anything if we decide to For that matter the dictatorships have proved the same thing They have almost conquered the world without any hard money They have a plan for ruling the earth which would have succeeded if we had not bestirred ourselves when we did The days of “Happenstance” are definitely over If we refuse to plan and execute, others will do it for us

Who says that world wars can't be prevented and depressions controlled? There will be, doubtless, small wars and some violence for many a year to come, but the same kind of organization which we believe will win this war for the free peoples can prevent any small war from growing into a world conflict. Likewise, there may always be some rise and fall in business prosperity, but we know now of a certainty that these oscillations can be held within limits.

The greatest lag in the world today is in our thinking. Everything else is rushing ahead at constantly greater speed—science and invention, engineering and production. It is our political thinking which falls behind. There was a time when this was not disastrous, but there will never be such a time again. We can never again let this machine era rush where it will. We are obliged to control it and keep on controlling it, all of our lives, for the alternative is to be destroyed by the machines and processes which should give us a life of richness and plenty.

POST-WAR WORLD LEADERSHIP ¹¹

SUMNER WELLES ¹²

This address was delivered at Arlington National Amphitheatre, on May 30, 1942

Secretary Welles, during January, 1942, had participated in the third Consultative Conference of America's Foreign Ministers representing twenty Latin American countries, at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

When the Conference was finally adjourned, nineteen of the twenty-one signatories to the resolution had broken off relations with the Axis or would quickly do so Mr Welles was generally acclaimed in this nation a master diplomat in this achievement of Latin American solidarity, practically complete, against the Axis

Statesmanlike speeches were given by Mr Welles on Latin American affairs in 1942, including his address at the opening session on January 15, 1942, his radio address from Rio de Janeiro on January 24, 1942, and his address before the Cuban Chamber of Commerce in the United States, at the Hotel Waldorf-Astoria, in New York, on February 16, 1942

At Arlington, on Memorial Day, the speaker, appropriately enough, visualized with his solemn audience the mission of America in protecting the peace

His denunciation of American isolationism of 1919-1941 is scathing His description of our political duties is personal and highly emotional Note the successive passages with their refrain, "I believe" Like Henry Wallace, Welles concludes that "This is in very truth a people's war" He sets up a pattern for world federation (or government) based upon the inter-American system Finally, he speaks eloquently of the hopes of the American people for a peace based upon the sacrifices of those who have courage, faith, and a vision of international cooperation

Students of American history and of public speaking of the year 1942 will find this address appropriate reading It is a fitting and typical expression of the thinking and speaking of one of our wartime spokesmen, one who attempts to provide us with a political philosophy adequate for the hours of our "gravest danger"

¹¹ By permission of and through the courtesy of the Hon Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State Reprinted from *Congressional Record*, v 88, no 103, p A13720-2, June 1, 1942 (daily edition)

¹² For biographical note see Appendix

Today, as our nation faces the gravest danger it has ever confronted since it gained its independence, the American people are once more meeting together in every State of the Union to commemorate the observance of Memorial Day

In the elm-shaded churchyards of the New England hills, in the more newly consecrated burial places of the West, here in the more quiet century-old cemeteries of the South, men and women throughout the land, are now paying tribute to the memories of those who have made the ultimate sacrifice for their country and for their fellow men

Eighty years ago our people were engaged in a fratricidal war between the States In the fires of that devastating struggle was forged the great assurance that, within the boundaries of the United States, men were, and would remain, free The lives of those who died in that contest were not laid down in vain

Forty-four years ago the United States went to war to help the gallant people of Cuba free themselves from the imposition by a nation of the Old World of a brutal tyranny which could not be tolerated in a New World dedicated to the cause of liberty Through our victory in that war there was wrought a lasting safeguard to the independence of the Republics of the Western Hemisphere Our citizens who then gave up their lives did not do so in vain

Twenty-five years ago the United States declared war upon Germany Our people went to war because of their knowledge that the domination of the world by German militarism would imperil the continuation of their national existence

We won that victory Ninety thousand of our fellow Americans died in that great holocaust in order to win that victory They died firm in the belief that the gift of their lives which they offered their country would be utilized by their countrymen as they had been promised it would be—to insure beyond doubt the future safety of the United States, through the creation of that kind of world in which a peaceful democracy such as ours could live in happiness and in security

These ninety thousand dead, buried here on the slopes of Arlington and in the fields of France where they fell in battle, fulfilled their share of the bargain struck. Can we, the living, say as much? Can we truly say, on this Memorial Day, that we have done what we, as a nation, could have done to keep faith with them, and to prevent their sacrifice from being made in vain?

The people of the United States were offered at the conclusion of the last war the realization of a great vision. They were offered the opportunity of sharing in the assumption of responsibility for the maintenance of peace in the world by participating in an international organization designed to prevent and to quell the outbreak of war. That opportunity they rejected. They rejected it in part because of the human tendency after a great upsurge of emotional idealism to seek the relapse into what was once termed "normalcy." They rejected it because of partisan politics. They rejected it because of the false propaganda, widely spread, that by our participation in a world order we would incur the danger of war rather than avoid it. They rejected it because of unenlightened selfishness.

At the dawn of the nineteenth century an English poet wrote of his own land

She is a fen
Of stagnant waters altar, sword, and pen,
Fireside, the heroic wealth of hall and bower
Have forfeited their ancient dower
Of inward happiness. We are selfish men

In 1920 and in the succeeding years we as a nation not only plumbed the depths of material selfishness, but we were unbelievably blind. We were blind to what constituted our own enlightened self-interest, and we therefore refused to see that by undertaking a measure of responsibility in maintaining world order, with the immediate commitments which that might involve, we were insuring our people and our democratic ideals against the perils of an unforeseeable future, and we were safe-

guarding our children and our children's children against having to incur the same sacrifices as those forced upon their fathers. Who can today compare the cost in life or treasure which we might have had to contribute towards the stabilization of a world order during its formative years after 1919, with the prospective loss in lives and the lowering of living standards which will result from the supreme struggle in which we are now engaged.

During the first century of our independence our forefathers were occupying and developing a continent. The American pioneer was pushing ever westward across the Alleghenies into the fertile Ohio valley, the Mississippi and Missouri country, the Southwest, and finally to the Pacific Coast. The shock of disaster elsewhere in the world was hardly felt, relief from recurring depressions could always be found, by expanding our frontiers, by opening up new lands and new industries to supply the needs of our rapidly expanding population. Thus cushioned against the impact of events abroad, the American standard of living steadily improved and became the hope of down-trodden peoples of other lands.

Protected by two great oceans to the east and to the west, with no enemies to the north or to the south, the nineteenth century imbued into the minds of our people the belief that in their isolation from the rest of the world lay their safety.

But the oceans shrank with the development of maritime communications, and the security which we enjoyed by reason of our friendly neighbors, vanished with the growth of aviation.

And even in our earlier days our industries became increasingly dependent upon raw materials imported from abroad, their products were sold increasingly in the markets of the Old World. Our urban industrial areas in the east became more and more dependent on our agricultural and mining areas in the west. All became increasingly dependent on world markets and world sources of supply.

With the close of the First World War the period of our isolation had ended. Neither from the standpoint of our phys-

ical security, nor from the standpoint of our material well-being could we any more remain isolated

But, as if by their fiat they could turn back the tides of accomplished fact, our leaders and the great majority of our people in those post-war years deliberately returned to the provincial policies and standards of an earlier day, thinking that because these had served their purpose in the past, they could do so again in a new and in a changed world

And now we are engaged in the greatest war which mankind has known. We are reaping the bitter fruit of our own folly and of our own lack of vision. We are paying dearly as well for the lack of statesmanship, and for the crass errors of omission and of commission, so tragically evidenced in the policies of those other nations which have had their full share of responsibility for the conduct of human affairs during the past generation

What can we now do to rectify the mistakes of these past two decades?

The immediate answer is self-evident. We must utterly and finally crush the evil men, and the iniquitous systems which they have devised, that are today menacing our existence, and that of free men and women throughout the earth. There can be no compromise. There can be no respite until the victory is won. We are faced by desperate and powerful antagonists. To win the fight requires every ounce of driving energy, every resource and initiative, every sacrifice and every instinct of devotion which each and every American citizen possesses. None of us can afford to think of ourselves, none of us can dare to do less than his full part in the common effort. Our liberty, our Christian faith, our life as a free people are at stake. Those who indulge themselves in false optimism, those who believe that the peoples who are fighting with us for our common cause should relieve us of our due share of sacrifice, those who are reluctant to give their all in this struggle for the survival on the earth of what is fine and decent, must be regarded as enemies of the American people

Now more than ever before must we keep the faith with those who lie sleeping in this hallowed ground—and with those who now at this very hour are dying for the cause and for the land they love

And after we win the victory—and we will—what then? Will the people of the United States then make certain that those who have died that we may live as free men and women shall not have died in vain?

I believe that in such case the voice of those who are doing the fighting, and the voice of those who are producing the arms with which we fight must be heard, and must be heeded

And I believe that these voices of the men who will make our victory possible will demand that justice be done, inexorably and swiftly to those individuals, groups or peoples, as the case may be, that can truly be held accountable for the stupendous catastrophe into which they have plunged the human race. But I believe they will likewise wish to make certain that no element in any nation shall be forced to atone vicariously for crimes for which it is not responsible, and that no people shall be forced to look forward to endless years of want and of starvation

I believe they will require that the victorious nations, joined with the United States, undertake forthwith during the period of the armistice the disarmament of all nations, as set forth in the Atlantic Charter, which "may threaten aggression outside of their frontiers"

I believe they will insist that the United Nations undertake the maintenance of an international police power in the years after the war to insure freedom from fear to peaceloving peoples until there is established that permanent system of general security promised by the Atlantic Charter

Finally I believe they will demand that the United Nations become the nucleus of a world organization of the future to determine the final terms of a just, an honest, and a durable peace to be entered into after the passing of the period of social and economic chaos which will come inevitably upon the ter-

mination of the present war, and after the completion of the initial and gigantic task of relief, of reconstruction and of rehabilitation which will confront the United Nations at the time of the armistice

This is in very truth a people's war. It is a war which cannot be regarded as won until the fundamental rights of the peoples of the earth are secured. In no other manner can a true peace be achieved.

In the pre-war world large numbers of people were unemployed, the living standards of millions of people were pitifully low, it was a world in which nations were classified as "haves" and "have nots," with all that these words imply in terms of inequity and hatred.

The pre-war world was one in which small vociferous and privileged minorities in each country felt that they could not gain sufficient profits if they faced competition from abroad. Even this country with its rich natural resources, its vast economic strength, a population whose genius for efficient production enabled us to export the finest products in the world at low cost and at the same time to maintain the highest wages, a country whose competitive strength was felt in the markets of the world—even such a nation was long dominated by its minority interests who sought to destroy international trade in order to avoid facing foreign competition.

They not only sought to do so, but for long years following the First World War largely succeeded in doing so. The destruction of international trade by special minority interests in this and in other countries brought ruin to their fellow citizens by destroying an essential element upon which the national prosperity in each country in large measure depended. It helped to pave the way, through the impoverishment and distress of the people, for militarism and dictatorship. Can the democracies of the world again afford to permit national policies to be dictated by self-seeking minorities of special privilege?

The problem which will confront us when the years of the post-war period are reached is not primarily one of production. For the world can readily produce what mankind requires. The problem is rather one of distribution and purchasing power, of providing the mechanism whereby what the world produces may be fairly distributed among the nations of the world, and of providing the means whereby the people of the world may obtain the world's goods and services. Your government has already taken steps to obtain the support and active cooperation of others of the United Nations in this great task, a task which in every sense of the term is a new frontier—a frontier of limitless expanse—the frontier of human welfare.

When the war ends with the resultant exhaustion which will then beset so many of the nations who are joined with us, only the United States will have the strength and the resources to lead the world out of the slough in which it has struggled so long, to lead the way toward a world order in which there can be freedom from want. In seeking this end we will of course respect the right of all peoples to determine for themselves the type of internal economic organization which is best suited to their circumstances. But I believe that here in our own country we will continue to find the best expression for our own and the general good under a system which will give the greatest incentive and opportunity for individual enterprise. It is in such an environment that our citizens have made this country strong and great. Given sound national policies directed toward the benefit of the majority, and not of the minority, and real security and equality of opportunity for all, reliance on the ingenuity, initiative and enterprise of our citizens rather than on any form of bureaucratic management, will in the future best assure the liberties and promote the material welfare of our people.

In taking thought of our future opportunities we surely must undertake to preserve the advantages we have gained in the past. I cannot believe the peoples of the United States,

and of the Western Hemisphere, will ever relinquish the inter-American system they have built up. Based as it is on sovereign equality, on liberty, on peace, and on joint resistance to aggression, it constitutes the only example in the world today of a regional federation of free and independent peoples. It lightens the darkness of our anarchic world. It should constitute a cornerstone in the world structure of the future.

If this war is in fact a war for the liberation of peoples it must assure the sovereign equality of peoples throughout the world, as well as in the world of the Americas. Our victory must bring in its train the liberation of all peoples. Discrimination between peoples because of their race, creed or color must be abolished. The age of imperialism is ended. The right of a people to their freedom must be recognized, as the civilized world long since recognized the right of an individual to his personal freedom. The principles of the Atlantic Charter must be guaranteed to the world as a whole—in all oceans and in all continents.

And so, in the fullness of God's time when the victory is won, the people of the United States will once more be afforded the opportunity to play their part in the determination of the kind of world in which they will live. With courage and with vision they can yet secure the future safety of their country and of its free institutions, and help the nations of the earth back into the paths of peace.

Then, on some future Memorial Day, the American people, as they mark the graves of those who died in battle for their country in these last two World Wars, can at last truly say—"Sleep on in quiet and in peace, the victory you made it possible for us to win has now been placed at the service of your country and of humanity, your sacrifice has not been made in vain."

APPENDIX

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

BARR, STRINGFELLOW (1897-) Born in Suffolk, Virginia, studied at Tulane University, 1912-13, A B., University of West Virginia, 1916, M A, 1917, Rhodes Scholar, Oxford University, 1919-21, A B, M A, diploma, University of Paris, 1922, teacher of history, University of Virginia, 1924-37; visiting professor of liberal arts, University of Chicago, 1936-37, president of St John's college since 1937, in service, U S Army, 1917-18, Phi Beta Kappa; author, *Mazzini—Portrait of An Exile*, 1935, and contributor of magazine articles on educational and historical topics

BERLE, A A JR. (1895-) Born in Boston, Massachusetts, A B, Harvard, 1913, A M, 1914, LL B, 1916, practiced law in Boston, 1916-17, in New York, 1919-1923; lecturer, Harvard Business School, 1925-1928, associate professor of corporation law at Columbia Law School since 1927, officer, United States Infantry, O R C, 1917-1919, Assistant Secretary of State since 1938, author of *Studies in the Law of Corporation Finance*, 1928, and other volumes and articles on corporation finance

BUTLER, NICHOLAS MURRAY (1862-) Born in Elizabeth, New Jersey, A B, Columbia, 1882, A M, 1883, Ph D, 1884, honorary degrees from many American and European Universities, president of Columbia since 1902; frequently a delegate to the Republican National Conventions, received Republican electoral vote for Vice President of the United States, 1913, received 69½ votes from New York State as candidate for President of the United States, Republican National Convention, 1920, member or chairman of many committees, associations, and foundations for the advancement of education;

awarded one-half of Nobel peace prize, 1931, president of Carnegie Endowment for International Peace since 1925, author of *The Meaning of Education*, 1898, *Philosophy*, 1911, *A World in Ferment*, 1918, *Looking Forward*, 1932, and numerous other books, essays, and addresses on subjects relating to philosophy, education, government, and international relations

CHAPMAN, VIRGIL M (1895-) Born in Simpson County, Kentucky, LL B, University of Kentucky, 1918, practiced law in Kentucky since 1918, member of Congress, 1925-29, and since 1931, various executive positions in the Democratic party and in various civic and educational organizations, member of Tau Kappa Alpha

CHURCHILL, WINSTON (1874-) Educated at Harrow, Sandhurst, entered the army, 1895, served with Spanish forces in Cuba, 1895, service in India, 1897-98, with Nile army, 1898, correspondent with *Morning Post*, South Africa, 1899-1900, escaped prisoner, and in various battles of the Boer War, 1900, Member of Parliament 1900-22, an officer in the British Army in France, 1916, first Lord of Admiralty, 1911-15, Minister of Munitions, 1917, various ministerial offices, 1918-22, Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1924-29, First Lord of Admiralty, 1939-40, Prime Minister, First Lord of the Treasury, and Minister of Defense since 1940, author of a long list of books, including *Masborough*, (4 vols) 1933+, *Blood, Sweat, and Tears*, 1941

COFFEE, J M (1897-) Born in Tacoma, Washington, A B, University of Washington, 1918, LL B, 1920, J D, Yale, 1921, admitted to Washington bar, 1922, member of Congress since 1937, contributor of articles to liberal and labor periodicals

COFFIN, HENRY SLOANE (1877-) Born in New York, A B, Yale, 1897, A M, 1900, New College, Edinburgh, 1897-99, University of Marburg, 1899, Th D, 1930, B D., Union Theological Seminary, 1900, D D, New York University and other institutions, Litt D, Hamilton and other institutions, many other honorary degrees, pastor of Bedford Park Church

(Presbyterian) 1900-05, pastor, Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, 1906-26, associate professor of practical theology, Union Theological Seminary, 1904-26, president of Union Theological Seminary since 1926, member of Phi Beta Kappa, author of *The Creed of Jesus*, 1907, *University Sermons*, 1941, *What to Preach*, 1926, and a number of other books

CROCKER, LIONEL G (1897-) Born in Ann Arbor, Michigan, A B, University of Michigan, 1918, United States Army, 1918-19, instructor in English, University of Michigan, 1918-20, professor of English, Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan, 1920-21, professor of speech, Floating University, 1926-28, professor of speech, Denison University, since 1928, author of *Henry Ward Beecher's Rhetorical Theory*, 1934, *Henry Ward Beecher's Speaking Art*, 1937, *Public Speaking for College Students*, 1941

CUSHMAN, ROBERT E (1889-) Born in Akron, Ohio, A B, Oberlin, 1911, Ph D, Columbia, 1917, teacher of political science, University of Illinois, 1915-19, University of Minnesota, 1919-23, professor and head of department of political science, Cornell University, since 1923, author of *American National Government* (with S P Orth) 1931, and other books

DAVIS, ELMER HOLMES (1890-). Born in Aurora, Indiana; A B, Franklin College, 1910, A M, 1911, Rhodes scholar, Oxford, A B, 1912, staff of *The New York Times*, 1914-24, news-analyst Columbia Broadcasting System, 1939-42; appointed director of the Office of War Information, June, 1942

FLEMING, DENNA F (1893-) Born in Paris, Illinois, graduate of Eastern Illinois State Normal School, 1912, A B University of Illinois, 1916, A M, 1920, Ph D, 1928, instructor in Illinois high schools, 1912-14, 1916-17, 1919-22; teacher at Monmouth College, 1922-27, teacher at Vanderbilt University since 1928, with A E F in First World War, Delta Sigma Rho, author of *The Treaty Veto of the American Senate*, 1930, *The United States and World Organization*, 1938, and other books

GANNON, ROBERT I (1893-) Born at St George, Staten Island, New York, A B, Georgetown University, 1913, Litt D, 1937, A M, Woodstock College, 1919, S T D, Gregorian University, 1927, M A, Christ's College, Cambridge University, 1930, LL D, Manhattan, Holy Cross, and other colleges; instructor in English and philosophy, Fordham University, 1919-23, dean of St Peter's College, 1930-36, dean of Hudson College of Commerce and Finance, 1932-35, president of Fordham University since 1936, author of *The Technique of the One-Act Play*, 1925

HENDERSON, LEON (1895-) Born in Millville, New Jersey, A B, Swarthmore College, 1920, University of Pennsylvania, 1920-23, instructor, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, 1919-22, assistant professor of economics Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1922-23, director of Consumer Credit Research, Russell Sage Foundation, 1925-34, economic adviser to various public and private agencies, commissioner Securities and Exchange Commission, 1939-41, administrator of Office of Price Administration since 1941; officer in First World War, 1917-19

HOWELL, W S (1904-) Born in Wayne, New York, Addison High School, 1920, Cornell University, A B, 1924, A M, 1928, Ph D, 1931, University of Paris, 1928-29, instructor, public speaking, Iowa State College, 1924-25, Washington University (Saint Louis), 1925-27, Cornell University, 1927-28, 1929-30, Harvard University, 1930-33, assistant professor of public speaking, Dartmouth College, 1933-34, assistant professor of public speaking, Princeton University, 1934-40, associate professor since 1940, author of *The Rhetoric of Alcuin and Charlemagne, A Translation with Notes* (with Hoyt H Hudson), "Daniel Webster," in *Studies in the History and Criticism of American Public Speaking*, member of Phi Beta Kappa, Delta Sigma Rho

LASSWELL, HAROLD D (1902-) Born in Donnellson, Illinois, Ph B, University of Chicago, 1922, Ph D, 1926, stu-

dent, University of London, Geneva, Paris, Berlin, 1923-25, teacher of political science, University of Chicago, 1922-38, political scientist, School of Psychiatry, Washington, D C, 1939, director of War Communication research for Library of Congress, member of Delta Sigma Rho, author of *Labor Attitudes and Problems* (with W E Atkins), 1924, *Propaganda Technique in the World War*, 1927, *Psychopathology and Politics*, 1930, *Propaganda and Promotional Activities*, 1935, and other books; associate editor, *Public Opinion Quarterly*

MACLEISH, ARCHIBALD (1892-) Born in Glencoe, Illinois, educated Hotchkiss School, A B, Yale, 1915, hon Litt D, 1939, LL B, Harvard, 1919, honorary degrees from Tufts, Wesleyan, Colby, captain, First World War, author (verse), *The Pot of Earth*, 1925, *Conquistador* (Pulitzer poetry prize), 1932, *The Fall of The City* (verse play for radio), 1937, and other works, appointed librarian of Library of Congress, 1939; appointed director of Office of Facts and Figures, 1941.

MCKEON, RICHARD P (1900-) Born in Union Hill, New Jersey, A B, A M, Columbia, 1920, University of Paris, 1922-25, Ph D, Columbia, 1928, instructor in philosophy, Columbia, 1925-29, assistant professor 1929-35, professor of Greek at University of Chicago since 1935, professor of philosophy since 1937, dean of Division of Humanities since 1935, United States Navy, 1918, author, *Philosophy of Spinoza*, 1928, co-author, *Studies in the History of Idea*, vol 3, 1935, editor, translator, *Selections from Medieval Philosophers*, 1929-30

MCNUTT, PAUL V (1891-) Born in Franklin, Indiana, A B, University of Indiana, 1913, LL B, Harvard, 1916, LL D, various colleges and universities, including Notre Dame and Indiana University, assistant professor of law, Indiana University, 1917, professor 1919-25; dean, Indiana University Law School, 1925-33, Governor, State of Indiana, 1933-37, U S High Commissioner to Philippine Islands, 1939; administrator of Federal Security Agency since July, 1939, major, United States Army, 1917-1918, officer in various educational organi-

zations, Phi Beta Kappa, national commander of the American Legion, 1928-29, co-editor, *Indiana General Corporation Act Annotated*, contributor to various journals

NELSON, DONALD M (1888-) Born in Hannibal, Missouri, B S, University of Missouri, 1911, chemical engineer with Sears Roebuck and Co, 1912-21, various other offices with that firm, executive vice president, chairman of executive committee since 1939, chairman of the War Production Board since 1941

PATTERSON, RICHARD C, JR (1886-) Born in Omaha, Nebraska, studied at University of Nebraska, 1905, E M, Columbia School of Mines, 1912, engineer, Du Pont de Nemours and Co, 1921-22, executive vice president and director, National Broadcasting Co, 1932-36, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, 1938-39, chairman of board of Radio-Keith-Orpheum Corporation since 1939, captain and major in France in the First World War, leader in many philanthropic, and public activities

PRENTIS, H W, JR (1884-) Born in St Louis, Missouri, A B, University of Missouri, 1903, A M, University of Cincinnati, 1907, LL D, Hampden-Sydney College (Virginia) and other colleges, with the Armstrong Cork Co since 1907, president since March, 1934, president and director of National Association of Manufacturers, member of Phi Beta Kappa

ROOSEVELT, FRANKLIN DELANO (1882-) Born in Hyde Park, New York, A B, Harvard, 1904, attended Columbia University Law School, 1904-07, honorary degrees from Rutgers, Yale, Notre Dame, and other institutions, began practicing law in New York, 1907, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, 1913-20, Governor of New York, 1929-33, President of the United States since 1933, elected to a third term, 1941, author of *Whither Bound*, 1926, *Looking Forward*, 1933, *Political Papers*, 1938, and other books, recognized as one of the foremost speakers in America

SAYRE, FRANCIS BOWES (1885-) Born in South Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, A B, Williams College, 1909, LL B, Harvard, 1912, S J D, 1918, various honorary degrees, instructor in government at Williams, 1914-17, law faculty of Harvard, University, 1919-34, adviser in foreign affairs to Siamese Government, 1923-25, later represented Siam on various treaty commissions, director of Harvard Institute of Criminal Law, 1929-34, Assistant Secretary of State, 1933-39, U S High Commissioner to the Philippines, 1939-42, long list of honorary awards by various nations, members of Phi Beta Kappa, author of *Experiments in International Administration*, 1919, *Cases in Criminal Law*, 1927, *America Must Act*, 1935, and other books

SEVERSKY, ALEXANDER P DE (1894-) Born in Tiflis, Russia, graduate of Imperial Naval Academy of Russia, 1914, naturalized U S citizen, 1927, Russian Naval Air Service, 1915-1917 (shot down and lost right leg), test pilot and aeronautical engineer, U S Air Service, 1921; president, Seversky Aero Corporation, 1922, president, Seversky Air Craft Corporation, 1931-39, inventor of airplane devices, author of *Victory Through Air Power*, 1942

SNYDER, FRANKLYN B (1884-) Born in Middletown, Connecticut, A B, Beloit, 1905, LL D, Beloit, 1935, Colby, 1939, A M, Harvard, 1907, Ph D, 1909; L H D, Northwestern, 1939, teacher of English, Northwestern University, 1909-37, dean of Graduate School, 1934-37, vice president, 1937-39, president since 1939, member of Delta Sigma Rho, author, *English of Business* (with R S Crane), 1921, *Life of Robert Burns*, 1932, and other books

STODDARD, GEORGE D (1897-) Born in Carbondale, Pennsylvania, A B, Pennsylvania State College, 1921, diploma, University of Paris, 1923, Ph D, University of Iowa, 1925, associate in psychology and education, University of Iowa, 1925-26, assistant professor, 1926-28, associate professor of psychology, 1928-29, professor, 1929-41, also director of the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station, 1928-41, and dean of the

Graduate College, 1936-42, second lieutenant, Field Artillery, Reserve Corps, 1918-23, member of Delta Sigma Rho, executive officer of various educational societies, commissioner of education for New York State and president of New York State University since July 1, 1942, author of *Tests and Measurements in High School Instruction* (with G M Ruch), 1927, *Study Manual in Elementary Statistics* (with E F Lindquist), 1929, *Child Psychology* (with B L Wellman), 1936, and other books

STUDEBAKER, JOHN W (1887-) Born at McGregor, Iowa, A B, Leander Clark College, 1910, A M, Columbia, 1917, LL.D, Drake, 1934, superintendent of Des Moines schools, 1920-34, United States Commissioner of Education since 1934, writer of various educational texts and articles on education, director, through the Office of Education at Washington, of a large school program for education of youth as part of educational program of World War II

WALLACE, HENRY AGARD (1888-) Born in Adair County, Iowa, B S, Iowa State College, 1910, honorary M S in agriculture, 1920, editor of *Wallace's Farmer* since 1910, Secretary of Agriculture, 1937-41, Vice President of the United States since 1941, author of *America Must Choose*, 1934, *Statesmanship and Religion*, 1934, *Whose Constitution*, 1936, *Paths to Plenty*, 1938, and other books and articles on agricultural, political, and religious subjects

WELLES, SUMNER, (1892-) Born in New York City; attended Groton School, 1904-10, Harvard, 1910-14, LL D, Columbia, 1939, Secretary of Embassy at Tokyo, 1915-17, Buenos Aires, 1917-19, Department of State, 1920-22, representative of the State Department on various Pan-American missions and conferences, Under Secretary of State since 1937

WILLKIE, WENDELL LEWIS (1892-) Born in Elwood, Indiana; A B, Indiana University, 1913, LL B 1916; practiced law in Indiana and New York since 1916, president of Commonwealth and Southern Corporation, 1933-40, member of law

firm of Willkie, Owen, Otis and Baily since 1941; candidate for the Presidency of the United States on Republican ticket, 1940, although defeated polled over 22,000,000 votes, visited England, 1940, after the election; in 1941 and later strongly supported Roosevelt's foreign policy

INDEX

- Acres of diamonds, cited, 100
- Address to Congress Winston Churchill, 19-29, occasion of, 19, characteristics of, 20
- Addresses of 1941-42, general themes of, 10-11
- Air power, an agency for winning the war, 187-9, British lack of, in battles of Norway and of France, 187, source of British successes in battles of Dunkirk and of Britain, 187-8, German domination through, in Crete, 188
- Aldrich, Gene, cited, 53-4
- Allies, and lack of unity after 1919, 122
- America and isolationism *See* Isolationism
- America, effort at preparedness since fall of France, 35, war aims of, 45-73
- America accepts the challenge Franklin D Roosevelt, 30-9, occasion of, 30, characteristics of, 30, results of, 30-1
- American century, 51
- American education *See* Education
- American plan to prevent war Nicholas Murray Butler, 259-64, occasion of, 259
- American liberty *See* Liberty
- Americans, their sound judgment, 10-11, their ill-timed criticism of the British, 113
- Another "shot heard round the world" Franklyn B Snyder, 142-9, occasion of, 142
- Areopagitica, quota, 63
- Aristotle, cited, 211
- Asiatics, probable leadership of, 222
- Automobiles, curtailment in use of, 153
- Axis, war aims and methods, 22, contrasted with those of the British, 23
See also Germany, Hitler, Japan
- Barr, Stringfellow How can our schools meet the war emergency? 230-4, biographical note, 279
- Battle of Atlantic, methods of dealing with, 116
- Battle of Britain, 188
- Berle, A A, Jr The welfare of free souls, 56-63, biographical note, 279
- Beecher, Henry Ward, as speaker in England in 1863, 102
- Biographical notes, 279-87
- Blackburn, J C S, quoted, 43
- Bottlenecks in American industry, 158
- Briand, cited, 261
- British, criticism by Americans, 114, fighting spirit against Germans, 114
- Britain, reformation in, a basis for American educational philosophy, 207
- Business, responsibilities for preserving roots of American liberty, 216-17
- Butler, Nicholas Murray American plan to prevent war, 259-64, biographical note, 279-80
- Cartel, need for control of, 52
- Cavite, Japanese bombing of, 183
- Chamberlain, Joseph, an exponent of economic barriers, 261
- Chapman, Virgil On the war resolution against Japan, 40-3, biographical note, 280
- Chicago round table, 77
- Chinese, fighting spirit of, 115
- Christianity, elements in American education, 198-200, 207-8
- Churchill, Winston Address to Congress, 19-29, visit to Washington, 19, American ancestry of, 21, experience with House of Commons, 21, training in speaking, 106, quoted, 107, biographical note, 280
- Cicero, warning to Romans, 67, on oratory, 100, cited as advocate of liberty, 212, influence on colonial education, 213
- Civilian morale and the war, 110-49
- Civilization, basis in faith, 58, in loyalties, 59
- Civil liberties, importance of, 92, use in wartime, 92, relation to executive power, 93, relation to public criticism and discussion, 94, relation to winning the war, 95
- Classical learning, a basis for American educational philosophy, 207
- Coffee, John M What does freedom of speech mean to us to-day? 96-9, biographical note, 280
- Coffin, Henry Sloane God's mysterious educator, 235-45, biographical note, 280-1
- Collectivism and Hitlerism, 69

- Colleges, American, as agencies for preserving liberty through courses in American government and history, 214-15
- College students, ignorance concerning basis of freedom, 206
- Commemoration ode, quoted, 149
- Communism, faith of, 58
- Conwell, Russell, cited, 100
- Corregidor Francis B Sayre, 179-85, occasion of, 179
- Corregidor Island, retreat to, 181, battle of, 181-2
- Criticism of government, need in wartime, 85
- Crocker, Lionel Leadership and the spoken word, 100-9, biographical note, 281
- Cost of living, stabilization of, 165
- Culture, American, based on Greek, Roman, and Christian antecedents, 205
- Curriculum, defects in American educational system, 214-15, 231-3
- Cushman, Robert E How to use civil liberty in wartime, 91-5, biographical notes, 281
- Davis, Elmer If we're good enough, we can take it, 111-18, biographical note, 281
- Demagoguery, dangers from, 48
- Democracy, relation to discussion, 11, in Athens, 66, relation to individualism, 70-3, based upon knowledge by the people, 79, contrasted with totalitarianism, 80, survival through defeat of Hitler, 146, temporary restrictions during wartime, 147, relation to the people and to the government, 79
- Democratic issue Wilbur Howell, 64-73, occasion of, 64, analysis of, 64
- Demosthenes, reference to, 67
- Dictatorships, in Rome, 212
- Discussion in wartime and democracy, 11, 94
- Dixon, bomber pilot, 53-4
- Dupes See Sixth columnists
- Dutch, fighting spirit of, 115
- Education, and the study of mental hygiene, 130, and the study of diet, 131, and social studies, 132, through adult forums, 133, and the war, 191-234, in America in the nineteenth century, 193, relation to wisdom, 194, roots in ancient Greece, 196, antecedents in Rome, 196-7, and the Middle Ages, 197, present-day weaknesses of, 197, deficiencies concerning political philosophy, history, and religion, 204-5, and the culture of Greece and Rome, 205, roots in Nominalist philosophy, 207, and the British Reformation, 207, and classical learning, 207, need for adjustments to meet post-war situation, 219-24, relation to the liberal arts program, 231-4
- Eight common principles for a better world Franklin D Roosevelt, 247-50
- Emerson, quoted, 142
- Englishmen See British
- Enterprise, free and American freedom, 209
- Equality of sacrifice Leon Henderson, 161-8, occasion of, 161, criticism of, 162
- Erasmus, cited, 213
- Euripides, reference to, 65
- Evil, problem of, 237
- Faith, relation of, to science, 59, 60, a source of national strength, 59, methods of developing, 62
- Farm prices, need for stabilization of, 166
- Farragut, Admiral, quoted, 42
- Fascism See Italy, Mussolini
- Fault finders See Sixth columnists
- Fifth columnists, 54, as aids to Axis military successes, 136
- Fleming, D F "Who says it can't be done?" 265-9, biographical note, 281
- Forty hour week, its character and results, 172-3
- Fosdick, Harry E, his testimony concerning speech training, 104
- Four freedoms, character of, 50, as goals of government, 81
- France, air power and defeat of, 187
- Freedom, development, 46, exposition in Old Testament, 47, in colonial America, 47, in other countries, 47-9, basis in American belief in sacredness of personality, 208, relation to representative government, 208, relation to civil and religious liberty, 208, relation to private property, 208
- Frontiers for youth George D Stoddard, 218-29, occasion of, 218, comments on, 219
- Gannon, Robert I Wisdom before information, 191-200, biographical note, 282

- Germany, methods in this war, 23, their set-back in Lybia, 25, record as aggressors after rise of Hitler, 32, necessity for defeat of, 38, 41, the enemy of freedom, 45-7, methods of defeating, 54, anti-democratic philosophy of, 65-70, air power of, 187-9
- Gladstone, quoted, 238
- God and the utilization of evil for good ends, 237
- God's mysterious educator Henry Sloane Coffin, 235-45
- Gossipers *See* Sixth columnists
- Greece, influence of, on concept of liberty, 211
- Hague Conference, first, purpose of, 260
- Henderson, Leon Equality of sacrifice, 161-8, biographical note, 282
- How can our schools meet the war emergency? Stringfellow Barr, 230-4, comments concerning, 230
- How to use civil liberty in wartime Robert E Cushman, 91-3
- Hoarders *See* Sixth columnists
- Hitler, quoted, 67, 68, 69, 71, his influence as speaker, 105, cited on importance of speech-making, 106
See also Germany
- Holmes, Justice O W, quoted, 242
- Home front, problems of, 151-77
- Howell, Wilbur The democratic issue, 64-73, biographical note, 282
- If we're good enough, we can take it Elmer Davis, 111-18
- Ignorance, relation of, to low morale, 124
- Individualism *See* Internationalism
- Inflation, threats of, 161, checking of, through stabilizing the cost of living, 165, checking of, through stabilization of wages, 165, checking of, through stabilization of farm prices, 166, checking of, through increased taxes, 166, checking of, through rationing, 167, causes of, 174, various methods of dealing with, 174
- Information, relation of, to propaganda, 79, a basis for civilian morale, 79, 80, program for providing, 119, lack of, a cause of American unpreparedness, 121, function of government in providing for, 82-3, people's need of, in wartime, 84, limitations of, respecting military matters, 84-5, need of, concerning production, 86, relation of, to formulation of opinions, 87
- Internationalism, and the support of democracy, 221, and individualism, 221
- Irreconcilables, 255
- Isolationism and the League of Nations Wendell Willkie, 251-8
- Isolationism, prior to Pearl Harbor, 122, end of, after Pearl Harbor, 275, its failures, 252, its support of tariff barriers, 234, its primary interest in domestic reforms, 254
- Issues of the war *See* War aims
- Italy, methods of, in the war, 22, defeats of, 24-5, as aggressor, 32, at war with America, 39, air power of, 188
See also Mussolini
- Japan, military record of, in the Orient after 1931, 32, motives of, for fighting against the United Nations, 27, 28, attack on the Hawaiian Islands, 17, attack on Far Eastern objectives, 18, relations with America since 1905, 16
See also Germany, Axis
- Jefferson, debt of, to classics, 213
- Jesus, quoted, 237, 243
- Kaltenborn, H V, quoted, 108, his training and experiences in speaking, 103
- King Lear, quoted, 239
- Labor and the war Paul V McNutt, 169-77, occasion of, 169, effect of, 170
- Labor, its voluntary waiving of right to strike during the war, 171, criticisms against, 171, relation to the forty-hour week issue, 172, general defense of, 172-7
- Language study as a means of promoting internationalism, 229
- Laswell, Harold D Propaganda, good and bad, 75-90, biographical note, 282 3
- Leaders, ability of, as public speakers, 101
- Leadership and the spoken word Lioner Crocker, 100 9, occasion of, 100, characteristics of, 100
- League of Nations, its leadership, 253, failure through lack of American support, 253, membership in, opposition in Senate, 255, American rejection of, 272
- League to Enforce Peace, history of, 260 3

- Lear, character of, 238
 Lee, Josh, as speaker, 104
 Liberal arts colleges, need for admitting many to, 232, its goals, 234
See also Education
 Liberty, relation to authority, 72, relation to religion, 206-7, basis in responsibility, 210
See also Freedom
 Lippmann, Walter, quoted, 191
 Libya British campaign in, 25
 Lincoln, as speaker, 101
 Lodge, H C, as opponent of League ratification, 255
 Lowell, James Russell, quoted, 149
 Ludwig, Emil, quoted, 104, 105
 Luftwaffe, in Crete, 188
- MacArthur Day Address Donald M Nelson, 151-60, occasion of, 151, criticism of, 152
 MacArthur, General Douglas, tribute to, 152, at battle of Manila, 180
 McKeon, Richard P Propaganda, good and bad, 75-90, biographical note, 283
 MacLeish, Archibald Propaganda, good and bad, 75-90, biographical note, 283
 McNutt, Paul V Labor and the war, 169-77, biographical note, 283
 Manila, Japanese attack on, 180 1
 Marxists, influence of, on Hitler, 68
 Mellon, quoted, 65
 Mein Kampf, and speech-making, 67-9, and the ignorance of people, 70, quoted, 106
 Military front, problems of, 179-89
 Mill, John Stuart On liberty, 65
 Montesquieu, quoted, 204
 Morale, civilian, 9, its character, 120, a means of building schools and colleges, 120-2, 129, lack of, 122, education for, 123, results of, 124, place in American history, 128
 Morale building in schools and colleges John W Studebaker, 119-34, occasion of, 119, characteristics of, 119 20
 Mussolini, defeats of, 25, quoted, 104-5
 "My country," meaning of, 148 9
- Nazism, a system of one-man government, 49, doctrines of, 60, and religion 61
 Nelson, Donald M MacArthur Day Address, 151-60, biographical note, 284
 Newspapers, policy in handling war news, 34
- Nominalist philosophy, 207
 Northcliffe, Lord, cited, 99
- On the war resolution against Japan Virgil Chapman, 40-3
 Organized labor *See* Labor
 Orient, awakening to economic possibilities, 222
- Paine, Thomas, cited, 111
 Pastula, Tony, heroism of, 53-4
 Patterson, Richard C, Jr Sixth column, 135 41, biographical note, 284
 Peace *See* Post-war world
 Pearl Harbor, damage at, 33, a means of securing national unity, 143
 People, progress of, 48 50, revolution by, 51
 "People's war," 176, 276
 Peter Zenger case, cited, 98
 Plato, cited, 211
 Post-war world, organization of, 248-50, leadership in, 247-78, need for government of, 266-7, 275
 Post-war world leadership Sumner Welles, 270 8
 Prentis, H W, Jr Preserving the roots of liberty, 201-17, biographical note, 284
 Preserving the roots of liberty H W Prentis, Jr, 201-17
 Price administration, office of, 165
 Price of free world victory Henry Wallace, 45-55, occasion of, 45, criticism of, 45-6
 Prices *See* Inflation
 Principles, American, 10
 Production, policy of, 35, battle of, 53, development for war purposes, 155-6, and cooperation of employers and employees, 157, and the avoiding of bottlenecks, 157-8, and the post-war world, 159 60, needed expansion of, 163, 183-4
 Propaganda, good and bad Archibald MacLeish, Harold D Laswell and Richard P McKeon, 75-90
 Propaganda, Hitler's principles of, 71, relation to free speech and the war, 75-109, original meaning of, 77, good and bad, 78, American government and use of, 75-80, German use of, in United States, 86, German techniques of, 127, and fifth columns, 136
 Public speaking, function of, 73, importance of, 101
- Quarterly Journal of Speech, reference to, 109

- Rationing, need for, 167
See also Inflation
- Ravola, Churchill's orator in, 107
- Reed, J. A., as a "bitter ender", 255
- Religion, relation to faith, 62, relation to wisdom and to education, 195, relation to the war, 235-45
- Rescript, of the Czar, as basis for a league, 259
- Responsibility, need for American, in post-war world, 257
- Republic, cited, 211
- Revolution, principles of, in Nazi Germany, 47, evils of, 50-1, principles of, among "free" peoples, 51
- Roosevelt, Franklin D. War Addresses, 15-18, America accepts the challenge, 30-9, his training and experience at Harvard, 107, and delivery of first inaugural address, 108, his seven point economic program, 161, Eight common principles for a better world, 247-50, biographical note, 284
- Rowell, C. H., quoted, 256
- Royal air force, as defender of Britain, 188
- Rubber, need for conserving, 153, drive for securing, 154
- Russia, German invasion of, 32, as ally of the United States, 39
- Sabotage, 54
- Sacrifice, on home front, 185
- Saint John, quoted, 58
- Saint Paul, quoted, 243
- "Sapientia and Doctrina", 194
- Sayre, Francis B. Corregidor, 179-85, biographical note, 285
- Schools, as morale builders through continued operation, 129, emphasis on mental hygiene, 150, emphasis on study of diet, 131, and support of civilian defense, 131, and production in their communities, 132, and vocational studies, 132, 231, and social studies, 132, and adult education, 133
- Security, Nazi threats against, 37
- Seversky, Alexander P. de Will air power win this war? 186-9, biographical note, 285
- Sixth column, The Richard C. Patterson, Jr., 135-41
- Sixth columnists, relation to fifth columnists, 137, as dupes, 137, as gossipers, 138, as fault finders, 138, as shirkers, 139, as skeptics, 139, as hoarders, 139, as wasters, 140
- Skeptics *See* Sixth columnists
- Snyder, Franklyn B. Another "shot heard round the world" 142-9, biographical note, 285
- Speech, freedom in wartime, 97, relation to Bill of Rights, 97, limitations by court decisions, 98
- Speaking, standards of, 11
- 'Speaking for victory', and study of war speeches, 9
- Stabilization of cost of living, 165
- Specialization, undue, 197
- Standards of living, 163
- Stimson, Secretary, on Manchuria, 121
- Stoddard, George D. Frontiers for youth, 218-29, biographical note, 285-6
- Strategy, German Japanese, 38, probable character of, 54
- Stresemann, cited, 261
- Strikes, diminution of, after Pearl Harbor, 172
- Students, need for, in wartime, 225, and post-war problems, 226-7
- Studebaker, John W. Morale building in our schools and colleges, 119-34, biographical note, 286
- Suppliants, The, cited, 65
- Taxes, need for increasing federal, 166
- Teachers of public speaking, their future, 73
- Thomas, Lowell, as a speaker, 102, quoted, 102-3
- Tires *See* Automobiles, Rubber
- Tolischus, Otto D., quoted, 105
- Understanding, relation of, to morale, 122, failure of, a cause of American unpreparedness, 124
See also Morale
- United States Office of Education, 11
- Unity, national, 143, contrasted with disunity in previous wars, 144, means of strengthening, 145
- University, mission of, in teaching of "wisdom", 200
- Vichy, its support of the Axis, 117
- Wages, stabilization of, 165-6
- Wallace, Henry. The price of free world victory, 45-55, biographical note, 286
- What does freedom of speech mean to us to-day? John M. Coffee, 96-9
- War aims *See* War
- War address Franklin D. Roosevelt, 15-18, background of, 16-17

- War, probable length of, 24, issues of, 46, justification of, 145, its purposes, 225, and individual preparedness, 223, and American unity, 239, and social advance, 240, and racial equality, 240, and international good will, 241, as an educator, 242
- War information, office of, 11
- Warfare of free souls, A. A. Berle, Jr., 56-63
- War Labor Board, 175
- War news, 112
- War plants, production through, 155
- Wasters *See* Sixth columnists
- Webster, Daniel, quoted, 64, 65, 203
- Welles, Sumner Post-war world leadership, 270-8, biographical note, 286
- Westminster Abbey, bombing of, 41
- "Who says it can't be done?" D. F. Fleming, 265-9
- Will air power win this war? Alexander P. de Seversky, 186-9
- William of Ockham, 207
- Willkie, Wendell, quoted, 109, his training and experience in speaking, 103, Isolationism and the League of Nations, 251-8, biographical note, 286-7
- Wilson, Woodrow, cited, 85, as spokesman for the League of Nations, 255
- Wisdom before information Robert I. Gannon, 191-200
- Wisdom, need in education, 194, meaning of, 194, and study of past, 196, in Greece, 196, in Rome, 197, in Renaissance and modern schools, 197
- Wordsworth, quoted, 272
- World unity, economic, 221
- Wyclif, John, influence of, on education, 207

CUMULATIVE AUTHOR INDEX

An author index to the volumes of *Representative American Speeches*, for the years 1937-1938, 1938-1939, 1939-1940, 1940-1941, and 1941-1942. The date following the title of each speech indicates the volume in which it appears.

- Ackerman, C W Role of the press as a factor in public opinion and economic changes 1937-38 198-209
- Barkley, A W Foreign policies of Roosevelt 1938-39 53-9
- Barr, Stringfellow How can our schools meet the war emergency? 1941-42 230-4
- Barton, Bruce Faith of Lincoln 1939-40 161-72
- Berle, A A Jr The warfare of free souls 1941-42 56-63
- Blackwelder, O F The contribution of the Christian faith 1940-41 255-62
- Borah, W E Against the repeal of embargo 1939-40 38-52, Anti-lynching bill 1937-38 17-38, Possible results of a European war 1938-39 29-35
- Butler, N M The American plan to prevent war 1941-42 259-64, Which way is progress? 1937-38 138-45, Why war? 1938-39 13-17
- Cameron, W J Christmas, 1940 1940-41 232-4, Rock and flood 1940-41 235-7
- Carter, Boake Germany takes Austria 1937-38 97-100
- Chapman, Virgil On the war resolution against Japan 1941-42 40-3
- Chester, C M Management's new responsibilities in our changing social economy 1939-40 293-305
- Churchill, Winston Address to congress 1941-42 19-29
- Clark, B C Rearmament 1938-39 71-6
- Coffee, John M What does freedom of speech mean to us to-day? 1941-42 96-9
- Coffin, Henry Sloane God's mysterious education 1941-42 235-45
- Compton, A H Science and religion 1939-40 421-6
- Conant, J B Unique ideal of American life 1939-40 337-45
- Conklin, E G Education for democracy 1939-40. 346-63
- Coughlin, C E Spirit of the re-organization bill 1937-38 111-21
- Crocker, Lionel Leadership and the spoken word 1941-42 100-9
- Cushman, Robert E How to use civil liberty in wartime 1941-42 91-5
- Cutten, G B Arise, let us go hence 1938-39. 210-20
- Danaher, J A Should the English-speaking democracies unite now? A debate 1940-41 209-24
- Davis, Elmer Finland surrenders 1939-40 63-7, If we're good enough, we can take it 1941-42 111-18
- Day, E E What really threatens American democracy? 1938-39 79-86
- Dewey, T E Calendar of unpunished crimes 1939-40 257-65, Hines policy-numbers case 1938-39 181-3, Inside story of a racket 1937-38 163-75
- Donovan, W J Shall we do whatever is necessary to insure a British victory? A debate 1940-41 33-48
- Douglas, W O The function of democracy 1940-41 225-31
- Durant, Will Crisis in American civilization 1939-40, 208-29
- Duranty, Walter Soviet Russia at war Round table discussion 1940-41 168-83
- Dykstra, C A Individual and the democratic adventure 1939-40 141-54
- Eastman, J B How can we solve the railroad problem? 1938-39 138-41
- Farley, J A Politics as a profession for business men 1939-40 266-74
- Fleming, D F "Who says it can't be done?" 1941-42 265-9

296 REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN SPEECHES

- Fosdick, H E Being civilized to death. 1937-38 210-19, Ethical problems of neutrality 1939-40, 427-37, Jesus' ethical message confronts the world 1938-39 223-33
- Frank, Glenn Essential differences between the Republican and Democratic parties A debate 1939 40 233-56
- Gannon, Robert I Wisdom before information 1941-42 191-200
- Gilkey, C W Bridges into a better world 1938-39 234-44
- Gottschalk, Louis Soviet Russia at war Round table discussion 1940-41 168 83
- Green, William Labor, freedom and democracy 1940-41 243-54
- Harper, S N Soviet Russia at war Round table discussion 1940 41 168-83
- Henderson, Leon Equality of sacrifice 1941-42 161-8
- Hildebrand, J H Are we educating for national strength? 1940-41 271-91
- Hillman, Sidney Agriculture, industry, and labor 1938-39 142-57
- Holmes, J H One supreme issue of the hour 1939-40, 391-407
- Hoover, Herbert National defense 1939-40, 126-37, Protection of democracy 1937-38 80-96, The question of peace 1940-41 196-208
- Howell, Wilbur The democratic issue 1941-42 64-75
- Hughes, C E Judiciary 1937-38 176-83, 150th anniversary of the first Congress 1938-39 161-5
- Hull, Cordell Opening of the Pan American Conference 1938-39 40-52
- Hutchins, R M Organization and subject matter of general education 1938-39, 199-209, Philosophy of life 1937-38 184-9, Shall we do whatever is necessary to insure a British victory? A debate 1940-41 33-48
- Irwin, W A American way 1939-40 183-90
- Jackson, R H Essential differences between the Republican and Democratic parties A debate 1939 40 233-56
- Kaltenborn, H V Czechoslovakia capitulates 1938-39 18-21, Germany invades Holland and Belgium 1939-40 68-75, Hitler's fifty-second birthday 1940-41 149-56
- Krueger, Maynard Propaganda 1939-40 191-207
- La Follette, R M jr American foreign policy 1937-38 69-79
- Lasswell, Harold D Propaganda, good and bad 1941-42 75-90
- Lee, J B Drafting of wealth in time of war 1938-39 60-4, Technological unemployment and relief 1938-39 108-18
- Lewis, J L In support of Willkie 1940-41 113-24
- Lindbergh, C A Our air defense 1940-41 75-81
- Lippmann, Walter Education without culture 1940-41 292-309, Rise of personal government in the United States 1937-38 122-37
- Lundeen, Ernest America's policy toward insular possessions of other countries 1939-40 86 116
- McKeon, Richard P Propaganda, good and bad 1941-42 75-90
- MacLesh, Archibald Propaganda, good and bad 1941-42 75-90
- McNutt, Paul V Labor and the war 1941-42 169-77
- Miller, C R Propaganda 1939-40 191-207
- Millikan, R A Science and the world tomorrow 1938-39 187-93
- Moulton, H G Wartime price control 1940-41 82 92
- Murphy, Frank Civil liberties 1938-39 173-80
- Muirrow, E R Spring comes to England 1940-41 157-62
- Nelson, Donald M MacArthur day address 1941-42 151-60
- Nye, G P Jr For an adequate defense 1938-39 65-70, Neutrality 1939-40 53-60, What does the European situation mean to us? 1937 38 54-60
- Patterson, Richard C The sixth column 1941-42 135-41
- Pepper, Claude All-out aid to Britain 1940 41 49-57
- Peterson, H C Propaganda 1939-40 191-207

- Phelps, W L Acceptance of American Education Award 1939-40 364-74
- Prentiss, H W Jr Preserving the roots of liberty 1941 42 201-17
- Reynolds, Robert America's policy toward insular possession of other countries 1939-40 86-116
- Roosevelt, E A Civil liberties—the individual and the community 1939-40, 173-82
- Roosevelt, F D America accepts the challenge 1941 42 30-9, Canadian position of the United States 1938-39 25-8, Four human freedoms 1940-41 185-6, Eight common principles for a better world 1941-42 247-50, Italy enters the war 1939-40 76-83, Message to Congress 1939-40 26-37, National defense 1939-40 117-25, New Deal must continue 1938-39 97-107, Preservation of American independence 1940 41 19-32, Republican leadership and national defense 1940-41 123-36, Second inaugural address 1937-38 11-16, A state of emergency exists 1940 41 57-74, This nation will remain neutral 1939-40 21 5, United States policy toward war 1938-39 36-9, Victory Dinner address 1937-38 101-10, War address 1941-42 15-18
- Ryan, J A Religion, the indispensable basis of democracy 1939-40 408-20
- Sayre, Francis B Corregidor 1941-42 179-85
- Schwellenbach, L B America's policy toward insular possessions of other countries 1939-40 86-116
- Seversky, Alexander P de Will air power win this war? 1941-42 186-9
- Sheen, F J Liberty and the republic 1938 39 245-52
- Smith, T V Forward America A debate 1938-39 119-37
- Snyder, Franklyn B Another "shot heard round the world" 1941-42 142 9
- Spellman, F J The one road to peace 1940-41 187-95
- Stoddard, George D Frontiers for youth 1941-42 218-29
- Studebaker, J W Democracy shall not be plowed under 1939-40 375-87, Morale building in our schools and colleges 1941-42 119-34
- Swing, R G The wheel of judgment 1940-41 163-7
- Taft, R A Forward America A debate 1938-39 119-37
- Taylor, Deems Universality of music 1940-41 238-42
- Thomas, E D America's policy toward the insular possessions of other countries 1939 40 86-116
- Thomas, Norman America's duty in time of crisis 1939-40 275-89, No democracy without civil liberty 1937-38 45-51
- Thompson, Dorothy Let's face the facts 1940-41 137-48, Should the English-speaking democracies unite now? A debate 1940-41 209-24, Stopping propaganda 1938-39 87-93, What does the European situation mean to us? 1937 38 60-7
- Tugwell, R G For a third term 1938-39 166-72
- Valentine, Alan Mobilizing the mind 1940-41 263-70
- Vandenberg, A H Memorial Day address 1937-38 39-44
- Wallace, Henry Community of interest between labor, capital and agriculture 1937-38 142 62, The price of free world victory 1941-42 45 55
- Waymack, W W Challenge of America 1939-40 155-60
- Welles, Sumner Post war world leadership 1941-42 270-8
- Wheeler, Burton United Mine Workers' Convention 1939-40 316-26
- Willkie, Wendell Acceptance speech 1940-41 93-112, Isolationism and the League of Nations 1941-42 251-8, Why are you unemployed? 1939-40 306-15
- Woll, Matthew Labor's contribution to American democracy 1939-40 327-34
- Young, O D Science of better living 1937-38 190-7

UNIVERSITY DEBATERS' ANNUALS

E. M. PHELPS, Ed. Cloth. Price \$2.25

Series of year books, each a collection of representative intercollegiate debates on important questions of the day. Constructive and rebuttal speeches for both sides. Each debate is accompanied by selected bibliography and briefs.

Vol. XXVIII. 1941-1942.

Federal Incorporation of Labor Unions, A League of Nations; Military Training; Failure of Colleges to Meet Student Needs, A Federation of Democracies Based on the Churchill-Roosevelt Principles, A Federal Sales Tax; Compulsory Saving, Post-War Reconstruction, Western Hemisphere Solidarity, Civil Liberties

Vol. XXVII. 1940-1941.

Industry Can Solve the Employment Problem, Conservation of Capital for Defense, Preservation of Democracy Through Decreased Government Control; Interstate Trade Barriers, Japanese Aggression, Union of United States and British Commonwealth of Nations, Regulation of the American Press, Compulsory Military Training; Strikes in Defense Industries; Western Hemisphere Defense

Vol. XXVI. 1939-1940.

The Basis of a Lasting Peace; Shall the United States Enter the War?, Government Ownership and Operation of Railroads, Neutrality of the United States; Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements, The Third Term for President, Should the Roosevelt Administration Be Approved?, The Dies Committee, Civil Liberties, Labor; Foreign Affairs; Government and Business.

Vol. XXV. 1938-1939.

The Increase in the National Debt; The Anglo-American Alliance, Government Ownership and Operation of the Railroads; Alliance of United States, France and Great Britain Against Fascism, Have the Achievements of Science Brought Progress?, American Solidarity; The Problem of Unemployment, The American Newspaper, "Pump-priming" Should Cease; Government and Health

Vol. XXIV. 1937-1938.

Democracy and Economic Prosperity; American Isolation from European Affairs, Protection of United States Citizens on Foreign Soil; Academic Freedom; Grades and Final Tests Subversive of the Aims of Higher Education; American League of Nations; Anglo-American Mutual Assistance Pact; N.L.R.A. and Arbitration of Industrial Disputes, Unicameral Legislatures, Uniform Marriage Laws, Regulation of Advertising

Vol. XXIII. 1936-1937.

The Constitution a Menace, Government Ownership of Electric Utilities, Subsidizing College Athletes, Teachers' Oaths; Unicameral Legislatures, Economic Internationalism, Minimum Wages and Maximum Hours (two debates); Consumers' Cooperatives, The Present-day Family as a Social Institution; The Sit-down Strike

Vol. XXII. 1935-1936.

A Written Constitution a Hindrance to Social Progress, State Medicine, Compulsory Military Training, Legalization of Sweepstakes, Admission of Negroes to State Universities, The Neutrality Policy of the United States, The Parole System, Admission of Hawaii as a State; Limitation of the Power of the Supreme Court (two debates)

Vol. XXI. 1934-1935.

Equalizing Educational Opportunity, An Evaluation of the New Deal, Social Services and Unemployment Relief, International Traffic in Arms and Munitions, Democratic Collectivism; The Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Collective Bargaining; Government Ownership and Operation of Public Utilities, Pacifism the Highest Form of Patriotism, Japan and Naval Parity

Vol. XX. 1933-1934.

British System of Radio Control and Operations, Armed Intervention, Japanese Policy in the Far East; A Department of the Consumer in the President's Cabinet, University of Chicago Plan of Education; Economic Reconstruction; Increasing the Powers of the President, Socialized Medicine; Freer Trade, Problem of State Liquor Control

Vol. XIX. 1932-1933.

Limitation by Law of Gifts, Incomes and Inheritance, Property Taxation for State and Local Revenue, British System of Radio Control, Safety-Responsibility Plan of Automobile Insurance, Voluntary Domestic Allotment Plan; Federal Regulation of Electric Power Utilities, Dictatorship Versus Democracy; Capitalism Has Broken Down, Peace Is Impossible Under Capitalism, Stimson Doctrine of Non-recognition of Territory Acquired Through Violation of Treaties

Vols. XII-XVIII. available. Contents furnished on request.

.

CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL PROBLEMS: DISCUSSION SERIES

Three profound studies based on important college debate questions, these books are planned to provide the coach and his debate squad and classes with sound background material. Special features are: problems, required readings, and examinations.

Each book presents basic material on a problem of great social significance, and is a compilation of opinions of recognized authorities. They deal comprehensively with the underlying events that have preceded an existing crisis and discuss possible solutions from many angles. Bibliographies and review questions follow each chapter.

No.

1. **Government spending and economic recovery.**
C. F. Phillips and J. V. Garland 1938. \$2.
2. **American neutrality problem.** C. F. Phillips and
J. V. Garland. 1939. \$2
3. **War and the Americas.** J. V. Garland 1940. \$2.