• Luncheon Honoring Philippine Generals Santos & Valdez, Manila [January 1939]

Our honored guests, this noon, have been the two senior officers of the Philippine Army practically from the date of its founding. No one could possibly be more familiar with the work they have done during the past three years, with the energy, the thought, the character, they have devoted to their duties, than myself. It is for this reason that I felt privileged to ask you to meet with me today in tribute to them, at the moment when one of them leaves the Army to assume another important position in the service of his people, while the other moves up to shoulder the responsibilities of the highest military post.

Recently, I attended a movie in which one obstreperous female character asserted, each time she opened her mouth, that she spoke for two million club-women of the United States. Unlike that person, I am not authorized to speak for any group or sect, for any military or civil organization, or even for any individual except only Ike Eisenhower. But to my own opinions as to the loyalty, abilities and worthwhile accomplishments of Generals Santos and Valdez in the Philippine Army, I can and do give the most emphatic expression. Confirmation of my convictions can be found in every district, every city, every barrio of the Philippines. Slow but steady development of a real defensive force, progress toward greater unification of a people through intermingling in training station, better physiques among the trainees, greater observance of rules of health and hygiene and, finally, a definitely enhancing appreciation of the requirements of democratic citizenship, are but a few of the accomplishments traceable wholly or in part to the gradual unfolding of the defense plan. In this process our honor guests have played important, untiring and effective parts.

My years of intimate contacts and personal friendship with these two men have been, for me, a real privilege and a source of inspiration. So it is with sincerity and earnestness that I congratulate the Mindanao re-settlement organization on its good fortune in obtaining General Santos as its Manager, and the Philippine Army in having General Valdez to serve as its Chief of Staff.

A moment ago I said that I spoke for no one but myself. Now I should like to modify that statement momentarily, and to this extent. If there is present any man that will not permit me to speak for him in wishing for General Santos and General Valdez a full measure of happiness in their new assignments, and unbroken continuation of their illustrious careers, then that man was invited here today by mistake. For I am determined that this thought shall be the sense of this meeting - enthusiastically adopted - by acclamation.

• ROTC commencement exercises, University of the Philippines, March 24, 1939

The Commonwealth Government is presently engaged in the development and utilization of its resources to meet the anticipated problems of future independence. In the fields of economics, politics, industry, social science, education and national security, great questions present themselves constantly for consideration, and the effects of answers developed today will extend indefinitely into the future. Among these questions, none is clothed in greater significance than that of providing an adequate security - of developing the means and methods that will assure reasonable protection for the nation once it has been completely freed of all outside control, and, coincidentally, stripped of all outside support.

Military discussions need not, in these days, be prefaced with long and exhaustive arguments to prove a nation's need for defensive strength. World events, daily reported in our newspapers, continue to hammer home the deplorable fact that life, liberty and property are not safe in a defenseless nation when its wealth is coveted by a more powerful neighbor. Indeed, this is not a newly discovered truth - two thousand years ago the greatest of all men said, “When a strong man, armed, keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace.”

In the program adopted by the Philippines to meet its defensive requirements, the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps is an indispensable feature. Consequently, in a very direct and important fashion, the destiny of an independent Philippines will be influenced and determined by the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps of today and of tomorrow.

Because of the great significance to future Filipino welfare of this organization I feel particularly honored in the invitation to address you today. Entertaining such a conviction, I have not come here merely to offer you customary, though very sincere, congratulations upon the obvious perfection of your military ceremonies, nor upon the completion of another definite step in your academic and military education. Neither shall I attempt, in resounding generality, to expound upon those ennobling human sentiments and beautiful philosophies that are so frequently the subject of the commencement discourse. Rather, I am here to talk to you as one soldier to another on military matters that I am convinced will become of increasing importance to you and to your country as the years roll on.

As members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps you are primarily citizens, and secondarily, soldiers. In the first of these capacities you enjoy all the rights and privileges of any other citizen; in the other you are compelled to forego such of those rights and privileges as involve participation in the political activities, decisions and policies of your nation. This distinction must be meticulously observed, because, in a democracy, the military is and must remain subordinate to civil power; the army is nothing but the servant, the tool, of civil government. Since this discussion is between soldiers, let us not concern ourselves with the wisdom of any political decision of the past or speculate on the possibility of significant political changes of the future. Rather, let us accept the political pattern as it now exists and as now projected by existing conventions, and confine ourselves to an investigation of our own duties, our own responsibilities and our own opportunities within this sphere.

The Philippine Defense plan was conceived in the purpose of providing maximum security at minimum financial cost. Of such dominating influence was, and is, the need for minimizing expense, that all thought of developing a strong professional army had to be flatly rejected. For this reason if for no other, the citizen-soldier must be the bulwark of Philippine defense! Lack of money with which to hire workmen for any task is not serious, provided we are ready, and able, to do the job ourselves. So long as there exists among a nation's citizens a common and flaming determination to protect themselves and their homes against any invasion by force, they can, in unified effort, develop a formidable defensive power. The Philippine Defense plan assumes that this spirit does exist and will continue to grow and flourish in these Islands.

As a consequence of these considerations and assumptions, the defense plan simply provides the machinery whereby the free citizens of this country may cooperate toward their own protection. They must be reasonably trained, properly equipped, well organized and efficiently led, so that they may be instantaneously ready in every province and barrio to line your beaches with the defensive fires that will beat back any attempted invasion. The plans attempt to provide, in detail, for satisfaction of these various requirements.

The function of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, in this great program, is to develop commissioned officers for the citizen forces; that is, for the great bulk of the whole Army.

The officer is the keystone of the military arch. No army can carry out a difficult task, indeed it can scarcely perform the routine functions of peace without an efficient officer corps. Ragged armies, poorly equipped, badly outnumbered and half starved have, in the world's history, earned astounding victories when efficiently led. On the other hand, I know of no army in which the officer corps was rotten with corruption or professionally was inept, lazy and stupid, that has achieved decisive results, even over an inconsequential opponent.

You are a cross-section of the Philippines' finest young manhood, a cross-section that has been unusually favored in educational and cultural advantages, and possibly, also in economic standing. You are the men to whom others of your generation will naturally turn, in times of stress, for leadership. If, in that greatest of all crises, war, you are to be worthy of your birthright, and ready upon your country's call to lead men in battle, it means years of study and self-preparation.

There is no royal road to this goal - good blood and breeding may produce an excellent raw material, but only earnest and continued work can transform it into a useful lieutenant, an efficient captain, a capable general. Successful defense of these Islands will never be possible unless you devote yourselves to this work, this study, this preparation, even while you are engaged in wresting a living from the world for yourselves and your dependents. Furthermore, you must do this without financial remuneration, your sole reward the sanctity of your firesides, the esteem of your countrymen and the approval of your own conscience.

Here, then, is the challenge to you as individuals and as an organization. Will you make of yourselves good

officers? Between success and failure lies a vast gulf of personal and national possibilities - even perhaps the difference between virile independence and hopeless bondage.

The thorough training of an officer is an intricate process. On the physical side he must develop his stamina and strength, as well as a certain dexterity in those movements and exercises in which he, as a junior officer, is required to be an instructor. His mental training includes general, as well as a variety of technical subjects such as organization, armament, tactics, supply and logistics. He must specialize in aviation, infantry, artillery or another of the arms or services. He must develop his analytical powers, his judgment, his initiative. He must know something of practical or applied psychology, he must be a bit of a doctor, an engineer, something even of a butcher, a baker and a cook. On the moral side he must be fair and just, honest and straight-forward; he must learn to make firm decisions and to accept responsibility for them without seeking to shift it either to superior or subordinate. He must understand men so that he may lead rather than merely command them; he must achieve self-confidence and courage, and, finally, he must be loyal - loyal to his Government, to his superiors, to himself and to his subordinates.

These qualifications may not be forced upon any individual. He may be assisted in their acquisition, he may be advised, he may be instructed, but in the final analysis, they come only of his own intense desire, his own straight-thinking and understanding, his own work, his own sweat!

The government provides you necessary equipment, it assigns instructors and it prescribes courses of training designed to teach you professional technique, and calculated to develop your powers of leadership. In the class room and on the drill ground the officer may learn much; but his natural field of instruction is on the march and in camp with his men. There he practices as he learns, and he learns with his mind, his muscles, and his heart. Never, so long as you are serious in your desire to develop yourself into a good officer, pass by an opportunity to go to the field with the men of your command. Every minute so spent will yield untold dividends if the time should come when the mobilization call is not for training, but for war.

Though by law you are obligated to such military service as your country may demand of you - your great President and your Government have not failed to realize that service performed only on a required basis cannot assure the ultimate safety of the Philippines. Woodrow Wilson once said “The highest form of efficiency is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people.” The Philippine plan goes even farther than this. It says, in effect, “The defense of the Philippines is completely dependent upon the spontaneous cooperation of its citizens, the law is nothing more than the written expression of a universal purpose.”

Your part, as the potential leaders in this cooperative enterprise, consequently requires more than routine work in the instructional courses laid out for you. These must be pursued thoroughly, willingly, even eagerly. The impulse for greater opportunity to learn should come from you - not from the Government. Never should we hear of a Filipino seeking to avoid military instruction, and if there should be any such, the contempt of his fellows should silence him forever. Moreover, you men, selected for training as leaders in time of war should also be the crusaders for and the shining examples of this cooperative spirit, in time of peace. Just as you have more than the average to lose in the event of national disaster, so should you, aside from nobler and more unselfish reasons, be most active in providing insurance against disaster. No physically fit young man in the universities and colleges of these Islands should permit himself to be excluded from the complete ROTC instruction. Let your actions prove to the contrary that the ROTC places pride of service above personal convenience, duty above immediate economic gain. When this organization, operating in this spirit, is graduating yearly into the Reserve ranks of the Army at least 2,000 young, eager, well-trained lieutenants, who, thereafter will pursue higher courses of instruction to the limit of their respective abilities, then the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps will be doing its full duty to the nation.

No person familiar with the long record of this institution in contributing to Filipino progress and welfare, and with the reputation of its President and faculty for public spirited leadership, can doubt that, assembled on this campus, are all the ingredients necessary to success. The result is in your hands - and if you meet the issue with courage and determination, then each of you will be doing his part in assuring that the future of the Philippine Islands will be as a beautiful and enduring edifice, in which the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps will be one of the principal supporting pillars.

• Radio Talk for the American Red Cross, February 28, 1943

I am asked to send an appeal from our soldiers in North Africa for subscriptions for the American Red Cross. But this is not any appeal - merely a statement of fact. Because I know that when American citizens realize that the Red Cross is the constant and faithful friend of our fighting armies, any donation requested will be over-subscribed in a single day. The Red Cross is the single agency in campaign that brings to your brother, husband, son or friend those comforting things that are not part of official equipment. Wherever your particular soldier is and whatever duty he is performing, the Red Cross is nearby to learn of his wants and to satisfy them. It hands him a smoke when he has none of his own; it gives him a razor, tooth paste, a piece of candy or some other item that may, for the moment, seem to him to be the most important thing he could get. In Red Cross clubs, big and little, wherever there are troops concentrated, it provides a homelike atmosphere, where the soldier gets good coffee, reads a book or a magazine, or just relaxes among people that he knows to be his friends. Can you not imagine what that means to him? If he is in the hospital, special attention is given by some Red Cross woman who will bring to him anything possible to add to his contentment.

In the past two years North Africa has been stripped of those articles that you obtain daily at the corner drug store. Here the soldier cannot walk in and buy any of the things that are so necessary to his comfort, sometimes almost to his existence. The Red Cross takes your subscription, transforms it into useful aid and brings it to the soldier, freely, cheerfully and efficiently.

We have need for the Red Cross every day, everywhere. I cannot possibly describe to you the extent to which all of us depend on it. Perhaps it would just be best to tell you that I have yet to meet an American soldier - and I have spoken to hundreds - who does not say to me with real enthusiasm: “That Red Cross is certainly doing one fine job.”

• Radio talk re 141st anniversary of United States Military Academy, March 13, 1943

One month ago tonight an American detachment held a high hill above the Faid Pass in Central Tunisia. It was commanded by Johnnie Waters, a West Pointer of the Class of ‘31. He was ordered to hold that hill. He then had been engaged for three months in almost continuous battle, in every hour of which he lived up to the glowing prophesies made concerning him from the first day that he began his career at West Point.

At first light on February 14th, the enemy poured in around his flanks and quickly he was surrounded by hostile mechanized forces. Undismayed, he carried on. For two nights and days he repulsed every attempt of the Hun to dent his position. Then the Corps Commander directed Waters to bring his troops back through the darkness to join the main American force. Efficiently and rapidly he organized for the withdrawal. His troops came out with 150 prisoners and joined the main body, while Johnnie Waters - as you would expect - stayed with a small detachment to cover the retirement. His devoted men wanted all to stay until he himself should depart, but he had made them soldiers that obeyed orders instantly.

Since that moment we have not heard of Johnnie Waters and his men. Wherever he is, whatever his fate, his example and his whole career typify the kind of service that West Point has a right to expect of her graduates. He knew his job and he devoted his full energies and his whole spirit to its execution. If that spirit and example are characteristic today of West Pointers in every duty to which assigned, then our Alma Mater is a shining symbol of that Americanism that will win this war - definitely and conclusively. If there could be granted to me now an answer to just one prayer, it would be this: “God let me, in my post, do my duty to my country as well as Johnnie Waters did in his.”

• Address at French Re-armament ceremony, Algiers, May 8, 1943

Allied Forces landed in North Africa six months ago today. As their Commander-in-Chief I then proclaimed the pledge of the President of the United States and the Government of Great Britain to re-arm those Frenchmen who sought only opportunity and weapons in order to resume the fight against the Axis for the

deliverance of their native land.

Today, General Giraud, through you, as one of the consistent and implacable foes of Hitlerism, and the leader of the French forces in North Africa, I am happy to transfer these implements of war to Frenchmen inspired by that purpose.

Supplementing vital equipment delivered to the gallant French forces from British and American armies during the Tunisian campaign, this new array of war munitions - only a small portion of that already here and coming - has been produced by the sacrifice and devotion of America whose millions of men, women and children have joined with their hands and their hearts in this great war for human freedom.

Brought here in the ships of the United Nations, this equipment is a token of the traditional friendship of the peoples of our two great countries. That friendship is shared warmly and loyally by the people of Great Britain, our indomitable ally, which once stood bravely alone against the Axis. British battle experience, gained during that trying period, is reflected in the design and quality of many of these machines, which are of the finest in the world.

I have just received from the President of the United States a personal cable which he has asked me to read to you at this ceremony. President Roosevelt's message is as follows:

"American workers whose labor is devoted to turning out arms and military equipment for the defenders of our common cause ask only that the fruits of their labor be placed in the hands of those imbued with a determination to use them to their fullest effect. The formal transfer today of arms and equipment to our gallant French allies will be a source of encouragement to these workers and of keen satisfaction to every American. Our soldiers look forward to the days ahead when the weapons being transferred today and those being forged in ever growing quantities will, in their hands and those of their allies, strike increasingly heavy blows upon the common enemy until the final victory is won."

French valor and French patriotism now have a trenchant sword with which to help strike from France the shackles of oppression. The victorious Jeanne d'Arc carried her battle standard into the coronation cathedral. Now that the only Axis soldiers left on African soil will soon be in graves or in prison camps, let us set our hearts and minds on complete victory, so that we may march, with this equipment, up the Champs Elysees to the Arc de Triomphe, where lies the Unknown Soldier, symbol of French heroism. There we will render a salute to the Tricolor, once again floating proudly, peacefully and forever over a freed French people, who will re-establish their own government in accordance with their own conceptions of right, liberty and justice.

• Radio talk for North African program of BBC, May 24, 1943

Evaluation of the North African campaign places a long list of gains on the credit side of the United Nations' ledger. The material prizes have already been catalogued and given to the public by responsible governmental officials. The prisoners we took and the losses inflicted upon the enemy - by land and sea and air - are history. We have jolted the enemy's morale; for in this theater one of the best and proudest of his armies has been utterly destroyed. But there are many other benefits that have not been so widely publicized - things that may be classed as intangibles but which, nonetheless, are transcendently important.

One of these is measured in improved battle technique - particularly among those units that came into the theater through the Northwest African ports. The American divisions had never before been in campaign, while the British forces that came directly from England had seen no active service since Dunkirk. All these have been tempered in the heat of battle. They have learned the requirements of survival, and the essentials of victory. The British First Army and the American II Corps have become formidable fighting machines. They know what it takes to win and, through them, other Allied units going into the fight for the first time will be better prepared - more ready to absorb the first shocks of conflict. The British Eighth Army, coming from the desert into the mountainous regions of eastern Tunisia, was confronted by strange battle conditions. So, even among that brilliant array of fighting men - which our enemies have ruefully asserted to be the finest organization of its strength in the world - there were advances in technique and professional ability.

Beyond all this, one of the greatest of our gains is represented in the Allied team play that has reached here a high degree of proficiency. I speak not merely of senior commanders, and their readiness to meet each

problem on its merits and without division along nationalistic lines, but of the rank and file as well. Each man here has come to realize that the greatest patriot, the greatest lover of his own country, is the one that is quickest to promote Allied team play and to demand its perfection. This spirit has inspired also the French troops that fought alongside us during the Tunisian campaign. For them and their sacrificial devotion to duty, every British and American soldier has only words of praise. They were magnificent.

This demonstration of unity on the battlefield, of unity in adversity as well as in victory, is sorely puzzling the Axis today. Our solidarity terrifies them, because they had complacently counted on the divided counsels and inter-family quarrels that have been characteristic of Allied campaigns in former wars. Their propaganda has been devoted to the creation of cleavage among us, and some of their most vindictive and most insidious lies have been poured upon each of us in turn in an attempt to make one friend turn against the other. To us here, all this sounds like the snarls and whimperings of helpless rage. This team is bound together by indestructible devotion to a common cause. On this team are Cunningham, Tedder, Alexander, Spaatz, Montgomery, Anderson, Patton, Hewitt, Willis, Bradley, Clark, Coningham, MacFarlane, and Doolittle. At our sides stand Giraud, Juin, Le Clerq, Koeltz, and Mast. These are the names you have most often heard, but under each of them, and imbued by the same spirit, are countless thousands of others.

We are ready to undertake any further task that our countries may choose to assign us. We stand as a single body - determined that there will be no cessation of effort until, working in concert with all other forces of the United Nations, we shall have brought the last army of Germany, Italy and Japan to its inevitable Tunisia.

• Statement at Italian Unconditional Surrender, September 8, 1943

The Italian Government has surrendered its armed forces unconditionally. As Allied Commander-in-Chief, I have granted a Military Armistice, the terms of which have been approved by the governments of the United Kingdom, the United States, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, acting in the interest of the United Nations. The Italian Government has bound itself to abide by these terms without reservation. The Armistice was signed by my representative and the representative of Marshal Badoglio and it becomes effective this instant. Hostilities between the Armed Forces of the United Nations and those of Italy terminate at once. All Italians who now act to help eject the German Aggressor from Italian soil will have the assistance and the support of the United Nations.

• Speech for Third War Loan Drive, AFHQ, October 19, 1943

First, let me say that it would be difficult to exaggerate the influence of our successful War Loan Drive on the men and women under my command.

This is a hard war; a bitter, bloody war. Those who are where the guns are firing and the bombs dropping - they know that we are up against a tough, vicious, treacherous enemy. Make no mistake - it will be a long, long way to final victory, and the road will continue to be rough. Our men know it. They are ready for it. But they want to be always sure, above all else, that the Home front stands firmly behind them. They want to know that the folks at home keenly realize that we are all in this together, fighting for our right to lead a free existence.

This war will continue to take everything that each of our soldiers has. And we know - every General knows - that the most important part of any soldier’s equipment is his fighting spirit. In the final analysis, this spirit is equally as important as guns and ammunition, because no General can win a battle, even with the best of equipment, if his men are not determined and confident. And they are completely confident only when they feel they are being backed to the limit by the folks back home. That is why overwhelming success in War Loan Drives is vitally important to the war over here. A successful War Loan Drive gives renewed proof to the men fighting in the mud along the Volturno River, to the man struggling every inch of the way toward Rome, to the man who never forgets that he is living in constant danger of his life - that his fellow citizens back home have the confidence in his ability to bring freedom back to the world, and are doing their full part to perpetuate the kind of America that we want.

The bald truth is that the man in the front lines believes it to be the patriotic obligation of the people back home to support the war until it hurts. They expect you to do your duty! You have not let them down; I know you never will. My confidence in you is equal to that I have in the victors of Gafsa, of Hill 609, of Bizerte, of Messina, Salerno and Naples. I believe in you as I do in my airmen that bomb the enemy by day and by night, and as I believe in our gallant seamen that carry our troops, protect our convoys and assist the Army in assaulting the enemy's strongholds.

Yet I think my men would like to have me be brutally honest with you and tell you that sometimes in the past they have worried about how deeply you feel the war. They know it is your war as much as it is theirs, and they know how important it is to have you all-out producing war materials to the limit, and buying bonds to the limit. It reassures them to know that you are willing to make the sacrifices necessary to turn over to your government these billions upon billions of dollars. To keep faith with the fighting man you will keep it up - keep it up until those who are fighting at the front, and all of you working and striving at home - shall, as one indestructible team, have won the final battle, and tyranny and oppression have been blasted from the earth.

• CBS radio broadcast, Allied Headquarters in Algiers, October 23, 1943

Thank you, Mr. Secretary. First let me say that it would be difficult to exaggerate the influence of your successful war bond drives on the men and women under my command. This is a hard war, a bitter, bloody war. Those who are where the guns are firing and the bombs dropping know they are facing a tough and vicious enemy.

Make no mistake; it will be a long, long way to final victory and the road will continue to be rough. Our men know it. They are ready for it, but they want to be sure above all else that the home front stands firmly behind them. They want to know that the folks back home really realize that we are in this together, fighting for our right to lead a free existence.

This war will continue to take everything that each of our soldiers has, and we know - every general knows - that the most important part of any soldier's equipment is his fighting spirit. In the final analysis this spirit is equally as important as guns and ammunition, because no general can win a battle even with the best equipment if his men are not responding properly. They are completely confident only when they feel they are being backed to the limit by the folks back home. That is why the overwhelming success of the Third War Loan Drive is vitally important to the war over here. A successful war loan drive will renew proof to the men fighting in the mud along the Volturno River, who are struggling every inch of the way toward Rome, and who will never forget that they are living in constant danger of their lives, that their fellow citizens back home have confidence in their ability to bring freedom back to the world and are doing their full part to perpetuate the kind of America that we want.

The truth is that the men in the front lines believe it to be the patriotic obligation of the people back home to support the war until it hurts. They expect you folks to do your duty. You have not let them down. I know you never will. My confidence in you is like that which I had in the victories at Gafsa and Hill 609. I believe in you as I do my airmen who bomb the enemy by day and by night, and as I believe in our gallant seamen who carry our troops, protect our convoys, and assist the Army in destroying the enemy in the south.

Yet I think my men would like to have me be brutally honest with you and tell you that sometimes in the past they have wondered about how deeply you felt about the war. They know it is your war as much as it is theirs, and they know how important it is to have you "all-out" in producing war material for them and buying bonds for them.

Let me assure you that it is necessary for you to turn over to your Government these billions and tens of billions of dollars. To keep faith with the fighting men, you will have to keep it up, keep it up until those who are fighting at the front and all of you working and striving at home shall as one indestructible team have won the final battle and tyranny has been blasted from the face of the earth.

• Radio talk for BBC broadcast on first anniversary of battle of El Alamein, October 23, 1943

You have heard, on the anniversary of the battle of El Alamein, the story of one of the greatest advances in this history of this war, leading to the joint operations which have carried Forces of the United Nations into the mainland of Europe.

The offensive at El Alamein, which was launched on October 23rd, was planned to synchronize with the offensive under my command at the other end of North Africa, which was then secretly under way. So I feel it doubly appropriate on this occasion for me to pay tribute to the Eighth Army.

Today, under the inspiring leadership of General Montgomery and the direction of General Alexander, the Eighth Army is fighting side by side with the American and British forces that landed in North Africa. It is a member of the great allied air, ground and naval team which is driving the enemy out of Italy.

The attack at El Alamein and the landings in North Africa marked the culmination of a great achievement in production and preparation in the United States and in the British Empire. The converging allied advances through the desert and through Tunisia were possible because the Home Front gave us the necessary ships, guns, tanks, aircraft and supplies. I would like the relatives and countrymen of the Eighth Army to know that if they are proud of the forces in the field, the fighting men are no less proud of the Home Front workers, who are making possible our military victories.

Since February of last year when they came under my command, I can speak from personal observation and knowledge of the superb quality of the Eighth Army Commander and his officers and men.

I paid my first visit to the Eighth Army and to the Desert Air Force at the time of the battle of Mareth and I have seen them since in Tunisia, in Sicily and recently in Italy. Like the Fifth Army in Italy under General Clark, and like Patton's forces of Sicily, as well as all the other parts of this military family, General Montgomery's troops are in great heart. His soldiers have marched hundreds of miles and fought on their feet over some of the toughest country in the world. This is a war where the foot soldier is as important as ever before - the man who carries all he needs on his back and his weapons in his hands. The infantry is the backbone of any army's success.

Today the Eighth Army is looking forward. Just before we invaded Italy I stood with General Montgomery at Messina to look over the straits towards the hills of the mainland. He said, as you know, last time I was on that Continent I was driven off it. Knowing him and his men and the allied forces that would be fighting with them I told him with absolute confidence, you won't be driven off this time.

Now the Eighth Army is in the middle of another great campaign, accompanied as always by its comrades of the United Nations fighting in the air, on the land, and on the sea. As Commander-in-Chief in this Theater I have complete confidence in its leaders and in its men; the people of Britain and the Empire have every reason to be proud of them.

• Radio address on anniversary of Allied landings in North Africa, November 8, 1943

As Allied Commander-in-Chief I should like first to express the gratitude of the land, naval and air forces in North Africa for the glowing tributes paid, during this broadcast, to their courage, skill, endurance and performance of duty. To these tributes I add, from my heart, my own thanks to the hundreds of thousands of loyal soldiers, seamen and airmen that are serving, in this theater, under Admiral Cunningham, General Alexander and Air Chief Marshal Tedder. On behalf of all these men and women, let me assure every citizen of the United Nations that we here, fully aware of the bitterness of the struggle still ahead of us, are resolved to carry it forward to final conclusion.

The anniversary of our landing in Africa is also a significant date for the Soviet Union. The Allied Forces in North Africa embrace the opportunity to hail the power and gallantry of the great Red Army. Recognizing that in this global war all fronts are inter-related, we pledge to the Russian forces and their great leader our word that every single thing we can do to advance the common cause will be done promptly, determinedly and to the utmost of our ability.

This inter-relation of fronts extends into the mines, factories, farms, and all forms of economic and spiritual life in our home countries. We know that you in our homelands are doing your part when we see tanks, ships,

planes, ammunition and vital supplies coming through in ample quantity and on time. These we hurl unceasingly at the enemy; you continue to produce more and more effectively and speedily, and we will continue to increase the fury of our blows at the enemy. In this unswerving determination to cooperate effectively is the formula for winning this war. Every one of us must do his part under the direction of our chosen leaders, all realizing that no sacrifice is sufficiently great to turn us from our purpose, and no obstacle too difficult for us to overcome in the relentless pursuit of the common objective.

• Radio address, first anniversary of AEF Radio Station, December 14, 1943

A year ago today I welcomed the inauguration of this radio service and expressed the hope that it would serve the fighting men and women of this theater well. Since that time, the microphones of these stations have recorded the important events marking our march to ultimate victory.

We have come a long way. It hasn't been easy going - none of it. The training, the waiting, the landing in Africa, the Tunisian campaign, Sicily, Italy - all this has meant days of working, marching, fighting. In the airfields, ports, and battle areas of all these places I have had the opportunity to meet and talk to some of you. Those men know, as I hope all of you know, how appreciative I am of your efforts and how proud I am to have you in this Command. Likewise I am proud of the unique success that British and American forces of all three services have attained here in molding themselves into the powerful unit that is now operating on the Italian front.

In other theaters we have watched during the past year our Russian allies drive the enemy back, almost to his own frontiers. We have watched our forces in the Pacific gain new outposts from which to strike at the heart of Japan. Our French allies have taken Corsica and a rejuvenated Chinese army is on the march. Altogether it has been a year of success and of hope for the future.

I have just returned from a conference with our Commander-in-Chief, the President of the United States. Concerning that conference I can tell you only that your part in the big job that lies ahead is a vital one; one that will require even greater achievements from all of us.

We have been together a long time. Living together, working together. It is impossible for each of us to meet all the others that are serving on this great fighting team. But if these radio stations, by bringing us news and entertainment, have created a stronger bond between us, then they have accomplished their mission. I wish both you and them continued success. Good luck!

• Christmas broadcast to English-speaking women abroad, December 25, 1943

For millions of our friends and allies of the United Nations this is the fourth wartime Christmas. We in the United States are just approaching our second. We have hardly begun to feel, as you have, the privations of war. We have hardly begun to make the sacrifices that you have been making cheerfully, without fuss or heroics for years past. Yet the war is close to us this Christmas, and it brings us close to you. The common bond that draws us together now more than ever before is the fact that our men, like yours, are away from home - many of them on distant battlefields. All over the world, in Great Britain, the South West Pacific, Australia, India and in Africa our men are together, fighting the same good fight shoulder to shoulder, on deserts and in jungles, on the sea and in the skies. They are working together, learning to know and understand each other, as we must learn to understand each other, we who stay behind and man the home front.

That is a bond between us this Christmas - the thought of our sons and husbands who are joined in a common enterprise, the enterprise of victory for the United Nations; the enterprise of a better world for our children and a lasting peace, for all the world's children. Christmas in peacetime is an occasion for family reunions, for gaiety and hospitality and present-giving. In wartime it means a great deal more. Let's stop for a moment and think how our men would want us to celebrate this Christmas. The other day I came across some words written by Carl Sandburg, one of our greatest American authors. This is what he said: "Perhaps democracy can best survive where men know the right moments for complete and solemn reverence, or the

nonsense that nourishes and the laughter that rests and may even heal." This, I think, expresses the spirit in which most of us are gathering around our Christmas trees this year. This Christmas, more than any I can remember, is a moment for complete and solemn reverence. It is a moment to pause and think about the things that for us make life worth living - the things for which, three long years ago, you went to war. You don't need to be reminded what they are.

We, the English-speaking peoples have values in common. But we have no monopoly on them. Anyone who has had the good fortune to live abroad, as I have done discovers that there are millions of simple and decent people all over the world who love freedom and hate tyranny as much as we do. These people are showing us, day by day, that they, like ourselves, are ready to work and fight and, if necessary, to die for freedom and decency. We can be grateful and thankful to have them as our allies. I am thinking at this moment of the people I knew personally in Paris and on the other side of the world in Manila, people I have lived among, who are now in temporary darkness, conquered but not beaten. Many of you who are listening must have friends cut off from you by the enemy, perhaps in Norway or Holland or Belgium or Poland or Malaya. I wish it were possible to send them personal Christmas messages, to assure them they are not forgotten and to tell them that the United Nations are on the march. I am thinking too of our other allies, the men and women of Soviet Russia and China whom we know only by their deeds - deeds so brave that we can hardly find words to tell them of our admiration and gratitude.

When we think of all these people and their courage and devotion, this Christmas becomes a moment for complete and solemn reverence, and for thankfulness that our idea of decency and freedom are shared by so many allies.

But our feeling of reverence this Christmas doesn't for a moment mean that we are gloomy. Far from it. Carl Sandburg spoke too, of the nonsense that nourishes and the laughter that rests and may even heal. There will be plenty of nonsense and laughter as we gather round our Christmas tree, just as we know there is nonsense and laughter in desert and jungle outposts, in tents, and barracks, and on ships at sea. There will be fewer trimmings on our trees. There will certainly be simpler presents. Many streets will be blacked out, many windows without lighted candles. This year we will find other ways of expressing the Christmas spirit. Those of us who can will invite soldiers and sailors to Christmas dinner tables. Inside our homes we will laugh and joke this Christmas Day because our hearts and hopes are high; because we know that we are going to win; because that victory will give freedom to millions of people who are now conquered and in slavery. At last but not least, we will be gay because that victory will bring our men home to us for another Christmas, a happier Christmas on which we shall gather round the tree together and sing "Peace on earth, good will to men."

• Broadcast for American Red Cross Drive on Blue Network "Report to Nation," February 29, 1944

If all American citizens could see for themselves the great good that their Red Cross contributions do for our fighting forces, there would never be any slightest question as to the sufficiency of Red Cross funds.

The Red Cross has been working in my Command for many months. I have seen it in cities, in bivouacs and at the front - in fact, it is everywhere that Americans are fighting or training to fight for the preservation of democratic ideals. You have been told time and again about the material things that it does for our people in uniform. You have heard about Red Cross clubs with their heart-warming welcome and clean entertainment for tired men. You know that Red Cross workers appear at every point throughout a theater of war with music, movies, reading material, doughnuts, coffee, cigarettes - almost anything and everything to meet a soldier's unexpected needs at odd moments.

But the basic good done by the Red Cross is something of which these things are only symptomatic. In the battle area there is a constant and jarring impact upon the human spirit that is sometimes manifested in just plain homesickness and at other times leads to abnormalities or excesses on conduct. The Red Cross men and women are forever alive to these possibilities and by their unceasing effort they are making it easier for Americans both to meet their war responsibilities and to maintain a record as fine examples of clean Americanism.

The first purpose of the Red Cross is to help send our Forces into every succeeding battle in the highest

possible state of morale and determination. The Red Cross concern is in the individual - to help him become an ever more efficient member of the fighting team. It is helping to win this war.

The Red Cross tells the soldier, also, of what you are doing - how you are working and sacrificing - that this war may be won speedily and conclusively. Day by day it tries to keep before the fighting forces a touch of home, to remind them of the things for which they are sacrificing. It helps keep the home front and the fighting front solidly welded together.

As the longer term objectives of this great purpose the Red Cross is helping to bring your sons, brothers, husbands, and friends home to you eventually, sound in body, healthy in mind and strong in spirit.

This is what your Red Cross money is doing. I don't need to tell you it is a good investment. I am sure that every American man and woman serving under me shares my confidence that when you understand these things the Red Cross drive for funds will be enthusiastically oversubscribed.

• Extemporaneous remarks at Sandhurst, England, March 11, 1944

I'm keenly sensible of the honor that General Fanshaw has done me, a foreigner, by asking me down here to witness the Passing Out review of a class from this famous Military College. Yet, on your soil I do not feel particularly a foreigner or a stranger. Since 1812 there has been no question, no difference arising between our two countries that hasn't been capable of amicable settlement. Within one lifetime, your nation and mine have twice found themselves partners in war.

In this war, more than any other in history, I think that we find the forces of evil more distinctly arraigned against those of decency and respect for humankind, than ever before. We are on the side of decency, and democracy and liberty. Happily we have great Allies. Every morning as we read our papers these days we have reason to give another cheer as the great Russian Armies hammer back the Germans and inflict upon them still further losses. Our great Air arms both by night and by day are punishing that enemy. They're softening him up but much remains to be done. We can, and we will, win this war, but it means that every one of us must do his full duty. Any person, whether at the plough or with a gun at the front, who fails to do his full duty every day and every hour, must forever bear his conscience that he has contributed in some incalculable amount to the agony and sacrifice that our two countries must endure.

It behooves us then to think what these duties are - particularly our own. Our Governments arrange that the resources of these great Allies are used in such a way as to inflict the greatest punishment upon the enemy - and most quickly accomplish his defeat. All our resources, the resources of manpower, of industry, of the mines, and the fields must be used to inflict the greatest punishment upon the enemy and accomplish his defeat. It is for the High Command by air, sea and land to see that these resources are placed into action properly led, organized and maintained, to win these victories.

Among ourselves I think we've already shown beyond any doubt that we can work together as a unified military team with no trouble whatsoever in the accomplishment of this purpose. As we get down to the ground armies there are technical problems, one type of which you yourselves have been earnestly engaged in mastering, that is, mechanized warfare. You are a member of a great ground team; the ground team itself, of course, is only a member of the great triumvirate of land, sea and air. The High Command can do no more than to put you in action in the best possible way, under the best possible conditions, and to make sure that you are well supplied, well cared for, and everything is done for you in the way of getting you ammunition, food, clothing and everything that you need. But upon your shoulders rests the greatest responsibility of all.

You young men have this war to win. It is small unit leadership that is going to win the ground battle and that battle must be won before that enemy of ours is finally crushed. It is up to you men to give your units - whether it is a tank crew, platoon, or becomes a company - leadership, every hour of the day, every day of the week. You must know every single one of your men. It is not enough that you are the best soldier in that unit, that you are the strongest, the toughest, and the most durable, and the best equipped technically. You must be their leader, their father, their mentor even if you are half their age. You must understand their problems. You must keep them out of trouble. If they get in trouble, you must be the one to go to their rescue. That cultivation of human understanding between you and your men is the one art that you must yet master and you must master

it quickly. Then you will be doing your duty and you will be worthy of the traditions of this great school and of your great country. To each one of you I wish Godspeed and Good Luck. If I could have my wish as I stand here today, feeling honored as I do in the tribute paid me, I would say this: If I could only meet you all somewhere East of the Rhine and renew the acquaintanceship of this pleasant morning. Good luck.

• Speech for 5th War Loan Drive, May 8, 1944

In moments of crisis involving the safety of our native land the American people have invariably rallied against the danger with courage, faith and resolution. For more than two years we have been in one of these periods of crisis, perhaps the greatest in our history. Again the fabric of America is standing the test of strain and sacrifice. On the battle field and on the home front men and women are daily making great sacrifices so that freedom and our way of life may be preserved.

There is now in progress the Fifth war Loan Drive to raise money so as to insure that this conflict will be brought to the speediest possible conclusion, and with the least loss in lives. Complete success in the war loan drive will meet the acclaim of the Armed Forces in the field and will be renewed proof that all Americans are one solid phalanx of determination in this great war.

All of us profoundly trust that soon the world may be restored to a just peace. Until we can, with God's help, bring about that happy realization of our hopes, each of us must seek incessantly for ways and means by which the value of our services to our country may be increased. For the moment we can do so by buying bonds.

Let's make this particular victory a quick and overwhelming one.

• Recording for BBC broadcast, London, May 8, 1944

In Tunisia we demonstrated to the world that great nations fighting as Allies for a deathless principle can combine their resources and together produce an efficient and completely unified military machine. No other product of all the fierce fighting throughout North Africa, and of the complete victory in which it terminated, was of greater value than this.

For all the future struggles of this war those Tunisian lessons of Allied integration have vital significance. Today they dictate the development of the Allied Expeditionary Forces in Great Britain. Whenever this Command may be called forth to battle it will go as a unit with every part trusting every other part and with every service effectively supporting every other service. Enthusiastic and efficient cooperation in a single team! In this Command these are more than mere words - they are the foundation stones of our organization. They are the guide posts that in battles still to come, will lead us, in company with our Great Allies fighting on other fronts, to final and conclusive victory over all our enemies.

For this sureness in coordination and for this unity in purpose and method we have to thank the gallant soldiers, sailors and airmen of the United Nations, who, in that great victory, so clearly pointed the way to future success.

• Remarks to ECAD & SHAEF Officer Personnel at Civil Affairs Center, APO 645, May 9, 1944

I wonder whether I could expedite this by asking you to forget any orders you have received so far today and break ranks and gather around here so that I can talk to you. Standing out there you remind me too much of a firing squad.

Ordinarily, when I go to a station like this to visit I ask that there be no demonstration of this kind. I permitted this one. I am glad to see how well you perform.

First of all, you are soldiers. Don't forget that. No matter what the nature of your work, no matter what you have to do, from now on you are wearing the uniform of your country and you are part of the fighting forces of

it. Now you are soldiers - with a soldier's job. Not soldiers in a Napoleonic sense - you are as modern as Radar and you are just as important to the Command. We in command have learned of this necessity through experience.

We went into Africa just a year ago last November. In Africa we did not have an organization of this kind set up. In Sicily we were better prepared; in Italy still a lot better. We will be still better prepared when we are on the Continent, due to the training you have had and the work you have done. You men here - you will do the job that must be done. It is this: although humanitarian in its results, your job is to help us win the war.

You have got to get the rear areas organized - electric lights, roads, and supply - and you must keep them working and get them restored as quickly as possible to some semblance of peace-time standards, so that they can support to the utmost the armies that are fighting at the front. You must take that responsibility for dealing with civilian affairs, whether it is restoring public utilities or helping a nursing mother who cannot get milk, and if you don't do your job, the armies will fail. A modern army is of great depth in the field. The fighting front of an army is a fringe of a tremendous organization. Many men are needed to advance and supply those at the very front.

First of all, you are part of an Allied team. Always remember that. Because your section of the army is called "Civil Affairs" you must not make the mistake of thinking you are politicians. You are not politicians or anything else but soldiers. You are not here to serve any nationalistic purpose or idea in the political field, no matter what you did in civil life. You are here to help a Commander win battles.

There can be no differences between British and Americans at any level. Problems that need adjustment are solved, and adjustments are made, on a higher level than ours. I get a directive from two Governments, and that directive is translated into its various parts and comes to you, but that doesn't mean that either of those two parts is British or American.

If you are a British Officer, whenever you have a particularly difficult or important job, when you go to handle the problem, tuck some American under your arm and go to it. Keep together all the time. You will find that the people with whom you deal will come to realize that here is an operating force that has no differences that are susceptible of being exploited. And I mean just that - you have got to stick together.

I said, of course, that your job is largely, in its results, humanitarian, but its purposes are military - to win this war. The distant future, of course, may present to many of you a different kind of job, possibly under an organism not as exclusively military. But let me ask you not to worry your minds about that phase of the future. Stick to your knitting! You are soldiers doing a soldier's job, and you are absolutely necessary.

Now a word about what you are doing here. No Commander can ever accumulate the supplies, the organization, the men that he needs in exact timing with the existence of that need. In other words, he piles up reserves. For some time some of you here have been in reserve. You're probably getting bored, some of you. You are a little tired of idleness, particularly when some of you were extraordinarily busy men in civil life, and you gave up many things - made many sacrifices - and you are getting damned tired of not being used usefully in view of your sacrifices.

Your time is coming, so don't worry. I will never forget a Civil Affairs Captain who came up to me in Italy and told me that he hadn't had any sleep in three solid days. I would enjoy my leisure, if I had any, right now, because if you get distributed over a war-torn country where there are no facilities - lights are gone, and there is no coal, and there are no doctors and no medicine and there is not anything else, and it is all on you, you are going to be busy - very busy. So be prepared. We will give you plenty to do.

In the meantime, the great reason for my coming out here to say hello to you is this: because you are a new organism in war - at least in this vast organization you are a new organism - I was afraid you might get to thinking of yourselves as a substitute and not an actual member on the team. I want to assure you you are a playing member on the team. Let me tell you we think you are a playing member on the team - a ball carrier - and when you get the ball we expect you to take it a long way.

Good-bye and good luck to all of you.

• **D-Day broadcast to people of Western Europe, June 6, 1944**

People of Western Europe: A landing was made this morning on the coast of France by troops of the Allied Expeditionary Force. This landing is part of the concerted United Nations' plan for the liberation of Europe, made in conjunction with our great Russian allies.

I have this message for all of you. Although the initial assault may not have been made in your own country, the hour of your liberation is approaching.

All patriots, men and women, young and old, have a part to play in the achievement of final victory. To members of resistance movements, I say, "Follow the instructions you have received." To patriots who are not members of organized resistance groups, I say, "Continue your passive resistance, but do not needlessly endanger your lives until I give you the signal to rise and strike the enemy. The day will come when I shall need your united strength. Until that day, I call on you for the hard task of discipline and restraint."

Citizens of France! I am proud to have again under my command the gallant Forces of France. Fighting beside their Allies, they will play a worthy part in the liberation of their Homeland.

Because the initial landing has been made on the soil of your country, I repeat to you with even greater emphasis my message to the peoples of other occupied countries in Western Europe. Follow the instructions of your leaders. A premature uprising of all Frenchmen may prevent you from being of maximum help to your country in the critical hour. Be patient. Prepare!

As Supreme Commander of the Allied Expeditionary Force, there is imposed on me the duty and responsibility of taking all measures necessary to the prosecution of the war. Prompt and willing obedience to the orders that I shall issue is essential.

Effective civil administration of France must be provided by Frenchmen. All persons must continue in their present duties unless otherwise instructed. Those who have made common cause with the enemy and so betrayed their country will be removed. As France is liberated from her oppressors, you yourselves will choose your representatives, and the government under which you wish to live.

In the course of this campaign for the final defeat of the enemy you may sustain further loss and damage. Tragic though they may be, they are part of the price of victory. I assure you that I shall do all in my power to mitigate your hardships. I know that I can count on your steadfastness now, no less than in the past. The heroic deeds of Frenchmen who have continued the struggle against the Nazis and their Vichy satellites, in France and throughout the French Empire, have been an example and an inspiration to all of us.

This landing is but the opening phase of the campaign in Western Europe. Great battles lie ahead. I call upon all who love freedom to stand with us. Keep your faith staunch - our arms are resolute - together we shall achieve victory.

• Remarks for broadcast on the Army Hour, September 3, 1944

From this battle front American fighting troops send their grateful thanks to the workers of America for having made this the best equipped fighting force in all history. In this expression of our gratitude we are joined by our gallant Allies. The British units include in their category of weapons many types that you have produced. The French Divisions now fighting in southern and in northern France are equipped exclusively with the products of your toil and skill. Each of you justly shares in the credit for the tremendous successes the United Nations have gained on this important front.

We are supremely confident that we shall continue to defeat the enemy until, in company with the great Red Army and our forces in the Mediterranean we shall utterly destroy the Nazi threat to the free world.

Very definitely this confidence is based upon our faith in you - upon our conviction that, just as we are redoubling our efforts to drive forward to the heart of the enemy's stronghold, you are going forward with us, producing an ever-increasing volume of supply and equipment, up to the very moment the guns are stilled and peace has returned to the world.

Now, as never before, we need to be certain that no shortage will develop in tanks, in airplanes, in naval craft, in trucks, in ammunition and in fuel, or in any other item that we need. Should we be compelled to stay our hand for a single day because of shortage in the arrival of the things we need for the battle, the price will inevitably be paid in soldiers' lives and in unnecessary anguish in thousands of American families, and in those

of our Allies.

The possibility of such a failure on your part does not even enter into my calculations. My faith and belief in the American fighting men is equalled only by my faith and belief in you, who, from your homes, have sent these men to this battlefront to help assure that freedom shall prevail in the world.

• Remarks in Paris, September 8, 1944

I address my words to the people of Paris. Two weeks ago France and Allied troops made their entry into the city. They came to give the coup de grace to the last elements of the enemy remaining here. But the liberation of Paris was already nearly complete. A week before, armed with courage and with resolution, the men of the French Forces of the Interior, who for four years, under the inspiration of General de Gaulle, had never ceased to struggle against the enemy, went into the streets to drive out the despised invader. The glory of having largely freed their Capital belongs to Frenchmen.

Every member of the Allied Force shared your joy when Paris was at last returned to its people and to France. From that hour the dark cloud of the enemy's presence was blown away. Liberty had come back to one of its traditional homes.

All members of the Allied Force wish to express to the population of Paris their fraternal admiration. On their behalf I present to the city the shield of the Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Expeditionary Force. It symbolizes the flaming sword of liberation which, dissolving the darkness of German tyranny, rises under the rainbow of the colors of the United Nations to the blue sky of freedom and of peace.

The shield I present today is temporary, soon to be replaced by one of metal which we hope may be placed in a permanent and appropriate setting.

May this simple object recall forever the great day of the liberation of Paris.

• Talk at joint meeting of Senate and Assembly of Belgium, November 9, 1944

Speaking for myself and my associates here present I thank you for the warmth of your welcome. More particularly I thank you for the generous hospitality you have extended to every member of the Allied Expeditionary Forces who has entered your great country.

This occasion seems to me to be almost a unique incident in history. I doubt that ever before have the elected representatives of a democratic country invited into their legislative halls as honored guest the commanders of a great fighting force, present in that country. We are especially happy to come so that we may express to you our admiration and respect for the fortitude and courage you displayed throughout the four years of enemy occupation and for the great help you gave us in the task of liberating your country. We worked together because of our common love of and our devotion to the cause of freedom, and in that sense, at least, we are members of one great brotherhood.

We have come to make you a pledge. We expect help from you in the future, just as you have given it in the past, to the end that all of us remain devoted to the one great objective of defeating our common enemy. That enemy understands one thing only - force. So we intent to apply force without stint; force to the uttermost! By making this our first task I realize that there will be imposed upon the Belgian people further privation, further suffering. We are aware of the crying needs of the Belgian people. My pledge is this: so far, as the requirements of the battle will permit, we will bring to you every help, every thing we possibly can.

I am sure that our two governments would want me to make this pledge to you! We have faith in you; in turn you must have faith in us, in our intentions and determination to carry out those intentions. We must both have faith in our final victory.

That confidence and faith can be based in solid accomplishment of the past. Only six short months ago, who among us could have foreseen that on this date we could have met here, in your legislative halls, to celebrate the complete liberation of Belgium? Let us all continue in that same decisive fashion to the end!

Long live Belgium!

• Radio broadcast, November 19, 1944

Allied fighting men have achieved in Europe since June 6th one of the remarkable military victories of all time. They have eliminated more than a million German soldiers.

In the great breakthrough in Normandy in late July, and in the sweeping exploitation that carried them all the way to the German frontier, the tactical pattern was always the same: sudden and devastating air attack, followed by intensive artillery bombardment, and then the forward surge of infantry and tanks to break defenses, capture towns and hurry forward once again. In their relentless advance, they liberated France, Belgium and Luxembourg.

This achievement of your sons, brothers and husbands and their gallant allies was possible only through great expenditure of bombs and ammunition. The huge stocks that we had accumulated in England before the beginning of the invasion were rushed by day and night, to the front, so that our fighting men would not be handicapped. All the way from the North Sea to the Mediterranean, tactical victories followed swiftly upon earlier ones, each worthy of its own chapter in our military history, but each adding to the inevitable drain upon the stocks of ammunition that you produced. Your toil and skill share with the courage and stamina of the front line soldiers the credit for the stunning successes of the summer and fall.

But today we are firing ammunition that we would not have used until next February or March if we had been content with slower advance, with less crushing victories, or if we had been ready to sacrifice soldiers to save materials.

Now we are hammering at the massive crust of armor surrounding the German fortress. Appalling conditions of rain, fog, snow and mud make difficult the employment of our Air Forces and the maneuver of our tanks, even of our foot soldiers.

But wretched weather can not stop artillery shells. More than ever before we need ammunition. In the capture of Aachen the First Army used 300,000 rounds of 105 mm ammunition in a two weeks' period, and, even so, the reduction of that place was delayed because of scarcity of ammunition.

In spite of all, we continue to attack. 5,000 pounds of ammunition are being poured every minute against the German defenses. Each month our guns are hurling six million rounds against the hostile trenches, forts and pill boxes, while our mortars add two million additional rounds to this figure. Expenditures have raced ahead of our receipts from home but I know that you do not want us to give the enemy one second's rest. You do not want the leaders of American soldiers to substitute additional cost in lives for the ammunition that could so surely save those lives. I owe it to every G-I American soldier in this greatest fighting force that America has ever put into the field, to urge upon you increased production of ammunition, signal equipment, winter clothing, engineering materials, vital medical instruments - and again, ammunition, always ammunition.

We are well aware that this calls for superhuman effort on your part. But you have already accomplished miracles in war production. We know that when you understand that your increased work will shorten the war and save thousands of lives, you will perform this new and even greater miracle.

• Thanksgiving broadcast, November 23, 1944

In this great war theater millions of America's fighting men and their Allies are, by their courage, endurance and suffering, making daily headway against a fanatical enemy. They are surmounting unbelievable hardships and obstacles to insure to all of us the future right to live as free people. Mud, bitter cold, bullets and minefields cannot stop them if they are plentifully supplied and supported from the homeland. They need myriads of shells and tires and blankets and guns and planes - a thousand things to enable them to keep up the incessant pressure. These they must get from the money you lend to the government.

Another thing - they are entitled to the constant assurance of your understanding, of your resolution, and of your unflagging zeal in the cause for which they are offering their lives. To keep faith with them none of us can permit our minds and hearts to stray for a single second from the great task we have before us. In the current

war bond drive, you once again have special opportunity to give these men the things they require and by so doing, reassure them and the whole world that the United States is a single, determined unit in working and fighting for complete victory.

There is just one way to gain the peace we want; each of us must work with ever increasing devotion and effectiveness up to the day the enemy capitulates.

We here - all of us - count upon you to over-subscribe the war loan and then to transform the money quickly into vital fighting equipment. It is needed, now.

• Speech at citation of 101st Airborne Division, March 15, 1945

It is a great personal honor for me to be here today to take part in a ceremony that is unique in American history. Never before has a full Division been cited by the War Department in the name of the President, for gallantry in action. This day marks the beginning of a new tradition in the American Army. With that tradition, therefore, will always be associated the name of the 101st Airborne Division and of Bastogne.

Yet you men, because you are soldiers of proved valor and or experience, would be the last to claim that you are the bravest and the best. All the way from where the Marines are fighting on Iwo Jima, through the Philippines and southeast Asia, on through the Mediterranean and along this great front, and on the Russian frontiers, are going forward day by day those battles sustained by the valor of you and the other Allied units that are beating this enemy to his knees. They are proving once and for all that dictatorship cannot produce better soldiers than can aroused democracy. In many of those actions are units that have performed with unexcelled brilliance.

So far as I know, there may be many among you that would not rate Bastogne as your bitterest battle. Yet it is entirely fitting and appropriate that you should be cited for that particular battle. It happened to be one of these occasions when the position itself was of the utmost importance to the Allied forces. You, in reserve, were hurried forward and told to hold that position. All the elements of drama, of battle drama, were there. You were cut off, you were surrounded. Only valor, complete self-confidence in yourselves and in your leaders, a knowledge that you were well trained, only the determination to win could sustain soldiers under those conditions. You were given a marvelous opportunity, and you met every test.

Therefore, you become a fitting symbol on which the United Nations, all the citizens of the United Nations, can say to their soldiers today, “We are proud of you” as it is my great privilege to say to you here today, to the 101st Division and all its attached units, “I am awfully proud of you.”

With this great honor goes also a certain responsibility. Just as you are the beginning of a new tradition, you must realize, each of you, that from now on, the spotlight will beat on you with particular brilliance. Whenever you say you are a soldier of the 101st Division, everybody, whether it’s on the street in the city or in the front line, will expect unusual conduct of you. I know that you will meet every test of the future like you met at Bastogne.

Good luck and God be with each of you.

• Recording for movie, March 29, 1945

I’ve been asked to be spokesman for this Allied Expeditionary Force in saying a word of introduction to what you are about to see. It is the story of the Nazi defeat on the Western Front. So far as possible the editors have made it a record of the really important people of this Campaign - I mean the enlisted soldiers and sailors and airmen that fought through every obstacle to victory. Of course, to tell the whole thing would take years. But the theme would be the same: Teamwork wins wars. I’m talking about teamwork between Nations and services and men. Right down the line. From the G.I. and the Tommy - to us brass hats.

Our enemy was tough and strong and cunning - but he made a few mistakes. And here was his worst blunder - he counted on cracking up our partnership. Well, he guessed wrong. We’re fighting for a common cause that’s welded us into one great team, and that team has included you, as an indispensable, working

member.

The spirit of free people working and living and fighting together served us well during the war in the West. It will defeat that other tyrannical enemy of human liberty - already reeling, in the far-off Pacific, under the blows of our gallant comrades-in-arms.

We, in the field pray that that spirit of comradeship will persist forever among the peoples of the United Nations.

• Recording for film of Norfolk House Conference, March 29, 1945

I assumed command at SHAEF with the best all-around team for which a man could ask. Some had already been working for months in England, others I brought with me from the Mediterranean. We adopted, first, a master plan, and then had to coordinate every last detail of the Ground, Sea and Air plans. While this was going on, we led off with an air show designed to make the landing points as soft as possible, to batter the German communications, and to make certain we'd have control of the air. It was quite a show - those Airmen did a magnificent job. Later in the campaign, they once flew over 14,000 sorties in a single day.

• Recording for movie, March 29, 1945

When the German port strategy became apparent, we had to move swiftly to counteract his plan. We captured Cherbourg in a mighty rush, but he hung on to other harbors, and when he couldn't do that, he destroyed them. That was the story of Brest, where American Ground, Air, and Naval forces fought such a long, bitter battle. In Brittany, where we were joined by French resistance forces. At the channel ports of Calais, won by the Canadians. Le Havre, captured by the British. Dieppe and Boulogne, Canadians. And Dunkirk, besieged by the Czechs. We just didn't have enough working ports, that's all. Supply suffered, our offensive was slowed, and the German was gaining time to consolidate a new defensive line. It takes a lot of freight per day per man to keep an Army fighting in the field. The fellows I charged with getting it to the front had a tough nut to crack, but they did it! All of us are glad to salute those men in the lines of communication.

As Supreme Commander, let me break in at this point to say just a word about the Navy. From the moment of embarkation to that of landing, the full burden fell upon the Navy and our merchant fleets. They had to sweep the mines, bombard the coastal batteries, marshal and protect the transports along the coastline preparatory to landing and, finally, man the small boats that carried the soldiers to the beach. On that day there were more than eight thousand ships and landing craft on the shores of Normandy. It was a most intricate task and a vital one for the success of our plans. The courage, fidelity and skill of the Royal and American Navies have no brighter page in their histories than that of June sixth, 1944.

• Recording for movie, April 17, 1945

Q: The men under MacArthur and Nimitz seem to be cleaning up on the Japs. Why do they need us guys for Europe?

DDE: Our men in the Pacific - some of whom have been fighting for over three years - have done a brilliant and sensational job with limited resources - but as yet only Japan's outer defenses have been cracked Japan's real strength is concentrated in her inner defenses and in China. To date our troops have met and defeated about one million Japanese troops. But we have yet to meet another four million. In addition, each year brings up one million new recruits willing to die for the emperor. Nothing less than the brute force of our total power will crush fanatic Japan.

Q: I'm an infantryman in Europe with a division that's been fighting for two years. Do I get a furlough

home before being shipped to the Pacific?

DDE: Yes, you probably will. Only a few if any of the combat divisions in Europe will be shipped directly to the Pacific.

Q: I am one of the Lucky Joe's in Europe that's been called non-essential and eligible for discharge. How soon do I get home?

DDE: Not right away. All available shipping will first be used to transport the men needed in the Pacific. It will be several months after V-E Day before the bulk of the non-essential men can be started home for release. And it will take many additional months to get all these men back to the United States. This we know will be tough on you and your families. But which is it better to do - send non-essential men home right away - or concentrate on the Pacific so that all men may get home sooner? Surely those men who will remain away from home a few months longer, in the safety of an inactive theater, will be the first to agree it's the right thing to do if it will save precious American lives on the Jap battle front.

• Recording for broadcast on joint hook-up of American networks, May 4, 1945

I have the rare privilege of speaking for a victorious army of almost five million fighting men. They, and the women who have so able assisted them, constitute the Allied Expeditionary Force that has liberated Western Europe. They have destroyed or captured enemy armies totalling more than their own strength, and swept triumphantly forward over the hundreds of miles separating Cherbourg from Lubeck, Leipzig and Munich.

More than three years ago Great Britain, China and Russia were desperately defending themselves against the onslaughts of mighty military machines, deliberately prepared to implement the Axis purpose to dominate the world. The dastardly crime of Pearl Harbor brought us suddenly and actively into that war. Our nation, always unwilling to attribute evil purposes to any people, and unready to withstand surprise attack, found itself beaten back from some of its important outposts and unable to take prompt and effective action to combat the enemy's designs. But America, fortunate in the quality of her leadership, did not become the easy prey envisaged by her self-confident assailants. Our late great President immediately met with that other indomitable spirit, Prime Minister Churchill, the man who had successfully led his country through the dark days of '40 and '41, when Great Britain stood defiantly alone as the unconquered foe of Naziism.

Even while Allied defenses in the far Pacific were still crumbling under the swift attacks of the Japanese, these great leaders, and their able lieutenants, began devising the gigantic plan of which the first two difficult parts have now reached glorious consummation.

In the very beginning the United States and Great Britain determined to combine themselves into a true partnership for the persecution of the war. They adopted as their first objective the crushing of the European Axis. This task they undertook first because only here was it possible for three great powers, Russia, Great Britain and the United States, to concentrate their full might against one part of the widely separated Axis powers.

Realizing that battlefield efficiency demanded unification in action as well as in purpose, American and Great Britain decided to place their combined forces, in every theater, under single command. Air - ground - navy - supply - all have been combined into one great team without regard to national or personal considerations. Into this team have been drawn representatives of many other nations. All have absorbed the same spirit of loyalty and team-play - and their success in working effectively together under conditions of stress and strain - of difficulty and of success - is something of which every participating country can always be proud. Here the United Nations have proved the possibilities of real cooperation. And let me remind you, at home, of your own place in this team. Without your unremitting labor, your financial and moral support - without your determination, nothing could have been accomplished. We, here, clearly recognize this and are proud to feel that you and ourselves are one.

With the progress of the war in this Theater every family, every individual, is familiar. The dramatic

accomplishments of G.I. Joe and his comrades of every nation - fighting in the air, on the land and on the sea - have been recorded for you daily by press and radio.

Starting first with a diversionary but most important attack in North Africa, a bitter campaign ensued in which the United Nations regained the use of the Mediterranean as a valuable channel of communications. The enemy forces in Africa were utterly destroyed, and Italy as a Fascist power was knocked out of the war. With these purposes achieved, the United Nations - with the huge quantities of supplies, special equipment and forces they had in the meantime developed - were ready to initiate the principal feature of their European strategy, the assault directly across the English Channel.

Since that June day when our men first landed upon the Normandy beaches, one of the notable campaigns of all time has been carried out. Working in effective cooperation with the great Red Army and the Allied Forces fighting in Italy, the French, British, American and other Allied Forces in this Theater have battled their way with ever-increasing speed and power through the most formidable defenses that Germany could devise.

The soldier, the sailor and the airmen, supported by the devoted efforts of thousands laboring in the services of supply, and aided by numerous comrades in the Resistance movement, first won the battle of the beaches. They won the pursuit across France, the campaign to destroy the Germans West of the Rhine and the crossing of that historic obstacle. Then they pierced to the heart of Germany to join up there with their Russian and Allied comrades coming from the East and from the South. This has been no separate war of air, of ground, or of sea. All have been welded together into one engine of avenging power - to the dismay and destruction of our enemies.

These startling successes have not been bought without sorrow and suffering. In this Theater alone 80,000 Americans and comparable numbers among their Allies, have had their lives cut short that the rest of us might live in the sunlight of freedom. Four hundred thousand of our citizens have borne the pain of physical wounds, and additional thousands have suffered privation in Nazi prison camps. The American men and women of this Theater, constituting the mightiest military force the United States has ever committed to action, solemnly salute our honored dead and extend to every relative, to every friend of all these, our deepest sentiments of respect and sympathy.

But, at last, this part of the job is done. No more will there flow from this Theater to the United States those doleful lists of dead and loss that have brought so much sorrow to American homes. The sounds of battle have faded from the European scene.

Permit me now a more personal word.

It was my great honor, and equal responsibility, to command Allied Forces in the Mediterranean, and, later, the Allied Expeditionary Force in Europe. This gives me the right to voice my lasting appreciation to numbers of people that have by their consideration, their understanding and their efficiency, made my task a bearable one.

To my own superiors in the British-American Combined Chiefs of Staff and the political heads of our two countries, I address my profound thanks. We here realize fully the immeasurable debt we owe to their wisdom, their forebearance and their staunch support. We trust that all our people have the same realization.

Merely to name my own present and former principal subordinates in this Theater is to present a picture of the utmost in loyalty, skill, selflessness, and efficiency. The United Nations will gratefully remember Tedder, Bradley, Montgomery, Ramsey, Spaatz, de Lattre and countless others. But all these agree with me in the selection of the truly heroic man of this war. He is G.I. Joe, and his counterpart in the air, the navy, and the Merchant Marine of every one of the United Nations. He has surmounted the dangers of U-boat infested seas; of bitter battles in the air; of desperate charges into defended beaches; of tedious, dangerous, fighting against the ultimate in fortified zones. He has uncomplainingly endured cold, mud, fatigue; his companion has been danger, and death has trailed his footsteps. He and his platoon and company leaders have given to us a record of gallantry, loyalty, devotion to duty and patient endurance that will warm our hearts for as long as those qualities excite our admiration.

So – history’s mightiest machine of conquest has been utterly destroyed. The deliberate design of brutal, world-wide rape that the German nation eagerly absorbed from the diseased brain of Hitler, has met the fate decreed for it by outraged justice. The self-styled super-race that six years ago set out on a career of pillage is now grovelling amongst the ruins of its own shattered cities as it fearfully hopes for a better fate than it inflicted

upon its own helpless victims. Throughout the United Nations the rejoicing bells peal forth.

Those bells voice our happiness that the Nazi scourge has been eliminated from the earth. But for the remaining enemy of humankind - Japan - those bells are sounding an imminent doom. The complete armed might of liberty and freedom is at last free to turn from the elimination of the principal criminal to the punishment of its equally despicable satellite. Already our comrades in the Pacific have made great inroads into her vitals. Japan herself must now realize her fate is sealed.

All of us here have one underlying ambition; to return speedily to our families. But we entered this war to do our duty to our country and to the cause that remains as sacred today as on that December 7th when we suddenly found ourselves at war. Wherever any man is called he will continue to do his part in assuring the completeness of victory. Some of us will stay here to police the areas and the nation that we have conquered, so that systems of justice and of order may prevail. Some will be called upon to participate in the Pacific war. But some - and I trust in ever-increasing numbers - will soon experience the joy of returning home.

I speak for the more than three million Americans in this Theater in saying that, when we are so fortunate as to come back to you, there need be no welcoming parades, no special celebrations. All we ask is to come back into the warmth of the hearts we left behind and to resume once more pursuits of peace - under our own American conceptions of liberty and of right, in which our beloved country has always dealt.

• Message for NBC special broadcast, SHAEF Forward, May 5, 1945

In this war it has been my high honor to serve, in two theaters, as an Allied Supreme Commander. In these commands fighting men of many nations have been included, but always the bulk of the forces were soldiers, sailors and airmen of Great Britain and the United States. They have lived, worked, fought and some have died, together - all as members of one great team, animated by a common devotion to the task of defeating Naziism and the self-styled superrace that hoped to enslave the world.

Full victory has been attained in Europe. Only the defeat of Japan remains as the last war task to be accomplished.

The victory in Western Europe was won by integration of spirit as well as of technical services. It was the brains and hearts of fighting men that secured the Normandy beachhead as much as it was the guns, the airplanes, the ships and special equipment we had at our command.

No courage could exceed that displayed as patient routine by the sailors in our minesweepers, landing and escort craft, Merchant Marine, submarines and torpedo boats. Where is there gallantry and stamina to exceed that of the riflemen, machine gunners and mortar men that have fought their way through obstacles and enemy lines from Cherbourg and Caen to Lubeck and Leipzig? Could we hope to find heroism and determination in brighter hue than that which has carried our airmen, day after day, night after night, into the heart of the enemy stronghold? These qualities of the United Nations fighting men have been backed by the weapons and equipment our home fronts have produced. The whole has been skillfully employed by great leaders on the sea, in the air and on the ground, all working in common purpose and real comradeship. And they have been supported by an equal devotion and efficiency in the field of supply and maintenance. Altogether, this Allied Force of almost five million men and women is one of history’s mightiest engines of righteous destruction.

As a United States Officer, I deem it my right to pay, tonight, special tribute to my British comrades - from highest commanders to the newest private. They have earned the high respect, admiration and friendship of all their Allied comrades. Speaking particularly for 3,000,000 Americans in this Theater, I merely say - we don’t like war; we will never like it - but so long as we had to fight this one we thank our God we had the men of the British Empire as partners.

Our earnest hope is that the spirit of good will and mutual understanding that has carried this Allied Force to a succession of notable victories, will persist always in preserving to the world the blessings of peace.

• Speech accepting title of honorary citizen of city of Reims, May 12, 1945

I am deeply moved by the honor that you are so kindly conferring upon me today in making me Honorary Citizen of the City of Reims. It is not so much to me personally that this distinction is addressed, but rather to all the troops who have fought under my command - to the soldiers of France, of the British Empire and of the United States - as well as to their brave comrades of the Red Army who have fought so courageously in the East. It is, therefore, on behalf of the men under my command, and as a symbol, that I am happy to accept this great honor.

When we decided to establish our Headquarters at Reims, we well knew all the inconvenience and small annoyances that the presence of a large number of troops would create for your fellow-citizens. Since our arrival, the people of Reims have extended to us a most friendly welcome, and all possible assistance which they were able to afford us.

May I ask you to be good enough to express to all your fellow-citizens of Reims our thanks and our gratitude.

I am anxious on this occasion to express our appreciation to the Frenchmen in the Resistance Movement, whose courageous effort has contributed so much to our success from the day of our landing to the day of victory. These words are addressed to all Frenchmen who have fought at our side, either in uniform or in the underground to prepare the road which led us all to victory.

For the second time in this century an arrogant Germany, thirsting for power, has wrought destruction and misery on your Continent. At the end of the last conflict, we merely made an armistice, for it was soon obvious that we had only achieved a temporary end of hostilities and that we were living not in a state of peace, but rather under a temporary cessation of the struggle.

This time, everything is quite different. The arrogant German was forced to sign his unconditional surrender and to acknowledge formally his total capitulation. This event took place in your city, whose history is already filled with glorious events. May the act of surrender signed by our enemy in your city be added to the glorious history of Reims.

• Toast delivered at dinner in Frankfurt, June 10, 1945

I raised my glass primarily to speak a word of admiration on behalf of the Allied Forces for Marshal Zhukov, but I am going to wander a bit afield before I arrive at my final toast. Marshal Zhukov has praised me in extravagant terms, my job and my performance of my job in this war. It seems a fitting occasion to me to point out that I have had the advice of the most skillful soldiers and skillful diplomats that the two great countries could produce. Soldiers, sailors, airmen and diplomats, realizing that only in unity is there strength, have subordinated themselves to my commands with perfect loyalty regardless of the claims made upon them from within their own countries. To those men I owe an immeasurable debt of gratitude. Those people have worked at my side in adversity and in prosperity and have never once deviated by one inch from the instructions laid down. I cannot name names today for the simple reason there have been so many who have performed so loyally that it would be an injustice to some if I named a single soldier; but I know those men intimately and I know what they want. They want peace. They want the opportunity for our farmers to raise a little more corn next year; they want the opportunity for our miners to live a little better next year. All of us who are right thinking want the common man of all United Nations to have the opportunities that we fought to preserve for him. They want the opportunities that will let all nations that have been engaged in this war go forward together to greater prosperity - not for us, sitting around this table, but for the masses that we represent. That means peace. Speaking for the Allied forces, we are going to have peace if we have to fight for it.

On two occasions now I have had the great honor of meeting high officials of the Soviet Union. It is my feeling that in this basic desire of all of us, they are one with us. Regardless of the methods by which we arrive at that goal, that is what we are struggling for. I cannot speak for any other individual; in fact, while I am expressing here what is in my heart and mind, I am speaking for no one except Ike Eisenhower, but I believe that there is not a single man around this table that would not give back all the honors, all the publicity, and everything else that this war has brought to him if he could have avoided the misery and suffering and debt that have been brought to the populations by reason of this war. Yet this war was a holy war, more than any other in

history this war has been an array of the forces of evil against those of righteousness. It had to have its leaders, and it had to be won - no matter what the sacrifices, no matter what the suffering to populations, to materials, to our wealth - oil, steel, industry - no matter what the cost was, the war had to be won. In Europe it has been won. To no one man do the United Nations owe a greater debt than to Marshal Zhukov. As our honored guest today he has come down and very courteously conferred certain honors of the Soviet Union upon members of the Allied forces. But Marshal Zhukov, a modest man, probably underrates the standing that he holds in our hearts and minds. One day, when all of us here at this board are gathered by our Fathers, there is certain to be another order of the Soviet Union. It will be the Order of Zhukov, and that Order will be prized by every man who admires courage, vision, fortitude, and determination in a soldier.

Gentlemen, I deem it a very great honor to ask you to rise and drink to Marshal Zhukov.

• Speech at London, England, June 12, 1945 (Guildhall Address)

The high sense of distinction I feel in receiving this great honor from the city of London is inescapably mingled with feelings of profound sadness. All of us must always regret that your country and mine were ever faced with the tragic situation that compelled the appointment of an Allied Commander-in-Chief, the capacity in which I have just been so extravagantly commended.

Humility must always be the portion of any man who received acclaim earned in the blood of his followers and the sacrifices of his friends. Conceivably a commander may have been professionally superior. He may have given everything of his heart and mind to meet the spiritual and physical needs of his comrades. He may have written a chapter that will glow forever in the pages of military history. Still, even such a man, if he existed, would sadly face the fact that his honors cannot hide in his memories the crosses marking the resting places of the dead. They cannot soothe the anguish of the widow or the orphan whose husband or whose father will not return.

The only attitude in which a commander may with satisfaction receive the tributes of his friends is a humble acknowledgement that, no matter how unworthy he may be, his position is a symbol of great human forces that have labored arduously and successfully for a righteous cause. Unless he feels this symbolism and this rightness in what he has tried to do, then he is disregardful of the courage, the fortitude and the devotion of the vast multitudes he has been honored to command. If all the allied men and women that have served with me in this war can only know that it is they this august body is really honoring today, then, indeed, will I be content.

This feeling of humility cannot erase, of course, my great pride in being tendered the freedom of London. I am not a native of this land. I come from the very heart of America. In the superficial aspects by which we ordinarily recognize family relationships the town where I was born and the one where I was reared are far separated from this great city. Abilene, Kansas, and Denison, Texas, would together add in size to possibly one five hundredth part of greater London. By your standards those towns are young, without your aged traditions that carry the roots of London back into the uncertainties of unrecorded history. To those people I am proud to belong, but I find myself today five thousand miles from that countryside, the honored guest of a city whose name stands for grandeur and size throughout the world. Hardly would it seem possible for the city of London to have gone farther afield to find a man to honor with its priceless gift of token citizenship.

Yet kinship among nations is not determined in such measurements as proximity, size and age. Rather we should turn to those inner things, call them what you will - I mean those intangibles that are the real treasures free men possess. To preserve his freedom of worship, his equality before the law, his liberty to speak and act as he sees fit, subject only to the provision that we trespass not upon similar rights of others - the Londoner will fight! So will the citizen of Abilene! When we consider these things then the valley of the Thames draws closer to the farms of Kansas and the plains of Texas. To my mind it is clear that when two peoples will face the tragedies of war to defend the same spiritual values, the same treasured rights, then, in deepest sense those two are truly related. So, even as I proclaim my undying Americanism, I am bold enough, and exceedingly proud to claim, basic kinship to you of London.

And what man who has followed the history of this war could fail to experience inspiration from the

example of this city? When the British Empire stood - alone but unconquered, almost naked but unafraid - to defy the Hitler hordes, it was on this devoted city that the first terroristic blows were launched. Five years and eight months of war, much of it on the actual battle line! Blitzes big and little, fly-bombs, V-Bombs; all of them you took in stride. You worked - from your needed efforts you would not be deterred. You carried on, and from your midst arose no cry for mercy, no wail of defeat. The battle of Britain will take its place as another of your deathless traditions. And your faith and endurance have finally been rewarded.

You had more than two years in war when Americans, in numbers, began swarming into your country. Most were mentally unprepared for the realities of war especially as waged by the Nazis. Others believed that tales of British sacrifice had been exaggerated. Still others failed to recognize the difficulties of the task ahead.

All such doubts, questions and complacencies could not endure a single casual tour through your scarred streets and avenues. With awe our men gazed upon empty spaces where once had stood buildings erected by the toil and sweat of peaceful folk. Our eyes rounded as we saw your women serving quietly and efficiently in almost every kind of war effort, even flak batteries. We became accustomed to the warning sirens, which seemed to compel, from the native Londoner, not a single hurried step. Gradually we grew closer together until we became true partners in the war.

In London, my associates and I planned two great expeditions, that to invade the Mediterranean and later that to cross the channel. London’s hospitality to Americans, her good humored acceptance of the added inconveniences we brought. Her example of fortitude and quiet confidence in the final outcome - all these helped to make the supreme headquarters of two allied expeditions the smooth-working organizations they became! They were composed of chosen representatives of two proud and independent peoples. Each noted for its initiative and for its satisfaction with its own customs, manners and methods. Many feared that those representatives could never combine together in efficient fashion to solve the complex problems presented by modern war. I hope you believe we proved the doubters wrong! Moreover, I hold that we proved this point not only for war, we proved that it can always be done by our two peoples, provided only both show the same good will, the same forebearance, the same objective attitude that British and Americans so amply demonstrated in nearly three years of bitter campaigning.

No one could, alone, have brought about this result. Had I possessed the military skill of a Marlborough, the wisdom of Solomon, the understanding of Lincoln, I still would have been helpless without the loyalty, the vision, the generosity of thousands upon thousands of British and Americans. Some of them were my companions in the high command, many were enlisted men and junior officers carrying the fierce brunt of the battle, and many others were back in the U.S. and here in Great Britain, in London. Moreover, back of us were always our great national war leaders and their civil and military staffs that supported and encouraged us through every trial, every test. The whole was one great team. I know that on this special occasion, the three million American men and women serving in the allied expeditionary force would want me to pay the tribute of admiration, respect and affection to their British comrades of this war.

My most cherished hope is that, after Japan joins the Nazi in utter defeat, neither my country nor yours need ever again summon its sons and daughters from their peaceful pursuits to face the tragedies of battle. But - a fact important for both of us to remember - neither London nor Abilene, sisters under the skin, will sell her birthright for physical safety, her liberty for mere existence.

No petty differences in the world of trade, traditions or national pride should ever blind us to identities in priceless values. If we keep our eyes on this guide post then no difficulties along our path of mutual cooperation can ever be insurmountable. Moreover, when this truth has permeated to the remotest hamlet and heart of all peoples, then indeed may we beat our swords into plowshares and all nations can enjoy the fruitfullness of the earth.

My Lord Mayor, I thank you once again for an honor to me and to the American forces that will remain one of the proudest in my memories.

• Remarks to Congress, June 18, 1945

My imagination cannot picture a more dramatic moment than this in the life of an American. I stand here in

the presence of the elected Federal Lawmakers of our great republic, the very core of our American political life and a symbol of those things that we call the American heritage. To preserve that heritage more than three million of our citizens, at your behest, resolutely faced every terror the ruthless Nazi could devise. I am summoned before you as the representative - the Commander - of those three million American men and women, to whom you desire to pay America's tribute for military victory. In humble realization that they, who earned your commendation, should properly be here to receive it, I am nevertheless proud and honored to serve as your agent in conveying it to them.

This does not seem to be the moment in which to describe the campaigns of the European conflict. They will become the substance of history, and great accounts they will be! But I think you would want from me some brief estimate of the quality of the sons, relatives and friends you - all America - have sent to war.

I have seen the American proved on battlegrounds of Africa and Europe over which Armies have been fighting for more than two thousand years of recorded history. None of those battlefields has seen a more worthy soldier than the trained American.

Willingly, he has suffered hardships: without a whimper he has made heavy sacrifices, he has endured much, but he has never faltered. His aggressiveness - his readiness to close with the enemy - has become a byword in the embattled Armies of Europe. You have read many reports of his individual exploits, but not one tenth of them ever has been or ever will be told. Any one of them is sufficient to fill a true American with emotion - with an intense pride in his countrymen.

Never have soldiers been called upon to endure longer sustained periods of contact with a vicious enemy nor greater punishment from weather and terrain. The American has been harassed by rifle and automatic weapons, pounded by hand grenades, by artillery and rocket shells, attacked by tanks and airplane bombs! He has faced the hazards of countless mines and booby traps and every form of static obstacle. He has conquered them all!

The tempo of battle had increased immeasurably during the span of this conflict. When the Germans launched their blitzkriegs through Poland, the low countries and France, featuring tactical use of airpower with mechanized units on the ground, it seemed to a fearful world that at last there had been achieved the ultimate in destructive force - that nothing could stand against the German armies.

When America entered the war arena the arrogant Nazi machine was at the zenith of its power. In 1940 it had overrun practically the whole of Western Europe, while, a year later, in the East, it had hammered the great Red Army far back into the reaches of Russian territory.

The Allies met this challenge with vision, determination, and a full comprehension of the enormity of the task ahead. America brought forth her effort from every conceivable source. New techniques of war were developed. Of these the most outstanding was the completely coordinated use of ground, air and sea forces. To his dismay the German found that far from having achieved perfection in the combined employment of all types of destructive power, his skills and methods were daily outmoded and surpassed by the Allies. Through tactical and strategic unification the Allies successfully undertook the greatest amphibious landings yet attempted in warfare. Following each of these, forces were swiftly built up on the beaches, and sustained by our Naval strength. The next step was always a speedy advance, applying to the astonished enemy an air-ground teamwork that inflicted upon him defeat after defeat. The services of supply by their devotion to duty performed real miracles in supporting the battle lines, America, and her Allies, sent finally into Europe such a mighty avalanche of aggressive power by land, by sea, by air, as to make the campaign of 1939 and 1940 seem small in contrast. The result was the unconditional surrender of an arrogant enemy.

All this America and her allies have done.

The real beginning, for us, was in December 1941, when our late great war leader, President Roosevelt, met with his friend, Prime Minister Churchill, and forged a definition of allied organizational and directional method for the prosecution of the war. During most of my three years in Europe, these two God-given men were my joint commanders-in-chief. Their insistence of making common cause the key to victory established the pattern of the war in Europe. To those two all of us recognize our lasting obligation. Because no word of mine could add anything to your appreciation of the man, who, until his tragic death, led America in war, I will say nothing other than that from his strength and indomitable spirit I drew constant support and confidence in the solution of my own problems.

In Mr. Churchill, he had a worthy partner, who led his country through its blackest hour, in 1940. The Prime Minister's rugged determination, his fighting spirit, and his singleness of purpose, were always a spur to action. Never once did he give less than full cooperation in any endeavor necessary to our military objectives, and never did he hesitate to use his magnetic and powerful personality to win cheerful acceptance from his countrymen of the great demands he was forced to make upon them.

It was no small test of the hospitality and generous understanding of the British people to have two million strangers moved among their already limited and crowded facilities. The added confusion imposed by the extensive gear of a great Army was accepted with a cheerfulness that won the admiration of us Americans. In critical moments Mr. Churchill did not hesitate to cut Britain's already reduced rations to provide more shipping for war purposes. Their overburdened railways had to absorb additional loads until practically all passenger traffic was suspended and even essential goods could be moved only on an emergency basis. For the hospitality the British offered us, for the discomforts they endured on our behalf, and for the sacrifices they made for the success of operations, every American acquainted with the facts will always carry for them a warm and grateful place deep within his heart.

Under these two great war leaders were the combined British-American chiefs of staff who were my direct military superiors and the channel through whom I received all my orders. Their unwavering support, their expressed and implied confidence, their wise direction, and their friendliness in contact, were things to which I am happy to bear witness. They devised the machinery by which huge allied forces were put together as a single unit, and through them were implemented the great military purposes that America and Great Britain agreed upon to further the political objectives of the war in Europe.

The spirit of unison that they developed was absorbed by the forces in the field. In no place was this vital unity more strikingly evidenced than among the individuals that served as my principal commanders and on my staff. British and Americans forgot differences in customs and methods - even national prejudice - in their devotion to a common cause. Often I have thanked a kind providence for these staunch allies, from highest commander to the newest recruit, and for their readiness to serve within the team.

From our first battle associations with the British Air Forces in England, with her Navy in the African invasion, and with the British Armies in North Africa, we have measured their quality through many months of war. We well know and respect the fighting heart of the British, Canadian and French soldiers and their leaders.

This teamwork was equally strong among the several services - Air, Ground, Navy and Supply. The Navy's task in gaining our first European footholds was a staggering one. Without wearing you with tactical details I ask you to take my word for the truth that in all the brilliant achievements of the American Navy, and of her sister service in Great Britain, there is none to excel the record that was written in the great and successful invasions of Africa, Sicily, Italy and France. With the Navy was always the Merchant Marine, in which Americans have served with a devotion to duty and a disregard for danger and hardship that defies any attempt to describe.

To the Air Forces, without whose services all else would have been futile, I - all of us - owe similar debts of gratitude. Perhaps it is best for me merely to say that in every ship, in every plane, in every regiment, was a readiness to give life itself for the common good. And in this statement, I must include the men that have been responsible for the tactics of the battle itself.

As an allied commander, I have tried in London and in Paris, to record something of the debt the United Nations owe to fighting leaders of the British Empire and of France. Today as an American, I should like to give you the names of our own officers that will always rank high in any list of those noted for service to our country. But any enumeration would necessarily be incomplete, so I must content myself by saying that, in great numbers, these battle leaders of the Army, the Navy, and the Air, have served loyally, devotedly, and brilliantly in my commands in Europe and Africa. Particularly I think you would like to know that without exception, their first concern, their constant care, has been the welfare - spiritual and physical - of their men - your sons, relatives and friends. You have as much right to swell with pride in the quality of the battle commanders you have sent to Europe and Africa as you have in the conduct of the millions they have led so skillfully and devotedly.

I have spoken mostly of Americans and British, because troops from this country and the British Empire always formed the bulk of my own command. But the campaigns of the Red Army, crushing all resistance in

the East, played a decisive part in the defeat of Germany.

The abilities of the Soviet leaders and the courage and fortitude of their fighting men - and women - stir the emotions of anyone who admires soldierly virtues. The Soviet people have been called upon for terrible sacrifices in their own land, ravished by the bestial excesses of the German. Driven back to Stalingrad, their calm refusal to acknowledge the possibility of any other outcome than victory will be honored in history for all time to come. Finally, when Russian armies and ourselves started the great drives that met on the Elbe, the end was merely a matter of days - the allies, East and West, linked up and Nazi Germany was no more.

Here at home you played a very special part in the Soviet victory. Large quantities of American equipment, sent over the Arctic route to Murmansk or up from the Persian Gulf, furnished vital material of war to assist the Russians in mounting their great drives. The production of our people has won the high praise from the Soviet leaders, as it has from other leaders in the allied nations. There is not a battlefront in Europe where it has not been of decisive importance.

The liberated countries of Europe have also played a part in fashioning the victory. Following upon our invasion of Normandy, the breakthrough last summer permitted the swift liberation of most of France and gave that people an opportunity to begin resumption of normal conduct of their own lives. France's own resistance forces, and some of her combat divisions, took a notable part in driving out the hated enemy.

Every American soldier has seen the toll that war has exacted from France. Towns have been destroyed. Broken bridges make difficult road and river transport. The destruction of rolling stock or its allocation to military needs has denied its use to carry needed civilian goods, particularly food and fuel. Even now, although the guns are silent, the urgent necessities of our redeployment to the Pacific make it impossible to do all that we would wish toward improving the trying conditions in which French people live.

This feeling extends also to Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg, which endured four years of German tyranny, and which supported effective resistance movements. In the Netherlands, during the last few months of conflict, real starvation prevailed in certain sections, where the German garrisons refused assistance. Our sympathy was aroused and tons of food were dropped by parachute to alleviate their suffering. Those countries still need, and deserve our help.

And now, because this meeting typifies, for me, the spiritual unity of the American home and battlefronts, I address a word to that relationship.

The American fighting man has never failed to recognize this dependence upon you at home. I am grateful for this opportunity to stand before the Congress and express my own and the thanks of every soldier, sailor and airman to the countrymen who have remained devoted to their tasks. This feeling goes beyond the tangible things - guns, ammunition, tanks and planes, although in these things you have sent us the most, and the best. It extends to such intangibles as the confidence and sympathetic understanding which have filled the letters written by families and friends to the men up front. For a few moments, simple words of affection and cheer blot out the danger and loneliness and hardship which are the soldier's life. They send him back with renewed vigor and courage to his inexorable task of crushing the enemy.

I hope you realize that all you have done for your soldiers has been truly appreciated. Never have they felt absent from your anxious care and war affections. The Red Cross - to name just one outstanding organization - stands high in their admiration. The Red Cross with its clubs for recreation, its coffee and doughnuts in the forward areas, its readiness to meet the needs of the well and help administer to the wounded - even more important, the devotion and warm-hearted sympathy of the Red Cross girls! The Red Cross has often seemed to be the friendly hand of this nation, reaching across the sea to sustain its fighting men.

The battle front and the home front; together we have found the victory! But even the banners of triumph cannot hide from our sight the sacrifices in which victory has been bought. The hard task of a commander is to send men into battle knowing some of them - often many - must be killed or wounded in order that necessary missions may be achieved. It is a soul-killing task! My sorrow is not only for the fine young lives lost or broken, but it is equally for the parents, the wives and the friends who have been bereaved. The price they pay is possibly the greatest!

The blackness of their grief can be relieved only by the faith that all this shall not happen again!

Because I feel this so deeply I hope you will let me attempt to express a thought that I believe is today embedded in deep in the hearts of all fighting men. It is this. The soldier knows how grim and dark was the

outlook for the allies in 1941 and 1942. He is fully aware of the magnificent way the United Nations responded to the threat. To his mind the problems of peace can be no more difficult than the one you had to solve more than three years ago, and which, in one battle area, has now been brought to a successful conclusion. He knows that in war the threat of separate annihilation tends to hold Allies together; he hopes we can find in peace a nobler incentive to produce the same unity. He passionately believes that, with the same determination, the same optimistic resolution and the same mutual consideration among Allies that marshalled in Europe forces capable of crushing what had been the greatest war machine in history, the problems of peace can and must be met. He sees the United Nations strong but considerate; humane and understanding leaders in the world to preserve the peace he is winning.

The genius and power of America have, with her Allies, eliminated one menace to our country's freedom - even her very existence. Still another remains to be crushed in the Pacific before peace will be restored. The American men and women I have been so honored to command would, I know, say this to you today: In our minds and hearts there is no slightest doubt that our people's spirit of determination, which has buoyed us up and driven us forward in Europe, will continue to fire this nations through the ordeals of battle yet to come. Though we dream of return to our loved ones, we are ready, as we have always been, to do our duty to our country, no matter what it may be. In this spirit we renew our pledge of service to our Commander-in-Chief, President Truman, under whose strong leadership we know that final victory is certain.

• Homecoming Speech, Abilene, Kansas, June 22, 1945

Because no man is really a man who has lost out of himself all of the boy, I want to speak first of the dreams of a barefoot boy. Frequently, they are to be of a street car conductor or he sees himself as the town policeman, above all he may reach to a position of locomotive engineer, but always in his dreams is that day when he finally comes home. Comes home to a welcome from his own home town. Because today that dream of mine of 45 years or more ago has been realized beyond the wildest stretches of my own imagination, I come here, first, to thank you, to say the proudest thing I can claim is that I am from Abilene.

The first and most important part of the celebration today from my view point was this, I was not set apart, I was merely another Abileneite putting on a celebration for something other than just one individual, an expression of our rejoicing that one nasty job is done in Europe, that in one sector of the world no longer will we have the fear of losing our sons, our relatives and our friends, in that theater at least we no longer have to pour our wealth in order to sustain our fighting armies. That is the real thing we are celebrating today. My position was merely a symbol of the forces over there and you people put on a special thing to say to those soldiers "thank you." That is the way I look at today's celebration. The parade itself was so unique in conception that to everyone who had part in planning it, developing it, or an actual participating part on the street, I want to extend not only my felicitations and admiration but my very great thanks for thinking of such a wonderful thing. I cannot believe that there would be anything better for all the big cities of the United States today, than to see that parade.

In that parade a whole epoch passed before our eyes. Its beginning was coincidental with the coming of my own father and mother to this section. In the days of the independent farm and the horse and buggy, where each family was almost self-sustaining, certainly the community was self-sustaining. We grew our corn and we grew our meat, we grew our vegetables, and the local mills ground the flour and we didn't have much connections with the outside world. As you noticed the end of that parade you saw the most modern type of machinery. No longer is it necessary for farmers to join up with their neighbors to get in the crops and the harvest, to carry out the round-up, to get the house built; we have become mechanized. No longer are we here independent of the rest of the world. We must sell our wheat and we must get things from the rest of the world. Our part is most important, there is nothing so important in the world today as food, in a material way. Food is necessary all over Europe and must be sent to preserve the peace. In that way you see immediately your connection with the problems of Europe.

We are not isolationists. Intelligent people are not isolationists. We are a part of the great civilization of this world at this moment, and every part of the world where a similar civilization prevails is a part of us. In a

more definite way, since I am now a citizen of New York City, that city is part of you, one of your bigger suburbs. If we then see our relationship with the whole world, how much more intimate is it with our own United States. This section with its great agricultural products is so necessary to all of the big cities of the United States, that I repeat nothing could be better for those cities than to have seen the parade today, showing in its several floats the nature and volume of your products. They would have no longer any trouble seeing that Abilene, Kansas is important to them and New York City would bed proud to be your suburb.

Through national organizations we cooperate with others in this world. It is through that conception that we hope to preserve the peace and we cannot have any more war. If we are going to cooperate effectively we must first be united among ourselves. We must understand our relationship with the big city and they with us and then as a whole we must be strong enough to present our own case in a dignified way before the councils of the world. President Truman's hands must be upheld at all times by the knowledge that back of him are united people ready to do his bidding if it becomes necessary.

Through this world it has been my fortune or misfortune to wander at considerable distance; never has this town been outside my heart and memory. Here are some of my oldest and dearest friends. Here are men that helped me start my own career and helped my son start his. Here are people that are lifelong friends of my mother and my late father, the really two great individuals of the Eisenhower family. They raised six boys and they made sure that each had an upbringing at home and an education that equipped him to gain a respectable place in his own profession, and I think it's fair to say they all have. They and their families are the products of the loving care, labor and work of my father and mother; just another average Abilene family. One more word, there was one thing in the parade today that was in error. A number of signs - I saw a sign, "welcome to our hero." I am not the hero, I am the symbol of the heroic men you people and all the United States have sent to war. It has been my great honor to command three million American men and women in Europe. All those people from Dickinson County could not come back at one time for a celebration like this, I fully realize, cannot be held for the return of each but in the sum total, if you, as a community, accepts each one of those men back to your hearts as you have me, not only will you be doing for them the one thing they desire but for my part you will earn my eternal gratitude. Every one of those men is precious to me and each one coming back does not want special treatment; he does not want to be supported for life. The initiative, the self-dependence that made him great as a soldier, he expects to exercise in peace, but he does want to be received in the same friendly spirit that you received me. I know you will do it, not as parts of your war duty but out of the greatness of your heart and the warmth of your affection for soldiers that have laid everything on the line for us, even their very lives.

And now, on the part of myself and my wife, my brothers and all their families, I want to say thanks to Kansas, to Dickinson County, and to Abilene for a reception that so far exceeds anything any of us could imagine, that all of us are practically choked with emotion. Good luck and God Bless everyone of you.

• Radio broadcast on Air Force Day, July 23, 1945

Successful war is waged in three elements. There is no more mystery concerning the part played by the Air Forces in achieving the victories of the Allied Expeditionary Force than there is concerning the Navies that escorted us to the beaches and sustained our sea communications throughout many months of fighting, or of the ground armies that swept forward from Normandy to the heart of the Reich. The whole invasion plan was based upon an unshakeable faith that the Air Forces could and would do their part, which involved the defeat of the enemy's air forces, the wearing away of his industrial capacity, the damaging of his communication systems, the practical immobilization of enemy reserves in selected tactical areas, and the softening of prepared defenses whenever the enemy was encountered in fortified lines, both on the beaches and later in the campaign. All the Air Forces, American and Allied, more than justified the faith of the high command and so brilliantly performed alongside and with the ground and Naval members of the victorious team, as to deserve every tribute that a grateful world can heap upon them.

• Recording at closing of the Allied Expeditionary Force radio program, July 28, 1945

It was with profound regret that I said good-bye - two weeks ago - to my staff at Supreme Headquarters upon the occasion of its dissolution as an Allied organization that had been formed in London almost two years before as the first Allied headquarters in Europe.

The spirit of team-work present on the date of formation of that headquarters grew and developed and permeated the entire Allied Expeditionary Force. Our many accomplishments in these past two years can be attributed not to any one man or nation, but to the fact that all of us had our sights trained on a definite goal and that we pulled together as a team.

Tonight we bid farewell to one of the examples of that team-work - the A.E.F. Program - which ahs brought enjoyment and enlightenment to the Allied Forces ever since the inaugural program on June 7, 1944 - D-Day plus one.

To the American, British and Canadian members of the Operating Staff of the program, I should like to express my appreciation and that of each member of the A.E.F. for the long hours spent daily - striving for perfection in a program which has been invaluable not only as entertainment but also as a medium for promoting understanding among our peoples.

To the Field Recording Units that worked throughout the operational area, recording timely events and the realities of war as experienced by the men who were faced with them - to the Mobile Transmitters Units that relayed the programs from the Continent to the Forces as they moved forward and into Germany - to the BBC which placed all of its resources behind this project, and to Mr. Haley, its Director-General, who has given so freely of his time and has so ably assisted in making the program a success - to all of you, we owe a debt of gratitude for your efforts in making this Allied venture a success.

When the Allied nations have won the final victory, each of us will have a responsibility to continue this basic principle of cooperation in our own countries - to influence those who have been less fortunate than we in that they have not had the experience of serving closely with others of the Allied nations - to explain this principle to the disbelievers - to act as missionaries in demonstrating that cooperation and united effort will gain the real victory-peace.

And now I should like to add a personal word of thanks to each and every one on you for the part you played and the contribution you have made to our joint effort. Good-bye and - wherever your new activities may take you - good luck and God-speed.

• Radio address upon departure from Moscow, August 15, 1945

Several of my officers and I visited Moscow as guests of the Red Army. This morning we are leaving. I can say only this - not only did we have a wonderful time, but we are leaving as friends of the city of Moscow. We are proud to be called your friends. You may rest assured that you have several representatives of friendship, somewhere on the globe, who will always speak well of Moscow. We like you. Farewell.

• Speech to correspondents of Tass upon departure from Leningrad, August 15, 1945

I regret that my stay in Leningrad has been so short. I have heard a lot about this city, but the impression which it made on me today is far more vivid and significant than anything I could ever imagine. I shall avail myself of the first opportunity to visit this remarkable city for a longer period of time. I thank the citizens of Leningrad for the warm welcome and for the sincere hospitality.

• Speech at Belfast, August 24, 1945

My first expression must be one of thanks to the city of Belfast - thanks for the high honor today bestowed

upon me as the representative of the great fighting force the Western Allies sent to Europe more than a year ago. Even more my thanks are due for the hospitality shown to American soldiers who were stationed here so long. The sojourn of our forces in Northern Ireland will remain a cherished memory in the hearts of many Americans. You received us into your community and into your homes, with a generosity which was evident and sincere. You put us at your ease. You gave us your friendship. For all this we are deeply appreciative.

This global war has taken the American Army to many foreign fields. It was here in Northern Ireland that we first began to concentrate for our share in the attack upon the citadel of continental Europe. From here started the long hard march to allied victory, which led our forces to North Africa, Sicily, the Italian Mainland, Normandy, and finally the dash across Germany. Americans have served beside many other forces - from the British homeland, from the colonies, from the other great members of the British commonwealth of nations, from other allies among the United Nations. It has been a mighty brotherhood of fortitude and courage, consecrated to the pursuit of a righteous cause. Thanks to this common purpose and these united efforts we now share victory on all fronts. These experiences, these friendships, should now serve us well in peace.

To me this ceremony is yet another symbol of the genuine respect and trust which the British and American nations hold toward one another. Quite aside from those things we own in common - language, literature, legal system, fundamental conceptions of government - the American people have a special and particular respect for the serene determination with which the British nation stood up undaunted in the face of the Nazi blitz. May I be permitted to pay homage to what may be all summed up in a single word, character.

The cities and boroughs of Great Britain have a proud tradition of free government. Historically they have been vigilant of their ancient liberties. They have displayed a sturdy sense of responsibility for their particular communal problems. They have fostered ideals of public virtue and civil consciousness, an awareness of the importance of individual initiative and communal effort. These virtues are similar to the sense of personal responsibility which in both our armies have characterized the individual soldier and the leaders of even the smallest units.

A tremendous step toward world peace will be accomplished if a similar sense of personal responsibility can be acquired by the German people. Our military government over them can not be a purely negative control. Gradually they should be encouraged to build free institutions suitable to their needs. We hope that they will accept and foster that consciousness of the individual's personal responsibility to think and act and vote which is the very antithesis of the Nazi theory of regimentation. They must absorb the ideal of the moral duty of every citizen to participate in democratic thinking for the salvation of his community and his nation, within an orderly and peaceful world.

My Lord Mayor, in inviting me to return here to become an honorary Burgess you have given one further proof of the ties of affection which bind the American Army to the people of Northern Ireland. I trust that you look upon it, as I do, as a token of our common purpose to work together for a better world.

• Speech at Belfast University, August 24, 1945

I accept with gratitude the high honor of the Doctorate of Queen's University, as one of the happy consequences of my service as Allied Commander-in-Chief. It was my privilege to bear responsibility to the fighting men and citizens of free countries, united in a single cause, and each of them will always share whatever can come to me in commendation.

In this award, there is the implication of your conviction that there was worked out, in war, a method of combined leadership and of cooperation that enabled millions of fighting men of different nationalities to pursue, effectively and surely, a common objective. I trust that this award symbolizes, also, your faith that it should always be possible for free nations to find an acceptable solution to a common problem.

Details of organization of the forces of the United Nations for the prosecution of this war would not necessarily be applicable to like efforts for coordinated action in peace. But that experiment owed its success to something deeper than details. From common danger we learned lessons of cooperation, of forbearance and accommodation, of sacrifices of immediate advantage, of subordination of selfish interest to the general good. We have thought and acted on a global scale. Together we have risked dangers, improving the prospects of

success by a flexible handling of our united resources, human and material. We have learned to confer and plan together, candidly and with a confidence that increased with direct contact and growth of personal friendships. These were the fundamentals of victory.

All this was born of a realization that the free peoples of the world had come to such a pass that only by unprecedented success in unifying their efforts could they find deliverance. The victory demonstrated that inexhaustible resources of faith and decency and character, can, regardless of diversity of race or nationality, generate a mighty power in combating evil. It has proved, once again, that men will not forever permit hate, perfidy, cynicism and perverted thinking to dominate the world. Throughout this long war there have been men and nations - and herein the British people have particular reason for pride - who never, in the darkest hours, lost faith in their cause or despaired of final victory.

And yet it was too near a thing. It was a risk we dare not run again. The mechanical power of destruction has now become so fearfully devastating that, I repeat, we must see that a similar menace does not rise again. We must now enlist the same energy and singleness of purpose in developing the institutions of peace which in the time of our necessity we devoted to the prosecution of war.

But the peace-time task presents certain difficulties far greater than those of war. The danger, in war, is immediate and the need of sacrifice unquestioned. The end achieved is clearly defined, since the purpose of military leadership is the destruction of the enemy's forces. Unity in action is eagerly sought.

Now, with the threat of utter disaster removed, courageous action, at first glance, seems less imperative. The pursuit of selfish aims seems less culpable. Men of narrow vision appeal to prejudice and peace loving men are tempted to temporize. The methods of coordination which should guide the ordering of a world of peace are more difficult to define than are those of purely military command. Yet we cannot doubt that the basic principles of united action which guided us through the war may be turned to the realization and preservation of the peace. It is a challenge and an imperative need. The opportunity has been purchased at an enormous price.

To this great task educational institutions have their own peculiar contribution to make. It is not possible for most men to know other nations at first hand, and in so doing rid themselves of the suspicions and doubts which we almost instinctively reflect in our contacts with strangers. But institutions of learning everywhere can interpret and diffuse an awareness of the history, culture, problems and characteristics of other lands. We confidently look to the universities, with their traditions of fresh, unconventional, creative thinking to lead in this particular effort, so important to the steady growth of a peaceful society of nations. Universities can go much farther, because they are free to make every kind of imaginative effort to anticipate and suggest solutions to those maladjustments which often serve to give a semblance of righteousness to a breach of the peace.

The substance of peace is a universal appreciation of human values. No other agency of civilization has more glowing opportunity to inculcate and spread this appreciation than has the university. Almost it seems that civilization itself and the freedom of men are in the balance - in the long run both depend upon breadth of understanding, the priceless product of true education. It is not too much to say that the world's universities have an unequalled responsibility toward future human welfare and unequalled opportunity to enrich it.

My Lord Chancellor, may I assure you again that I am proud you have today associated my name permanently with this great university.

• Suggested Reply to Burgomaster of Schaerbeck, September 6, 1945

This act on the part of the Historic Commune of Schaerbeck is a tribute that would warm the soul of any soldier. Knowing the gift you bestow upon me comes as the sincere expression of loyal friends who labored in the high cause of human freedom, gives the token an immeasurable value. It is one more unbreakable tie that binds me to the warm-hearted Belgian people.

The infinite patience employed in fashioning this sword for me confirms it as a labor of affection. In its setting is reflected the organized effort that crushed the enemies of freedom in Western Europe. Nothing could be nearer to my heart than a reminder of that strong combination of fighting men that liberated our friends and doomed our enemies. In that combination Belgium was an important member.

As I accept this treasured symbol, let me give you my grateful thanks for this and many other kindnesses

shown me in Belgium. May God bless your gallant Nation and keep us all steadfast in faithful service to the great cause of human dignity and freedom.

• Suggested reply to Burgomaster of Brussels, September 6, 1945

I am deeply appreciative of the high honors bestowed upon me by the beautiful capital city of your great country. This day will always be among my most cherished memories. I will hear with pride the title “Honorary Citizen of Brussels.”

This city - all Belgium - has extended most cordial hospitality, generous assistance, and cooperation to the Allied Forces. Belgium’s contribution to the war effort has been magnificent. The great port of Antwerp, the rail and waterways, the coal mines, the storage depots and other facilities, have been of indispensable value to the Allied Forces and have been important factors in hastening the victory. I express my appreciation and gratitude to the officials and workmen, and to the soldiers of the reborn Belgian Army. I pay tribute, likewise, to the courageous Belgian resistance forces, who served under my command so gallantly, and to the fortitude and perseverance of the people of Antwerp and Liege who continued in their invaluable work for the Allied cause through the dangerous period of V-bombings.

Both the living and the dead allied soldiers make a sympathetic bond with the people of the Ardennes who courageously shared the suffering of our armies last winter. May these bonds between our countries be forever strengthened and may we always keep foremost in our minds the ideals and principles for which we fought, suffered and attained final victory.

In these imperishable values we have, between your country and mine, an indestructible kinship. Long may it live - Long live Belgium.

• Transcription made for National War Fund at request of Col. Luther L. Hill, September 11, 1945

War is a grim, cruel business, a business justified only as a means of sustaining the forces of good against those of evil.

In the war just won the threat of despotism was met by a union of the forces of freedom. In marshalling those forces, there was a unity of military power. Forces of the ground, aid, and sea operated in coordinated movement and command. The greatest victory was due to the combined efforts of all elements operating as a unified whole.

Equally important with the unity of the fighting forces, has been that of the home front, a factor which supported and sustained the spirits of our fighting men during the bitter campaigning on alien soil.

Through bond purchases to provide the munitions of battle, through making available life-giving blood plasma, through supporting the essential war-time services that give to the uniformed personnel a mental stimulus, the home folks have assured our fighting forces that the nation solidly backed the cause for which they fought.

Without that help the fine achievement of our soldiers would not have been possible. But the military victory is only half of the total victory that is necessary before the was purposes of our people will be completely realized.

With the actual combat service at an end, many thousands of our men must remain in the occupation forces overseas. All of them long to get back home now! But they have further obligations, placed upon them by the American determination to see that Germany and Japan cannot again plunge the world into conflagration.

Men in the Occupation Forces face the tedious task of prolonging an already long tour of duty far from their homes and friends. They will experience impatient weeks when they will appreciate, more and more, anything the folks at home can do to make their continued absence less irksome. They will place an even higher appraisal on the smallest considerations and kindnesses - the mail call, the things that bring a touch of home, the activities and events that help to brighten the routine of inaction, to occupy their time and sustain their spirit.

These men have demonstrated the toughness of their make-up in crushing powerful and ruthless foes. But

monotony and foreign surroundings combine to make their life a cheerless one. That is why Army Special Services has arranged to have “made-in-America” entertainment taken to these men by the USO Camp Shows. In supporting this important activity for our service men, the home folks will let them know they are not “forgotten men.”

Aside from our own men, there is urgent need for helping, wherever we can, to relieve the suffering and distress of peoples who are the innocent victims of the same unprincipled enemy which they and we have conquered.

It is not enough that we have been victorious over the military enemy if another enemy of even greater destructive potentialities is permitted to menace the future of mankind. The triumph in the shooting war will become an empty mockery if democracy fails in the fight against starvation and disease.

To the limit of their capabilities and the extent of their credits, the governments of those afflicted nations are concentrating their resources on this grim threat that now hangs over the Old World. But neither their ability nor their productivity is sufficient to cope with the present situation.

It is essential that the ordinary instrumentalities of governments and peoples be augmented by existing American private agencies for foreign relief. Those organizations affiliated with the National War Fund have been active in alleviating suffering in the allied nations throughout the war, and they must be supported in their further efforts.

Any assistance that Americans can voluntarily render will be not only a gesture of appreciation for what the peoples of those nations have endured, but will also be a distinct contribution toward international solidarity.

It will be another indication of America’s humane and understanding desire to make workable and enduring the peace for which America’s men poured out in unstinted measure their valor, their strength, their courage - and in many instances - their all.

• Recording for the Radio Forum, September 29, 1945

In the face of some of the appalling problems confronting the world today there seems little need to argue for international team-work in their solution. To say that the victors in the late war need still to cooperate, each with all the others, is to state a truism rather than a proposition. Suspicion, hunger, privation, fear of disease and fear of death dwell in great sections of the earth, and unless international cooperation meets this challenge with firmness, forbearance and wisdom, resulting chaos could well become another Vesuvius, with civilization the Pompeii.

One example of a definite world problem exists today in Germany. Here allies are attempting, in concert, to carry out policies stated by our governmental heads at Potsdam. Subject only to limitations in speed imposed by the size of the task, by destroyed records and conflicting testimony, we are eliminating from the economic, governmental and educational life of the German people, every man that was actively associated with the Nazi party or its affiliates. Punishment decreed by proper courts will be promptly carried into effect.

We are making certain that Germany cannot, within the foreseeable future, again plunge the world into conflict. Her great war plants have been and are being dismantled, to be disposed of as dictated by our governments. Germany’s war staffs have been dissipated. Her industry is rigidly controlled.

We have been straining every resource to care for and rehabilitate hundreds of thousands of displaced persons whose only crime was that they crossed the purposes of a megalomaniac. We are demanding that the principal burden fall on the German population, which is basically responsible for their plight. With sympathy and forbearance we are trying to give these unfortunate victims a decent current life while policies are worked out, on higher levels, that will permit them to make for themselves permanent places in civilized society.

Another purpose is to give to ravaged countries restitution and reparation from German resources, and then to produce an economy in Germany that will sustain a standard not higher than that of surrounding territories. This does not necessarily mean a permanent choking off of natural resources needed throughout Europe, but it does mean that these assets shall always be devoted to peaceful purposes, and shall not produce weapons with which a new Hitler may hope to conquer the earth.

We have begun a system of education and dissemination of information which we hope will lead the

German people, particularly the very young, into paths foreign to those of war. They must be made to realize that only through convincing proof of reform may they gain a position of respect in a democratic world, and that any resort to force will always result in the loss of all that their labor, thought and effort have brought into being for their own benefit.

How long this occupational process must go on is something for governments to decide, but naturally, we hope that the military phase of directing civil activities will soon pass. No matter how wise, humane, firm and understanding soldiers may be, the future task here - at least its constructive features - is, under American concepts of government, a civilian rather than a military function. Everything we do is based upon this conviction, and every feature of our control organization is so designed as to facilitate transfer from military to civilian authority whenever decision to that effect can appropriately be taken. In the meantime, the American Army here is sending veterans home at unprecedented speed.

As we strive toward these objectives there is constant consultation with our allies concerning method and procedure. Though each member of the Control Council is naturally called upon to uphold firmly the views and interests of his own country, in all negotiations there has been friendliness, understanding and consideration in solving problems that fall within the limits of our own responsibilities.

In a project of this kind, where positive action depends upon unanimous agreement between four independent representatives, we cannot expect the same type of decisive and speedy efficiency that is a characteristic of a successful military command. But we should have faith and patience to believe that, in broader perspective, every foot of progress based upon Allied cooperation and the growth of mutual confidence is worth a yard of advance in temporary or local affairs, achieved without regard for the views of co-partners.

In the field of global cooperation world leaders have responsibilities and problems that make our local ones in Germany seem small by comparison. Of these the greatest is preservation of peace. Though men have long known that the one thing more destructive than victorious war is a lost one, yet too often they have blinded themselves to the possibility of war in the background when plausible argument has held before their eyes a glittering picture of immediate gain. World leaders have been making measurable strides in producing agreements and machinery to maintain order and eliminate piracy in international relationships. Those leaders deserve and need our earnest support and our continuing interest in the intricate problems they must solve; they need to know that we will strive as earnestly to preserve peace as to win a war.

Back of any system of justice is always demanded the power to enforce legal and just decisions. The necessary power can be provided for international peace machinery only by the strength of those that are determined to make the system work. Reasonable readiness to apply military force against deliberate violence remains a necessity.

We have just entered the atomic age, as in the first World War we had only just well entered the age of Ari. The exact influence of this newest discovery of science upon the pattern of military forces cannot yet be foreseen with certainty. But no matter what the nature of these forces, we simply cannot afford extravagance. The premiums for safety insurance must be paid, but they should be accurately gauged to our needs.

Efficiency in war demands complete national coordination. The several organisms to achieve over-all coordination necessarily head up into our President, the executive upon whose shoulders must always fall the heavy burden of guiding the nation at war. The fighting services are but the cutting edge of the whole machine that he must gear to the requirements of the battlefield. That cutting edge must be efficient and, in spite of its many-sided character, this means it should be a single whole. Without this permanent unification we cannot escape duplications and needless expense, and this applies in peace, as well as, even more dramatically, in war. No matter what atomic mysteries still lie ahead, it is axiomatic that so long as warfare involves the elements of land, sea and air, the closest possible articulation of our national fighting forces will promote efficiency and save money.

As has been so clearly demonstrated at least twice within our lifetime, modern war is an all-inclusive business. It is no longer a thing apart from the core of a nation’s life, a mere contest between professional warriors.

It involves every last shred of moral and physical power that the nation can bring to bear. In our present state of development, any country, no matter how wealthy, that faces the possibility of war with nothing but professional forces upon which to depend, will either bankrupt itself in the effort to sustain respectable strength,

or will be so pitifully weak that the people can experience no sense of security behind it. Moreover, if a nation persists in this error, a predatory power will feel freer to leap to sudden attack with less fear of the consequences. In the training of our healthy manpower, as an obligation to the nation and to the individual himself, is to be found the most efficient, economical and democratic method of equalizing the burden of providing security and of standing before the world as a nation ready to defend democracy. And if any man fears that such training glorifies or promotes militarism - let him sample the mass opinion of our returning veterans. I assure you they want no more war!

Thus we may be strong, within the means we can afford: and the words of the strong are weighty in the councils of peace. With confidence in ourselves, with consideration for the viewpoints of others, with readiness to seek acceptable solutions in those cases where our interests conflict with others, we can cooperate in the concrete problems, of which the German is only one, and we will be a vast influence in support of international law and order.

More specifically, we will be helping to lift from the hearts and minds of our own children that age old curse, the fear of war!

• **Response to toast of President Benes at local Press Bureau, October 16, 1945** (as reconstructed by Col. Taylor, Lt. Weisgall and Lt. Col. Woldike)

It is provident that in some of the world's crises great leaders were on the stage of history. The United Nations were indeed fortunate to have at their head such men as President Roosevelt, Generalissimo Stalin and Mr. Churchill. They were the heads of the three great democracies which bore the brunt of the material side of the war. But, of equal importance, and to an extent difficult to over-estimate, was the spiritual support of the smaller countries who fought with us. Hitler's great mistake was to believe that if he succeeded in conquering Europe physically, he could also harness it spiritually. He failed first and foremost in the case of Czechoslovakia when its President, Dr. Benes, in 1938, after the Munich crisis, refused to tip his hat to Hitler's gangster methods. It was the example of Dr. Benes, which to a large extent gave us courage and determination in the early days to pursue the war to its final victorious end. Thus, he surely deserves a place beside the other three great leaders.

I had the honor during the war, to command the soldiers of many nations. Among these many soldiers, I also had command of the Czechoslovakian Armored Brigade, a Bomber Squadron and three Fighter Squadrons. They were all splendid soldiers, who contributed materially and spiritually to the success of the war. I repeat once again that a great deal of the credit must go to your outstanding President and leader, Dr. Benes. It is this spirit that I raise my glass in his honor!

• **Remarks at Louvain University, October 19, 1945**

It is with feelings of the deepest humility and the greatest gratification that I accept this high honor from your hands today. My feeling of humility arises from the fact that all of those things for which you are honoring me were really the products of a vast force, not only the Allied force that I was privileged to lead into Europe, but of all the democratic peoples behind it that contributed by their work and their sacrifice to our final victory. My great pride arises from the fact that his honor comes to me from an old, ancient, proud university of Europe, situated in a country which stands high in the affections of my own country and of all democratic people everywhere, and which has established a record in this war that, according to its history, is worthy to rank with any other. Your own University, twice within our own lifetime, has been subjected to the horrors of an occupying force. It has never wavered in its adherence to truth and in that was one great obstacle that Hitler and his predecessors could not overcome. Dictatorships are based and founded upon falsehood and deceit; truth, in the long run, will always defeat. It was around truth that the peoples of the world rallied to defeat Hitler. The position of Louvain University in all this has been a leader in those matters of the spirit that have achieved even this military victory. In the years to come institutions such as yours will have an even greater responsibility, as I

see it. This war has seen advances in science that are so great that they stagger the imagination of man in his effort to control them and devote them to his usefulness rather than his destruction. Only objective education, through leaders who are concerned with the rise of man and with the Christian principles on which all true democracy is based, can help us point the way.

In the years to come Louvain University will be one of the leaders in this effort and I am exceedingly proud that my name may forever be associated with that University. I thank you again for allowing me to serve as a symbol for all those soldiers, sailors and airmen in receiving the honor that you have conferred upon me today.

• **Speech for Freedom House, November 7, 1945** (recorded August 22, 1945)

It is with a sense of special distinction that I accept the annual award of “Freedom House,” particularly as I note in the citation the words, “soldier of peace.” It is a title I should like always to be worthy to bear.

At the beginning of the late war the people of the Western democracies were inspired to toil, battle and sacrifice by the ringing words of two great statesmen, who showed us that the freedoms under which we live were at stake in the conflict.

Although it was for freedom we fought and won this war, we have always known that fighting alone cannot preserve it. Instead, the demands of war and its after effects call for increased vigilance in guarding our liberties. We realize that freedom of speech and press must, in the face of military requirements, suffer curtailment in major conflicts. Individual liberty and industrial enterprise must likewise be circumscribed to meet the needs of the nation. Beyond this, if the outpourings of all production should be too long or too frequently devoted to destructive processes, then at last fear and famine will stalk the earth and, in cumulative effect, freedom will give way to the single effort to survive.

Civilization has long understood these things but has shown meager progress in the practical business of preventing war. Now, there has been established, in the San Francisco Charter, a concert of Nations that holds promise for a peaceful future. It can - it must - work! Its success will be determined, in marked degree, by the mutually exhibited intelligence, sympathy and forbearance of the peoples represented in it. We, as citizens, cannot shift our own responsibilities to the shoulders of representatives sitting around a conference table. We must strive for understanding and be ready to do our part in substituting cooperation for conflict.

It is easy to say that the seeds of war are found in each of us, in our selfishness; in our unwillingness to assume obligations that we hope others will bear for us - in short, in our refusal to accept the golden rule as a fixed law of life. Likewise it is easy enough to make glittering generalities about the blessings of peace and the stupidity and the futility of war. We are living in a world of harsh realities and one of these is acknowledged weakness within ourselves. The problem must be solved in full understanding of these difficulties. The solution, therefore, must appeal to self-interest as well as to idealism.

As a first essential, our Nation should have a respectable position in the matter of military readiness so that it may be free of the fear of forceful domination imposed by sudden and unscrupulous attack. Free institutions confer on each of us priceless privileges, but with an equal obligation to defend them. To achieve this reasonable position in the modern world involves time for technical and physical training, and a definite drain upon the national purse. These expenditures are something that we cannot begrudge when we consider the alternative; but we must attain national military efficiency with the least possible diversion from productive pursuits of human energy and material resources.

Even when we have done this, we have not provided a cure for a world sickness that has re-appeared through the ages with persistent frequency.

Admitting that freedom cannot thrive under conditions of perpetual or frequent global conflict, it is necessary, in addition to all other steps, to remove or ameliorate conditions that lead communities toward war. Among those conditions a traditional one has been want, fear of starvation. Another has been mutual racial and national antagonisms, most frequently built upon ignorance. A third has been greed for power or material gain, largely inspired by some individual who, eager to increase the power in his own hands, has falsely led a nation into a belief that might and right are synonymous.

There are others, but consider only the three just named.

To reduce privation in the world, prosperous nations must be ready so to guide their own economies that those less fortunate can also live. No principal section of the earth should become so habitually impoverished that its inhabitants reach the stark conclusion that no catastrophe - even war - could represent a worsening of their situation. Everybody, everywhere, must come to feel that he has something to risk, something to lose, in a resort to war! If realization of this purpose requires from prosperous nations some reduction in expected profit - the cost can scarcely be so great as that imposed by international unrest and the threat of conflict! Certainly it will be far less than war itself!

To reduce mutual suspicions and antagonisms it is important that people - and I mean the people themselves, rather than only governmental representatives - learn to know more of each other. Among the soldiers now returning to our shores from Europe, plenty can be found who will object to certain policies and customs that they encountered overseas. But few you will find who have lived in Britain that do not like the British people. They appreciate sincerely the hospitality and good humor that they encountered in the British home and in public. The same for large sections of Europe! Even though our returned soldiers may complain about monetary rates of exchange, you will find that almost all think of ordinary European citizens as people much like themselves, and in the circle of actual contact are losing those suspicions we instinctively hold toward strangers. Admittedly a whole world cannot become international travelers and so learn these things at first hand. But there is recourse to education! Particularly it is important that throughout the world the history of all races and nations be accurately written and taught. Knowledge of others is important to us. From the primary grade to the master's degree, educators must seek objectivity, honesty and a broadly human approach to subjects affecting all peoples of the earth. In the pulpit, the press, the radio, and every type of public organization we should differentiate clearly between patriotism and jingoism - we should teach that knowledge leads to cooperation; ignorance to disaster!

Lastly, with respect to the greed for power, freedom-loving peoples instinctively react in friendliness to any government what takes as its principal purpose the benefit of all citizens. Americans need not be fearful of every other form of government, even though we know that, for us, our own is the best. But we cannot dismiss for our anxieties any instance where an individual, rising to power, begins to pursue the age-old methods of the tyrant to lead his people into the vicious doctrine that whatever they may seize and hold is rightfully their own. These false leaders must be detected in time and measures must be promptly applied by the new-born concert of nations so that future Hitlers can early be made helpless to disturb the peace and endanger freedom.

The labor if civilian populations and the gallantry, fortitude and sacrifice of millions of fighting men have preserved to America, in the late war, her freedoms, and given us another chance to insure their better protection. To the dead and disabled we owe a debt that can be discharged in no other way. It is also to our own selfish interest, regardless of higher motives, to be strong nationally; to seek accurate knowledge of our own and of other countries; to work with others in increasing prosperity of those that are denied even the necessaries of life, and with our partners in the great international enterprise now developing, to take timely steps to see that no man may, through fanaticism and bigotry, develop a dangerous military spirit and strength.

There is no panacea for the evil we seek to destroy - just as there is none for many of the other ills that mankind has inherited. We must be patient but persistent. We must be prepared to make some sacrifice, to bear some cost. But there can be no worthier cause to which to devote out talents and our substance!

Mr. Chairman, again I thank you for choosing me to act as the representative today of all those Americans that, during the last years, have devoted their lives and efforts to defeating the Nazis in Europe and to preserving freedom!

• Notes for use in Boston, Massachusetts, November 12, 1945

For me it is a most happy circumstance that my orders to proceed to Washington for temporary duty afforded opportunity to accept the gracious invitation of this city and state to pay here a brief visit. The warmth of your welcome to Mrs. Eisenhower and myself will live with us always. We are most truly and humbly grateful.

It is always a pleasant task to report to Americans upon the character of the service performed by the

soldiers our country sent to Europe. My admiration, respect, and affection for the trained American soldier, sailor and airman are without limits. So, it is a special privilege to assure you that your own 26th Division, commanded by a great leader, General Paul, established a record in Europe that measures up fully to the highest American standard. The division was first committed to battle under such conditions of terrain, weather, and enemy resistance as to be classified as frightful. But from its first day of action until the whole job was done, it never faltered, never hesitated. Every man entitled to wear the Y-D of the Yankee Division on his shoulder will do so in honor and in pride for the remainder of his life. I am told that your 43rd Division in the far Pacific established for itself an equally brilliant battle record. The Minute Men of Lexington and Concord would be proud to acclaim the brilliant performances of New England's representative on numberless battlefields in World War II.

In both hemispheres victory has crowned the efforts of our fighting forces, but in the aftermath of major conflicts there is invariably and inescapably experienced throughout the world a feeling of confusion, uneasiness, doubt and indecision. These create unrest in many fields - industrial, political, financial, and international. Though we in America do not wholly escape these universal problems, we are, in one vital aspect, extremely fortunate. We know, at the very least, that each of us has the treasured opportunity to exert his own influence in seeking solutions. We, any of us, may express freely our own convictions in the confidence that the will of the majority, peaceably expressed, will prevail, and that the right of the minority will not suffer thereby.

It is in the role of a citizen exercising this American right that I venture to address to you today a few thoughts which, in my trip across the Atlantic, I have attempted to reduce to writing in order that I might not trespass too excessively upon your time.

As a preliminary I should like to suggest the importance of remembering, always - though with undiminished appreciation and obligation for the vital work of our great Allies - the accomplishments of this country in the late war. Undismayed by the black outlook of the early months, when it seemed that the all-conquering hordes of Germany, Japan and their partners were in an unassailable position, you, by your sweat, your blood and your undaunted spirit contributed mightily and decisively to the greatest global victory of all time.

Never has more dismal prospect been transformed into more glorious result. The conclusion is that when America clearly visualizes the task she has to do, so that all may rally as one toward its accomplishment, there are few things that for her can logically be classed as impossible. She, and her Allies, can even win the peace!

In Europe there were more than three million Americans on the day of victory. The final division to reach us disembarked last April and promptly participated in battle to hasten and clinch the victory. In passing, it is significant to note that this division came into action three years and four months after Pearl Harbor day, a fact that gives some inkling of the tremendous task and the time involved in gearing a nation to the requirements of the battlefield.

Within six weeks after the arrival of this final fighting division, the entire process of pouring our resources into Europe was reversed. The business of tearing down that mighty battle machine properly began, so as to provide additional strength in the Pacific and to return our uniformed men to their pursuits of peace. Ever since that day the War Department has constantly accelerated the pace of demobilization, using every ounce of energy at its command to restore those men to their family circles, where you are so anxious to welcome them. Up to a certain, definite point this process of disintegration is wise, commendable, necessary! But a conviction that I want to leave with you today is that there is developing a situation that is bringing that limiting point into sharp focus.

Peace did not descend upon Central Europe with the cessation of hostilities. It marked the end of killing and it provided an opportunity to begin the laborious business of restoring order from chaos; of imposing upon a conquered people methods and processes which we consider appropriate to peaceful pursuits; of cooperating with our Allies in regulating the economy, the industry, the education - indeed, every activity of the conquered country - and to compel democratic reform and virtual rebirth of the German people.

Enforcement of this intricate program requires military strength. If disintegration of our forces proceeds too far, it will become quickly evident to the Germans, who are expert in this type of appraisal. If we become incompetent or unequal to the task not only will we be humiliated and shamed but America's influence in building the foundations of an enduring peace in Europe will disappear and the great costs of the war may have

been paid in vain.

May I point out that in addition to all the normal tasks devolving upon an occupational force in a thickly populated, hostile country, we cannot neglect our responsibilities to millions of unfortunate people that we call displaced persons.

The agonies they have suffered, the injustices they have helplessly borne, have left them a charge upon the democratic world. They are exceedingly grateful for what the American Government and soldiers have done and are doing for them. But the sad fact is that that job will be a continuing one until those people can return to their homes, or, have been given opportunity, in some spot upon the earth, to develop for themselves a respectable standard of self-sustained living.

Beyond all these tasks there is another one for our soldiers that touches upon our immediate interests. In Europe there are now more than six million tons of valuable American property. The processes of hasty redeployment have necessarily left much of it in condition where only deterioration and destruction will result if we are robbed completely of our own men to take care of it and to provide for its orderly disposal. Though we are making in those areas the maximum use of local civilian labor, responsibility in this task can be faithfully discharged by no one except Americans, the owners of the property. We must take care of our own.

All of these tasks are now largely being performed by soldiers. Some of them will always have to be, as long as the task remains.

The plain and unpalatable fact is that accomplishment of America's war purposes - which I take to be the establishment of an enduring peace - requires, for a period of which the length cannot now clearly be foreseen, the maintenance of adequate American military forces in Europe.

Moreover, you and I, all of us, should help in making those men understand the depth of our appreciation for the distasteful but vitally necessary work they are doing for us.

Please do not think that I would agree to any unconscionable delay in sending back to his home the man who has borne the brunt of the battle. No one, anywhere, could have greater concern that I for the human desire and the logical right of the American who has faced the fury of the enemy in the field to have further military duties carried on by those who have not been so exposed. Certainly, we must recognize and plan for realization of this rightful desire.

In outlining this problem I am merely pointing out to you that a day of critical decision is rushing upon the American people. That decision in simplest terms is merely this: Are we going so far in weakening ourselves in Europe as to turn our backs upon a problem critically involving the future peace of the world, including this country? Are we going to abandon, unfulfilled, the great purposes for which we fought this war? Or, are we going sanely and logically to provide the means and the strength in Europe that will see that job through to the end?

In my opinion there can be no temporizing, no compromising, with this issue. I feel that I owe it to every man who loyally, uncomplainingly and successfully carried out the tasks that I placed before him in Europe - particularly I owe it to those and to the families of those who gave their all that America's purposes might be served - to urge the instant adoption of a system whereby America's wartime soldiers may be returned to their homes but under which America's obligations to the world and to herself may, in this regard, be satisfactorily met.

It is not easy, but it can, it must, be done.

As the representative of all the men you sent across the Atlantic and vigorously supported as they helped to crush Hitlerism and restore peace, I express our confidence that you, again, will meet the challenge.

• Speech at American Legion Convention, Chicago, Illinois, November 20, 1945

For any soldier there is always a feeling of special satisfaction in receiving a summons to appear as an honored guest before a convention of his own country's fighting men. Among all those that have worn their country's uniform in past wars there unfailingly exists a bond, a union, that can scarcely be felt by anyone that is not of that band. Moreover, that feeling of brotherhood makes no particular note of the element in which the service of the individual was rendered, land, sea or air. It appears that the warrior who has returned to ways of

peace automatically responds to the truism that a country's defenders are - and should be - one. Consequently, I have a special pride and high sense of distinction in the honors accorded to me today by this great Legion. Those honors I accept as a tribute to the services of three million American fighting men that contributed so decisively to the defeat of Hitler and his hordes.

Associated with those Americans in a single Allied command were soldiers of other nations - the majority from the British Empire and large numbers from France. It is therefore particularly gratifying to me that there have appeared before this convention military representatives of those two great peoples, two men who served intimately with me in the Allied Expeditionary Force. This happy circumstance gives me opportunity to pay tribute here to Sir Arthur Tedder, Marshal of the Royal Air Force and my Deputy during all the operations in Northwest Europe. A gallant leader and one of the finest airmen in the world, he was in every sense a true ally and a worthy representative of his country and of the more than one million British Empire fighting men of all arms that marched shoulder to shoulder with the Americans through eleven months of bitter campaigning from the Normandy beachhead to final junction with the great Red Army in the heart of Germany.

Another of your guests, General Koenig, is a true son of the French Republic. His services in this war add a new luster to the glory of French arms. He participated in the desert battles that carried the British Eighth Army from El Alamein to Tunis, and joined the Allied Headquarters in England as the commander of all French resistance forces. Under his inspiring leadership they contributed markedly to the success of the campaign, service rendered in the face of terrorism, cruelty and oppression. He is now commander of the French Zone in Germany and my associate on the Allied Council in Berlin.

Every American that served with me in Europe is proud to pay tribute to Sir Arthur Tedder and General Koenig, and to the fighting forces of their two countries. In equal measure we are proud of the magnificent work done by the Red Army and by the Allied Forces that battled the long and tortuous way up the Italian Peninsula to be present in the last few weeks in the final roundup of the once invincible Wehrmacht and Luftwaffe.

Some members of that American Expeditionary Force of World War II are undoubtedly here today. Others of you are the fathers and the older friends of the men who so courageously, loyally and successfully carried out the tasks that it was my responsibility to place before them in Europe. But whether of this war or of the one waged with equally brilliant results by the former generation, all of you here have special knowledge of things that our country must clearly understand and cannot afford to forget.

You have seen battle and you have experienced the tests it places upon man's moral and physical endurance, upon his skill and upon his ability to follow and to lead. You understand, more than others, the indispensable requirement of teamwork upon the battlefield and you have seen the costs of disintegration, when the power derived from complete confidence in the union of the team disappears in the disorganization of purely individual action. In short, you understand and can bear witness to the priceless battlefield value of training. This value has persisted during all wars of history. A question is: Does it still prevail?

We have just entered upon a scientific age which, in its most fearsome aspects, contains unimaginable threats for civilization. It may be possible that the time will come when the age old virtues of physical and moral stamina, of courage, of patriotism, and of readiness for self-sacrifice will be meaningless to the nation's preservation. Conceivable - we are told - the day may come when any nation, no matter how small, if guided by perverted thinking, may suddenly unleash upon us or any other, destructive forces against which we would be powerless to defend ourselves. There is implied no limit to the capacity of science to reach the maximum in destructive effect unless that limit be found in the destruction of man himself. When the day of that capability comes, if it does, the only hope for the world as we know it will be complete spiritual regeneration, a strengthening of moral fiber that will place upon all men self-imposed determination to respect the rights of others.

To struggle toward the development of that world spirit is one of the noblest and most necessary efforts to which a man can devote himself. But to participate in that struggle does not, of itself, meet the requirements of today.

Three thousand years of recorded history lie behind us to prove that neither will the day of international order, nor that of complete spiritual regeneration, come suddenly and instantly. A thousand practical considerations always assure that the old gives way only gradually to the new! Although man has recoiled in

fear from the introduction of gun powder and, later, explosives of multiplied power, although he has trembled at the advent of the big bomber, of the submarine, the tank, and pilotless missiles capable of reaching across hundreds of miles of distance, he has not yet been able to resolve his deep political and economic issues without recourse to violence. Neither has he sufficiently progressed in the development of moral and spiritual values as to compel him to adhere consistently to the principles inherent in his great historic religions.

We come then to this: We dwell in a world in which the possibilities of destruction are so great as to terrify peoples everywhere. Yet we must still acknowledge human weakness within ourselves and others. It is with this world that we must now concern ourselves, even as we reach toward and strive for a better one.

I see no incompatibility between enlisting ourselves under the banner of peace based upon international cooperation and common appreciation of human values on the one hand and, on the other, the effort to make certain that our beloved country shall not become the victim of predatory force. It is idle to say that our nation can never be endangered. Pearl Harbor should have effectively dispelled that delusion. It is equally idle to say that reasonable preparation to care for ourselves constitutes unwarranted suspicion of those who have been and who we are glad to class as friends. We call war an emergency, and it is just that. Like all emergencies, it usually comes, at least to us, unexpectedly and from quarters that are not revealed until too late.

From the time that Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931 up until the moment when we were attacked in 1941, we had a few far-seeing statesmen that constantly pointed out to us the danger building up in Asia and Europe to ourselves and to our way of living. Because we entertained no thought of aggressive war it was indeed difficult for us to ascribe to any other such a motive. And though, eventually, we became sufficiently alarmed to undertake increased measures of preparation, Pearl Harbor Day found us with a pitifully small air force, an inadequate fleet, and a poorly equipped and badly trained Army.

To be strong nationally is not a sin, it is a necessity! We must be strong first to defend ourselves, secondly, to give the necessary dignity and influence to the words of our leaders as they labor to perfect machinery by which the world may settle its difficulties legally and peaceably, rather than illegally and by force. A weakling, particularly a rich and opulent weakling, seeking peaceable solution of a difficulty, is apt to invite contempt; but the same plea from the strong is listened to most respectfully.

We, as soldiers and veterans, bear the conviction that, given the latest and plentiful equipment, strength still springs from unity, from stamina, from teamwork and from perfected technique. These result from training! And training requires time! The minimum is a year!

With your knowledge of the difference between trained and untrained men in battle, what greater boon, what greater privilege could we give to all our young men than a degree of training which in emergency will allow them quickly to be integrated into the forces that may have to stand between our country and a thousand Buchenwalds? Even though we should become the victims of sudden and devastating raids, does anyone imagine that America would abjectly sue for peace at the price of surrendering the traditions of free life that have made her great?

Moreover, does anyone imagine that, even under these conditions, trained and disciplined men, ready to fight the conflagrations, to rescue the wounded and to rally instantly behind their leaders, would not be more valuable than an equal number of equally brave and courageous men that had no modicum of training!

A reasonable period of peace-time experience in teamwork, in the development of mutual confidence, in perfected technique of weapons, and in coming to comprehend the leadership and organization that are inherent in intelligent military instruction, would provide for our young men an opportunity they deserve, and would do much to give our nation justified confidence in the matter of national security.

We are still congratulating ourselves and giving thanks to the Almighty for the great victories that this year have crowned our efforts in both hemispheres. Yet let us not forget the circumstances of the early months of that war. From December 7, 1941, it was eight months before we made our first relatively small counter-move, in the bitter Guadalcanal campaign of the western Pacific. It was eleven months before we attacked with our first few divisions in North Africa, and these, because of the circumstances of that year, were only sketchily trained. It was almost exactly two and one-half years from the day the Japs treacherously attacked us before we made our decisive move in Europe to cross the Channel. And it was several months more before we became strong enough in the Pacific to move definitely against the Philippines. The time we needed was gained for us by the courage of the British Empire, the sacrifices of Russia, and by the vastness of the Pacific Ocean and the

selfless devotion of the initially few American soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen in the Pacific Theater. Thus in two World Wars we have been dependent upon friends to protect us while we, over a period of many months, devoted feverish attention to repairing the woeful state of unpreparedness in which the outbreak of hostilities found us.

Let us now resolve to be reasonably forehanded in this matter, so far as it is possible for a peaceful citizenry to be.

There is another aspect to this question that deserves attention. Based upon numberless contacts with many people of other nations, I hold the conviction that no other country fears a strong America, no decent preparations of our own will be regarded suspiciously by others, because we are trusted. Indeed, I am convinced that others would interpret any return of ours to our former levels of unpreparedness as an intention to return to what we thought was isolation. They view with concern what they regard as our unseemly haste in disintegration of the mighty forces that did so much to bring Hitler, Mussolini and Hirohito to their deaths or to their knees. A respectably strong America means to others a willingness on our part to bear our full share of the burdens of preserving peace - not an intention to resort to force for our own enrichment or advantage.

I know of no more sincere pacifists than American soldiers and veterans. No one could wish more passionately than they for the assurance that no longer need we devote any of our time and treasure to the maintenance of organizations whose very purpose is negative rather than to constructive development of our country. No consideration of rank, renown, reward or personal advancement has the slightest weight with any officer of my acquaintance, as compared to his concern for peace and his country's welfare. Moreover, this problem does not primarily belong to the active soldier, except in an advisory capacity. The fighting forces of this country belong to you, our nation's citizens and voters. Your responsibilities are great - and the broader and deeper your knowledge of the requirements of security the more it devolves upon you to give to others that same understanding of the issues here involved.

I am told that the purpose of training all our youth, for their own good and for that of the country, is opposed by many of those to whom we have a right to look for spiritual and educational leadership. If this is true, I feel that it must arise from a reluctance to face realities, to study our own history, a history that amply proves the futility of chronic weakness and lack of training in preserving the peace. There appears to be a failure to understand that if we trust our own motives then our strength can never be that of the bully, but of the peacemaker. If we sincerely believe, as I believe, that the America of the future will be true to our traditions of the past; that we will respect the rights of others and be considerate of the weak; that we will work to increase the fruitfulness of the earth but will not steal from others to satisfy a desire of our own; that so far as it is given for mortals to do, we will act in the international field in the spirit of the Golden Rule - if we have faith in these things, then we and the world will be advantaged by our strength.

This country can never be militaristic in its thinking - and to pretend that a year of training will develop such a national philosophy can best be answered by yourselves. You - all of you - have military training - do you feel militaristic? Do you feel inclined to urge one country to adhere to a policy of aggressive war? I am perfectly satisfied to leave that answer to you.

So, why should not we give our sons opportunity in time of peace so to prepare themselves that in the event of war they may, at minimum risk to themselves, serve their nation as brilliantly, effectively and successfully, but with less delay, than you of World Wars I and II have already done. For in the event of another war it could well be that we would be the first rather than the last to be attacked.

With this great arsenal of democracy destroyed or defeated, while it was still unready and therefore weak, the aggressive assaults on other peace-living nations would be less hazardous. But if we are strong - there will be given this hypothetical Hitler of the future no advantage in singling us out first for attack, and so he may be deterred by the lessons of two World Wars from attempting any resort to force.

A strong America is a trained and an integrated America. Nowhere is that integration more necessary than in our Armed Forces. We must not think, primarily, in terms of ground forces, naval forces, air forces. We must think in terms of coordinated action. Every consideration of efficiency, economy and progress in research demands the closest possible unity among all our fighting forces, all the way from bottom to top. This great and necessary purpose, I believe, can be best achieved by unified control at the top.

And now, once more, may I say that the American and Allied Forces that I had the high privilege to lead in

Europe, join with you and with me in the devout hope that never again will the children of America be summoned from their peaceful pursuits to face the purgatory of battle.

You, here, can be an effective force in assuring realization of that hope.

• Speech at Canadian Club, Ottawa, Canada, January 10, 1946

Ever since the war ended in Europe I have been hoping for opportunity to visit Canada. My purpose was deeper than mere desire to renew association with old Canadian friends. I have wanted to come here so that I might, in the heart of their homeland, pay humble tribute to the soldierly virtues of those wartime comrades and, from a more personal viewpoint, give expression to my gratitude for their loyal and faithful adherence through long years of war, to the principle and substance of allied unity.

It is beyond the power of any man to add to the lustre of the military reputation established by the brave men and women of Canada who served with me in Europe. They have written their own proud record in your hearts and in those of all men wherever freedom is venerated. But it is only simple justice to state that in an allied force numbering in the millions, and in which courage and fortitude were so much the rule as to be taken for granted, assignment of vital battle objectives to the Canadians brought to the High Command only feelings of satisfaction and of confidence. The 1st Canadian Army under General Crerar will always be remembered and respected as an invaluable member of the allied team.

No man could command a force in which your Canadians were included without feelings of deep humility and lasting pride. Because I had that privilege, those men were, for many months, my Canadians, too, and no one can take from me the place they hold in my affection and admiration.

Memory goes back to my first contacts with them in Britain, when they were commanded by General McNaughton. That summer they carried out the memorable Dieppe operation, in which one of those freak chances of war resulted in a casualty list of saddening proportions. Yet let no one tell you that the Dieppe affair was devoid of valuable results. I know of no other single incident that did so much to confirm convictions that the coastal fortifications in France could be successfully breached on a large scale. Moreover, out of that operation many battle leaders derived valuable lessons that were applied later to the amphibious operations in the Mediterranean, and still later, when we lunged across the Channel for the final invasion.

Canadians first came under my command in Sicily. From that moment onward, we served together in Italy, France, Belgium, Holland and, finally, in Germany. Other stirring pictures come back to me. The Royal Canadian Navy, pressing home the assault against the Normandy beaches! The bold pilots of the Royal Canadian Fir Force riding herd in the skies and covering the battle path of their comrades on the ground all the way from the beach to the Elbe. Great fighters, in great events! They lived history - a bright page of history.

I think I can best express my feelings toward my Canadian comrades by saying that I am truly grateful to the fathers and mothers who sent those men and women to serve in the Allied Command in Europe, and equally grateful to all who, here in their homeland, supported them unstintedly throughout the years of conflict.

Canada points, with justifiable pride to a dozen directions in which she made vitally important contributions to allied victory. In carrying on the great air training program, in providing mountains of munitions, in convoying ships through seas infested with submarines, in sending needed cargoes of foodstuffs - in all these and many more your record needs no embellishment from me.

Throughout this war, our two nations have been drawn together in planning and producing for a common cause. It has been a cooperation which seemed as natural as it was inevitable. Our nations are such good friends that we take neighborly collaboration as a matter of course. During the two years when you were at war and we were not, some twelve thousand American citizens crossed your border to enter the armed forces of your country. After the Jap attacked us and the European Axis declared war, 26,000 individuals of Canadian birth entered our own armed forces. These reciprocal acts seem to me spontaneous evidence of the friendship that must forever exist between our two people.

There is other evidence of effective war cooperation between our two countries. Under the far-sighted leadership of Prime Minister, Mr. Mackenzie King, and of our late President Roosevelt, common problems were solved by the devotion to them of common resources.

Among these were the defense of Newfoundland and the Maritime Provinces, the development of an air route across Canada to Alaska - since known as the Northwest Staging Route - an air route over Hudson Bay, and the overland Alaskan Highway. A common readiness to venture boldly resulted in the initially hazardous airway across Labrador, Iceland and Greenland which, in a few short years, has made air travel to Europe a commonplace. Cooperation exploited for war purposes the great ports of embarkation at Halifax and Prince Rupert in British Columbia.

We, in the United States, keenly realize that success in these and other vital projects demanded generosity and many concessions on the part of the Canadian Government. As a soldier-citizen of your neighboring country, it is a great privilege to express to you deep and lasting gratitude. The allied victory in Europe stands as a monument to teamwork and to the results of practical understanding between nations. Nowhere was that teamwork more effective than here in our two homelands. Even customs duties were relaxed and the freest exchange of personnel, materiel and all types of commodities was permitted across the international border. Through these means the efficient prosecution of the war was immeasurably increased. As a direct consequence hostilities were shortened!

In addition to Canada's contribution to victory in Europe, our joint operational effort extended to other sections of the globe. A Canadian combat team participated in the Aleutians campaign. Over a long period of time squadrons of the Royal Canadian Air Force and units of the Royal Canadian Navy operated jointly with United States forces in the North Pacific. Hundreds of American soldiers were trained in Canadian schools during the war, and this practice was pursued, also, in the opposite direction.

In this reminiscent review of the war years, I have refrained from mentioning until now one specific instance when my attention, as a commander, was intensively directed toward the Canadian sector. The first Canadian Army covered itself with honor in the beachhead in the bitter attack beginning February 8, 1945, and in the operation across the Rhine. But the instance in which it produced, from my viewpoint, its greatest climax was when it undertook the hazardous mission of clearing the Scheldt Estuary, key to the great port of Antwerp. Although we had already taken the city and port, they were useless to us while the Germans commanded the approaches. We had to work that port - final victory came directly to depend upon its early usefulness. When Field Marshal Montgomery turned the task over to my old friend, General Crerar, and the Canadians, I knew the task would be brilliantly and expeditiously executed.

It is a great accomplishment such as that one which I like to remember. The end of Naziism was in clear view when the first ship moved unmolested up the Scheldt. Yet retrospective satisfaction is saddened always by the memory of brave men whose lives have been spent in the victory, of gallant soldiers whose priceless courage has bought, for us, the peace. There is no way to pay to them and their loved ones an equal devotion, except as we strive as unselfishly and gallantly to maintain the peace as they strove to win it.

The tragic, turbulent years of war ended last May in Germany, last August in the Pacific. Now the victors have set themselves a new and even greater task - to work out a formula and a practical procedure intended to smooth international frictions to find a way to banish war forever from the world.

I hate war as only a soldier who has lived it can, only as one who has seen its brutality, its futility, its stupidity. Yet there is one thing to say on the credit side - victory required a mighty manifestation of the most ennobling of the virtues of man - faith, courage, fortitude, sacrifice; if we can only hold that example before our eyes; moreover, if we can remember that the international cooperation then so generously displayed points the sure way to the success of the United Nations Organization, then the war can never be regarded as a total deficit. I have heard people say that wartime unity was based only on necessity - that now when necessity is past, we may expect differences which were forgotten in the urgency of a common fear! But the falsity of that contention is clear, because the necessity for cooperation has not passed. Nations that joined together to defeat ruthless enemies have even greater reason to remain united for the peaceful settlement of their differences lest new Hitlers rise to throw the world into a chaos more awful than the shattered countries of Europe present today. That is what we squarely face!

Our two nations have lived as peaceful neighbors so long that in our own relationships we have totally forgotten the meaning of fears and lusts for conquest that bred the war from which we have just emerged. The ripeness of our friendship is apparent for all to see in a border which marks separate sovereignty, but binds together rather than divides. The secret is nothing other than mutual understanding and respect.

We must not over-simplify the problem. We must not delude ourselves into believing that all nations will easily achieve this broad result or that nothing more is demanded than verbal adherence to beautiful generality. But it can be achieved if every nation realizes that its very survival may depend on its earnest cooperation in the peaceful settlement of disputes. All must learn that in cooperation there is giving as well as receiving. The one that eternally gives and does not receive will eventually exhaust itself. In the contrary case the recipient becomes nothing but the object of another's bounty. To cooperate we must give and take in a spirit of mutual, sympathetic understanding. Our two countries have long done it - the United Nations did it in war. The practice must continue and must become universal. When that is done the fortifications that bristle along borders throughout the world will speedily come tumbling down and from the hearts of populations will be lifted age-old burdens of fear.

Another mistake we must not make is to assume that this crusade for promoting mutual understanding can be successfully conducted exclusively by others - by the world's statesmen and political leaders. Each of us, however humble, has a part to play. Governments may wisely deal with the problems which rise in our concerted search for peace, but in the end it will be the citizens of all countries who must outlaw war. Until the peoples of the world understand and respect the interests of their neighbors, the victory will elude us. Until the peoples of the world embrace the democratic belief that the dignity of the individual is the basis of the success of nations, the world will not find an enduring peace.

I venture to speak of these things because it was my lot to be intimately associated with a great cooperative effort in Europe. Success was ours because each nation was willing to submerge what might have appeared to be its own narrow interests in the common cause. A bright factor in future prospects lies in the fact that since the fighting ended there have been no futile arguments over the part that any particular one of the United Nations played. Just as each was necessary to victory, all must march together toward peace. Positive action is required. Attack, not defense, is indicated!

We have come through a momentous experience together. If it has been glorious in its achievement, it has been tragic in the lives we had to spend for success. White crosses, standing in regimented clusters throughout a thousand leagues of foreign soil, forever mark the path of victory and the price your nation and mine and our friends have paid for survival. They cry out for peace, they challenge democracy today. I pray, and I firmly believe, that in meeting that challenge, your nation and mine will always find themselves in the forefront of the charge.

• Speech at Toronto University, January 12, 1946

Man's instinctive and traditional respect for knowledge, reason and truth is reflected in the regard, amounting almost to veneration, in which educational systems are held throughout the civilized world. Inevitably the award of an honorary degree by a great university inspires in the recipient a sense of special pride and gratification. In this instance my natural reactions are rendered the more acute by circumstances of peculiar significance.

First of all, no one could emerge from the experiences of leading a great collaborative endeavor among nations - as I have - without acquiring the most profound respect for the contribution of education to our mutual success. Not only in the field of science itself, but in devising courses of instruction in the many complicated weapons, machines and techniques of modern war, education has played a decisive part in preparing men for battle. The Armed Forces of my own country - and I am sure of yours - drew heavily on the faculties of our colleges and universities for specialists of all sorts. This generous cooperation of educational institutions everywhere placed at our disposal the brains required to carry out some of our most difficult assignments.

The enlightened programs of education which both our nations have followed for many years paid rich dividends in speeding our preparation for the critical campaigns. Knowledge and sound habits of study acquired in the classroom gave us intelligent troops, quick to grasp each new lesson. It gives me particular satisfaction to acknowledge here the great debt which I feel to the educators of our two nations.

In the late war, I was privileged to associate with large contingents of Canadian fighting men, who braved every terror to uphold principles of humanity which are implicit as well in our concept of free education. Many of those men are here today, heroic sons of Canada and of Toronto University. So I have the additional

privilege of testifying again to the gallantry, the fortitude and the devotion that they displayed in such high degree at Dieppe, in Sicily, Normandy, on the Scheldt and on the Rhine and beyond. I pay to them my humble tribute of continuing admiration, affection and gratitude.

I have another reason for unusual personal gratification in today's ceremony. There is universal recognition of the fact that to attain victory on the western front it was necessary for many peoples, both in the field and in their homelands, to submerge nationalistic differences in the advancement of a common cause. That lesson, I hold, has a broad and profitable application in other circumstances. I like to think that the signal honor today accorded me as former Commander and a representative of the Allied Expeditionary Force, symbolizes the profound respect of Toronto University for the unlimited possibilities of cooperation in the field of international endeavor.

Again, I am particularly happy to visit a great educational institution in a country with which my own has been neighbor in more than mere geographical sense. For many years the absence of military protective works and formations on either side of our great length of common border has been a source of amazement to other countries. The age-old aspiration of nations to establish with others workable cooperation has, in this specific instance, achieved fulfillment.

The peoples of the United States and Canada are imbued, respectively, with the same fierce and justifiable pride in their independence and national pursuits as are other countries of the world. We have many of the same potential causes of serious difference as do others, involving divergent interests in political, economic, and social fields. Yet, such is the relationship between these two truly good neighbors that neither is compelled to provide in its plans and in its expenditures for physical defense against the other. Each of us has an abiding faith that those 3,000 miles of common border measure as secure a boundary as the world has known, defended as it is by mutual friendship, mightier than guns, tanks, airplanes - more powerful even than the atomic bomb.

In that security, that confidence, each of us has a national asset of incalculable value, physical and moral. It is a mighty river of common blessing fed by tributaries that are plain to see.

Of these the primary one is mutual understanding. This, in turn, is fed by such things as unimpeded exchange across the border of ideas, literature, correspondence and visits by individuals. All of these factors contribute to a steady flow into the important stream of mutual understanding, just as does the common language of the peoples. As always, mutual acquaintanceship - ordinary human contact - eliminates many of the suspicions that impede the growth of friendship.

A second principal feeder of the main river is a common basic concept of political life. In each country there is respect for the dignity and rights of the individual, with the citizens themselves providing the ultimate source of all political power. Instinctive trust and friendship flourish between peoples where their governments exist to serve rather than to exploit them.

A third important tributary is the determination in both Canada and the United States to raise constantly the educational level of all the people. As the fruits of education are widely spread, the cleansing spring of knowledge, logic and reason is made to flow over the dark ground of prejudice, fear, hysteria - the soil in which the evil seeds of war forever flourish. On both sides of our common border we therefore find an undying hatred of war - a clear-eyed view of its bestiality, a deep conviction that force can never substitute for justice in adjustment of wrong, and a scornful condemnation of any institution so costly as war yet so devoid of constructive purpose.

When called upon to combat definite threat to their free way of life, the citizens of your country and of mine have gallantly marched against and utterly destroyed the mightiest military machines that boastful dictatorship could design. But even these necessities and these successes could not delude our people into believing that armies should be trusted above friendship for security, that reliance upon military power can give civilization as firm a foundation as can orderly, legal procedures.

The United Nations Organization, to which we look for so much, has the task of taking the world as it is and of devising workable methods and machinery to maintain peace. But until there is a surging flow of mutual understanding and tolerance in the hearts and minds of men everywhere, the assurance of peace will not be firm.

I think it would be arguing the obvious to dwell at length upon the desirability of spreading to the rest of the world the opportunity to live in the same spirit of neighborliness that we have so long enjoyed. Some of our

more fortunate circumstances cannot immediately be theirs. Good connecting communications, a common language, universal educational systems, a history of decades of peaceful cooperation - not all these can apply immediately in every case where a nation has with another a common land border. Other ways must be found to provide, between ourselves and other nations, and between themselves, the great end result that has come to us so naturally and easily.

Here then, it seems to me, is found one of the great challenges to the educational systems of the world, particularly to those institutions to which we have the right to look for leadership.

To state the proposition in a concrete - possibly over-simplified form: Is the educational system prepared, as a part of its mission in carrying cultural levels ever upward, to provide on a world basis a substitute for those advantages of accident and of natural growth that your country and mine have exploited to our mutual profit.

The factual, honest teaching of history is important. For example, you and ourselves are relatively young nations and it is frequently difficult for us to understand that in certain problems of life, the legends and traditions of two thousand years ago may be fully as important as the cold logic of today. Yet in other climes and among other peoples these age-old values are considered a part of the spirit as opposed to materialism. If we can truly grasp and analyze the roots of the aspirations, of the hopes and the fears of others, we will generate not only a needed tolerance in ourselves but will encourage hope in others and allay their fear.

The world has done much toward this end in the field of medicine, where research and study have substituted science for witchcraft in the treatment of the sick. Here we have a shining example for other lines of endeavor. Medical knowledge is disseminated through all countries and great scientific foundations are constantly striving throughout every quarter of the globe to conquer the plagues and diseases that have scourged mankind since early history. Through explorations in universities and our laboratories have come results that have tightened up the world into a small neighborhood. Now we must develop the spiritual values and mutual understanding that will permit us to live tolerantly together in this shrunken world.

We may visualize the achievements of learned men during the past centuries as falling along two parallel channels which at times have been closely related and at other times have bourne only slight relationship to each other. We look upon the ancient Greeks as leaders primarily in the field of social, cultural and political progress. Without attempting to slight their scientific achievements, I believe I may safely say that their understanding of human values surpassed their scientific progress. In the centuries that have followed, scientific advancements have caught up with and in some senses far out-distanced the development of those social forms which enable man to live in peace and enjoy the benefits of learning, scientific and otherwise. To my mind, the tremendous challenge now is to direct our efforts in such a manner that human relationships may be kept abreast of scientific achievements.

In London, delegates of the several United Nations have recently convened the first session of the General Assembly of this organization on which the hopes of the world are pinned. The importance of this instrument for peace cannot be overemphasized. The meetings mark the beginning of a great cooperative venture among nations whose problems will magnify a thousand times those we faced in forging our great instrument of victory in war.

The task is formidable but it can be mastered. Much of its success may well depend on the knowledge which farsighted individuals everywhere - and particularly in our institutions of higher learning - can give to the people, increasing their understanding of the problems to be met and providing an example of the patience and tolerance in their judgment of the factors involved in these historic discussions. You men whose study probes the realities of life in every field, whose search is a constant one for truth, must accept a broad responsibility for nurturing understanding of the complexities and pressures of international relationships.

All these things you gentlemen are better equipped than I to think through, to develop into definite objectives and to plan for their fulfillment. A soldier cannot escape a feeling of profound diffidence when venturing, before such a body as this, to discuss such subjects. My excuse is the same as would be offered by any of the other war veterans present today. We have seen the ugliness, the suffering, the terrible cost of war. There is no legitimate road toward the goal of permanent peace that we will not attempt to travel. Our civilization has reached a brink from which the prospect - if we turn not into sure paths of peace - is a thousand times more terrifying than anything yet witnessed.

So, applying some of the maxims of the soldier, I urge that we do not delay - that we do not complacently

assume the absence of mortal danger - that we marshal our forces into one mighty effort - that we have the patience to endure inevitable setbacks - that we keep our eyes on the final objective and strive unceasingly toward its attainment. Where are we going to find the leadership? Where else but in the university - traditional symbol of truth, integrity, tolerance, knowledge and understanding.

As I accept, with great pride, the honorary doctorate of Toronto University, I pledge every support possible in my power to education everywhere, as it carries on its rightful role in this glorious, universal, crusade.

• Address over Columbia and associated broadcast networks, January 18, 1946

Tonight I should like to speak to every man and woman in the service, and also I hope that my words go straight to the fireside of every family at home with a loved one overseas. It is my purpose to tell you the facts about this demobilization situation, which has suffered much from misunderstanding.

Last Tuesday the War Department announced the formula for discharge from the Army up to June 30, 1946. The chief points, as they affect enlisted men, are these:

First, every man, both abroad and at home, who is surplus to our needs and who cannot profitably take the place of a higher point man, is to be discharged as rapidly as he can be processed. Our needs do not include made work and useless drill.

Next, by April 30, this year, all enlisted men with 45 points or with 30 months service will be out of the Army or aboard ship returning home. Finally, by June 30, all enlisted men with 40 points or with 2 years service as of that date will be out of the Army or aboard ship returning home. This does not apply to volunteers, of course.

It represents a slower pace for those few months than the Army had tried to maintain. Some men who hoped for discharge by March may have to say in the Army one, two or perhaps three months longer, because we cannot continue to do our job without them. I shall explain the compelling need in a moment. Bur first I want to say that this schedule of discharges, as I have given it to you, will be carried out to the letter. If there were doubts before, each soldier of extended service now knows where he stands. Now, this is what has been done in demobilization so far: Most of this happened, of course, before I came to Washington. Of the 8,300,000 in the Army when Germany surrendered, more than 5,000,000 have been discharged. Over half of the tremendous force we assembled for war has already returned to civilian life. Actually, more than 5/8th of the VE-Day soldiers are now civilians. Think of it! No other demobilization has ever been carried out so speedily, or on a scale remotely comparable to this in vastness.

After VJ-Day, the demobilization time-table was speeded up to such an extent that 1,665,000 more men and women had returned to their homes by New Year’s than we had dared hope would be possible. The Army has really put its heart into returning war-weary men to their homes.

From the outset, it has been evident that a time would come when the rate of discharge would have to be adjusted to the number of men still needed to do our job oversees and in this country. Under original estimates that time was expected next spring. The rapid demobilization rate advanced the date. Everything possible has been done to postpone a slowdown. Overseas commanders are now cutting their requirements to the barest minimum. Similar economies are taking place in this country. In an effort to get men overseas faster and relieve veterans, we have cut the basic training period for recruits by a month.

We began an intensive campaign to recruit volunteers for the Army, backed by the most attractive conditions ant Army has ever offered - anywhere. I wish we could have an all-volunteer Army. But facts do not yet bear out the hope that enough young Americans will volunteer to produce the Army of 1,500,000 to which we shall have reduced by July 1, 1946.

You see the situation. We had to put on the brakes. That is all. There has been no change in basic demobilization policy. The actual cause of the slow-down is to match the diminishing strength of the Army with the diminishing size of the job. It has nothing to do with brass or future plans for the peace-time Army. But all of the men that would have been out of the Army by July 1 under the original schedule will be out or en route home, on that day, under the revised rate.

Now, what are these needs that keep veterans in service when they want to come home? In addition to the

historic mission of the Army - to maintain a force in defense of the nation - the close of the war has left our country with great added responsibilities overseas. These place new duties upon the Army, falling into two parts.

The first is the pacification of enemy lands and the establishment of control measures dictated by our Government's policies. These policies are not fixed by the Army. They are decided by higher authority. Then the Army is assigned the task of carrying them out in the lands of our conquered enemies. The shooting war is over, but we are engaged in disarming Germany and Japan - to make certain that those two lustful countries stay beaten till they learn how to live as neighbors with the rest of us.

From my own experiences as Commander of the European Theater, I know how big and difficult is the task of occupational forces in countries that have suffered physical, moral and Governmental destruction. It takes a great many individuals to do the job. We must watch the hostile population for any renewal of resistance. That requires police work and supervision right down to their local Governments so that we actually know what is going on. We must patrol zone and international boundaries - 2,000 miles of them in Germany and Austria, for example. We must destroy fortifications and military stores. We must guard important power stations, telephone exchanges, bridges, and other possible targets of enemy sabotage. In 365 separate stations we are taking care of 450,000 of Hitler's unfortunate victims. We must institute educational programs, scrutinize records, take measures to guard health and enforce proper sanitation, if for no other reason than to safeguard the lives of our own men. We must keep there a reserve of military strength.

These duties are a continuing charge on the Army. They will last as long as we occupy those lands. Reductions in future troop strength will be made as our policies progress toward curing these people of their warlike habits. But as long as we have occupation forces, we shall need manpower.

The second part of the overseas job is huge, but should steadily diminish. It is the liquidation of the great depots, warehouses, camps, bases, ports, airfields and other installations which we built to fight the global war in Europe and the Pacific. Also we must protect and care for the millions of tons of Government property, bought with billions in taxpayer dollars. Now that the fighting is over, it must be determined how much of this is needed for our occupation forces: how much can be liquidated through the civilian disposal agencies. But until this property actually passes from control of our Government, the Army is charged with inspecting, repairing, maintaining, accounting for and guarding all of it. In the awful poverty of the conquered countries, unbridled thievery is normal to living. If we relaxed our vigilance, the stores would melt away overnight.

But as the property is disposed of, warehouses abandoned and bases rolled up, a proportionate number of men come home. The revised estimates of our requirements, both overseas and in this country, indicate that, by July 1, we can do the job overseas and provide the necessary support for them at home with an Army of 1,500,000. This figure includes the Air Forces.

I have said little about our difficult and numerous problems of demobilization at home, but I assure you that the search for surplus men is going on here just as earnestly as it is abroad.

To do all these things requires that the rate of volunteer enlistments be stepped up and that Selective Service meet the Army's calls. Any failure in either the recruitment of volunteers of the Selective Service draft of young men will seriously jeopardize the Army's ability to carry out its assigned missions. These are the hard facts of the problem. In our earnest study of this problem, we are working closely with the Congress and other governmental agencies. Invariably they share our desire to bring home quickly the men who bore the brunt of battle. But at the same time, we must meet our needs in manpower.

In the foregoing I have outlined the responsibilities and commitments which require us to keep men in the Army to perform tasks assigned us by the highest authority in the nation. If our inflow of new men should fail to produce by July 1 the 1,500,000-man Army we require for these missions, then some of the functions now charged to the Army must be abandoned. There is no alternative.

The men who have now received the Army's pledge to be released by June 30, will be discharged by that time or be on a ship coming home. If we are left short of our 1,500,000 men on that date, the policy-making agencies of the Government must decide which of the many vital functions now assigned to the Army are to be dropped.

Understanding the War Department's mission and the present needs in manpower I am sure that all Americans, civilians and soldiers alike, will feel more personally their part in the great task which the

Government of the United States - and the people - have given the Army to carry out. Its importance should be realized by every citizen. The mothers and fathers and wives of soldiers in our armies of occupation should feel proud of what their men are doing in securing the peace.

Our success is this great endeavor is the sum of success in thousands of jobs. Some jobs seem unimportant. Some may be made to seem so, because they are difficult to dramatize. I know how yearning for home - and boredom - may fill a soldier's letters with a disturbing sense of his own unimportance in the pattern of Army life. But our Army is playing a great role in a troubled world. As each of us comes to understand this truth, then he will take pride in the part he is playing.

The fighting has stopped. The urgency of war has gone. But we have a new urgency - the necessity of building a secure peace - a peace purchased with the lives of our comrades. The Army's mission is to do its part in establishing and assuring this peace and to support our country in the great cooperative venture of nations. For myself, I feel that the practical common sense which is an American characteristic will meet the issue.

This is a time when maturity and wisdom must assert themselves for the safety of this nation's future. Together we have won a great victory. It will become glorious if we are able to make it the last one we need to win.

• Speech at American University, February 10, 1946

Any man, particularly any soldier, must feel a profound sense of pride and distinction in an invitation to address a group such as you men compose. Each of you bears upon his body the permanent, honorable scars of dangerous service: service rendered in order that our great nation might continue to live according to the expressed will of its own citizens. I come here to salute you, true soldiers of freedom. I come also to pledge to you that so far as there lies within me any power to assist in eliminating from the earth the ignorance, the intolerance, the stupidity that have led nations to aggressive use of force and you men to beds of suffering, that power will always be unstintedly exerted.

In our hatred of war - in our repudiation of rule by force, which means enslavement - we still cannot forget those ennobling traits of human character which alone can carry men forward to victory, when war is thrust upon us.

Even people who have fortunately remained strangers to the terror of the diving plane, the nerve-shattering thump of bursting bombs and shells, the sickening smells, the dust, the mud, the stifling heat, the freezing cold of the battlefield, the bone-deep weariness of marching and firing and digging and crawling, the sadness of blank files in the ranks - even those that have been spared all these can sense that battles are won only by a mass manifestation of virtues we most admire in men. Courage, devotion, drive, sacrifice, discipline, optimism, mutual help, loyalty: together they mean effective teamwork.

But not yet has been solved the problem of employing these virtues which sustain the truth that man was created in the image of God, to serve as effectively the cause of peace as the demands of war. Must we admit that only the compulsion of a common, deadly fear can produce the teamwork that is as necessary to the peaceful concert of peoples as it is to batter and crush a stubborn foe? Why is it that the demonstrated abilities of a great nation and her allies to produce the mightiest force of righteous destruction yet seen upon the earth, cannot produce an equal progress toward the heart's desire of every individual on that earth - the assurance that he may pursue his peaceful desires in tranquility and absence of fear?

To this question I believe there is but one answer. It is leadership.

I do not refer exclusively to the leadership exercised by those in high places, although they must be wise, far-seeing and completely selfless. I mean, primarily, the day by day influence of all who by reason of their qualifications are entitled to be classed as leaders, regardless of race, creed, profession, or standing in the social or economic world.

You men know, better than others, that the highest commander cannot, by himself, provide the leadership necessary to tactical victory. He must be supported by a great organization of devoted assistants, the base of which must be the captains, the lieutenants, the sergeants and corporals, every man that has a position of responsibility over another on the battlefield. The issue of victory or defeat lies, finally, in their hands.

To enumerate their necessary qualifications no one could be better fitted than you that I am now facing. Through days and months of experience where real leadership was essential to success, you learned to distinguish between the true and the false, between the man who leads and the one who seeks by virtue of undeserved authority to escape his own proper share of the costs that must be paid to achieve any positive and worthwhile purpose.

You may well know that the officer who pretends to a position of human rather than of mere official superiority, who dares not test himself to the fullest before the eyes of his followers, who deliberately thrusts upon his men added danger, suffering or exhausting work in order that he may himself escape their full impact, is not, in the eyes of his men, an officer and a leader, regardless of the weight of the insignia he carries upon his shoulder.

One the other hand, you likewise know that the commander who shares, naturally and unpretentiously in every problem of the group, whether in bivouac or on the battlefield, who gains the confidence of his men and gives to them his own, who shares with them every vicissitude of fortune, who takes no thought of himself until every need of all his men has been accommodated, who learns from them as much as he can teach to them, and who expresses in every word and deed his pride of belonging to the whole, invariably gains for himself the greatest reward that can come to any man.

This reward is the respect, esteem and love of those with whom he is privileged to associate. Moreover, his is an elite unit, whether designed for destruction of the enemy or constructive work in the ordinary processes of peace. Such a man is stranger to resentment from his men. They accord - they demand for him - a position before the world that comes only to those who have rendered honest service to their fellows.

These truths have a direct application to the future of you men here before me. Both by force of circumstances and by individual fitness you will be persons of influence. The visible evidence of your physical suffering makes you also a marked man in the automatic respect and dignity that will be accorded your words by others who have not undergone the trials of the battlefield. What you have to say will be listened to attentively because all the world acknowledges the dignity of sacrifice. Moreover, your presence in this university is evidence that you have flatly declined to accept varying degrees of physical disablement as a serious blight upon your future. You have thus demonstrated certain essential qualifications of leadership, including self-reliance, optimism and definite refusal to admit defeat.

Thus there extends before you widened responsibility to which you will bring already demonstrated qualities of leadership, qualities ripened and matured both in battle and in the class rooms of this university.

You will serve in many places and, eventually, in many varieties of useful activity. But underneath all differences in daily preoccupations is one common objective toward which you can work effectively. That is a safe and enduring and democratic peace for all the world. Unless this great country of ours with its almost limitless potential remains a leader in this effort, success will elude us. This means, in turn, that you, who best understand the terrible alternative, must exert yourselves ceaselessly in this effort.

You will stand for cooperation as against domination and you know that cooperation implies readiness to give as well as to receive, to help with your full strength another from whom you in turn expect the help of his full strength. We must deal with those who do not well understand us, just as we do not fully understand them. We must work with those who view our motives with suspicion as we are suspicious of their intent. To achieve true concert of action these finally must be eliminated. The prospect may at times seem dark, but discouragement must not paralyze your efforts. If our country is to do all of which it is capable in the problem of promoting peace, it must be always ready to cooperate in solving the problems that beset us all. One of these is to protect the peace, our own peace and that of others that look to us for leadership. Until the world is ready completely to repudiate force as a means of settling international difficulty, our country must be strong in those processes by which force is represented. We must feel secure, else fear will warp our own judgment and, externally, reduce our influence to futility. Our Armies, our Navies, our Air Forces, in fact our whole citizenry, must always be ready to uphold against any apparent threat, principles that we believe to be right - almost sacred. But as the certainty of security for those principles progressively develops, we, like all others, must hasten to keep in step therewith, so that a diminishing portion of our labor and our wealth will be devoted to security organizations and their essentially negative purposes.

You men, and others like you throughout our country, are equipped to lead toward this goal. With your

knowledge of war you will fight the indifference, the blind complacency, the sheer selfish laziness that more than once have permitted war to burst upon us. With your keen insight into the responsibilities of leadership, your understanding that the only true privilege of the leader is the opportunity to serve his fellows, you will bring under your banner a constantly increasing army determined, with you, to win the peace. With the qualifications of patience, endurance, determination and optimism you have so clearly displayed, you will let no set-back, no discouragement diminish the effectiveness of your efforts. Before you is an opportunity - a challenge to your leadership. You have proved your ability to seize the one and to meet the other.

Some of you I had the great privilege of serving with in Europe. Others of you served our flag in the far Pacific and here at home. All of you have a definite investment of time, effort and of sacrifice in the future of our country. The glorious victory you hammered out will become still more so as, through your leadership, men everywhere can believe that you and your Allies have won the last victory which need be attained through the suffering and slaughter of men.

I congratulate American University upon having had in its student body this group of disabled veterans; I congratulate you men upon your battle and your scholastic records. More than this, I believe that your future lives in the cause of promoting understanding, forbearance and tolerance among nations, will be of far greater value to your country than have even your past achievements, to which all of us pay tribute.

To each of you I say from the heart – “Good luck, may God go with you.”

• **Remarks to the General Assembly of Virginia, March 8, 1946** [re Winston Churchill]

Ladies and gentlemen, it is one of the high honors of my life to return to a joint meeting of the Legislature of the State in which my mother was born and reared. I could not conceive of a happier occasion upon which to come than as one of the aides of one of the great men of this world - the man in whose indomitable spirit the Allies found inspiration during the war, the man whose conception of political, industrial and military affairs led him to be the chief inspiration for the North African campaign and whose battle spirit never wavered for one single second in support at any time that the fight was joined by sea, by air, or by land.

Of all the things that supported me through three and a half years of warfare on the European continent, I know of no other single thing that was of greater moral benefit than unwavering, staunch, indomitable, courageous support of the Prime Minister of Great Britain. It is my earnest conviction that only history can measure even remotely the true value of the worth of the service he has rendered to all of us. But I am certain that in meetings such as this, with the wholehearted welcome he finds in this city from my own countrymen to him, he will gain some little measure of understanding, in his own time, of what we think of him.

• **Speech at Richmond University, March 28, 1946**

It would be entirely futile for me to attempt to express this morning the high sense of distinction I feel in the honor done me by this great University. In the extravagance of the language used by the two officers of the University who have just commended me I find little reason for personal pride, rather for apology to those of my own men who are in this audience and have probably realized that I am not quite so good as the University seems to think. But part of my pride comes from the fact that this Richmond University is situated in the heart of the state which, as one of the first English-speaking colonies of the United States, gave to our country such names as Washington, Jefferson, Lee and Jackson and countless others, who in their turn and in their time have done what these sons of yours have done in the last four and a half years. They have been careful to see, these sons of yours, that the heritage these English-speaking people have, a heritage that goes all the way back to 1215 at Runnymede, has not been lost or destroyed. When the sons of America are ready always to bare their breasts in defense of the principles that the English-speaking people have come to venerate, and to consider in a class of the sacrosanct, just that long will universities such as we see here, and gatherings such as this, be possible. When those principles are gone, from attack from without or within, this can no longer be.

Even my new-found membership as a Doctor of Laws of the University of Richmond, I have diffidence in

entering any field that does not belong to my own profession. However, I realize clearly that I am here as a representative of three million Americans that the United States sent to Europe to defeat Hitlerism. My most fervent hope is that a goodly number of those three million would approve your choice of me to act as their representative today. Certainly I have the confidence to believe that I can speak for many of them in voicing the deepest hope, the deepest desire they have for the future. There is no man that has come back from France that can view with equanimity the prospect of his own son going through what he did. The world must have peace! And the men coming back from abroad demand the leadership in high places and in all the institutions in America that will lead toward that peace.

No matter how earnestly all of us may support the official and legal structure that we call the United Nations and in which we pin our hopes for one phase of this hoped-for accomplishment, we know if we stop to think a minute that in legal procedures we cannot find the entire result. Those men have a right therefore to look to our educational institutions for leadership. My great friend, Admiral Nimitz, has spoken of the value of education in war and of its value in seeking and maintaining the victory that was won. I hold that education must go further than teaching us “know how,” teaching us skills, teaching us to be the best doctors, the best lawyers, the best engineers in the world. It must even go further than teaching us why we will fight for the principles of free speech, of equality before the law, of the fight of habeas corpus, the right to act as we see fit, so long as we do not infringe upon the similar rights of others. Educators must show us that while for us those principles are sacrosanct, for certain others this is not necessarily the case. Although Abraham Lincoln said, “A house divided against itself cannot stand,” he did not say that two houses constructed differently, of different materials, of different appearance could not stand in peace within the same block. If we are going to live at peace with other nations of the world we must understand that they do not give the same veneration to these American principles that we call the heritage of the English-speaking races. They do not see that in free speech, in the right of habeas corpus, there is anything particularly wonderful. They claim in certain instances that their ideals are higher than ours. They say, we forget the individual, we give our allegiance to the group, to the nation. And ladies and gentlemen, some of them believe in those principles as sincerely and honestly as we believe in ours.

You will recall that in our own country we had a bit of unpleasantness that we call the War Between the States, and regardless of all the contributory causes of that War, the basic reason was a matter of principle. Never has greater heroism and endurance been shown by the soldiers on each side of a question, and each thought he was dying for a principle.

We must learn in this world to accommodate ourselves so that we may live at peace with others whose basic philosophy may be different - and in practice we will often find very great differences. We must be firm in defense of our own, we must be good-humored, and we must be patient, but we must understand, and to understand I know of no institution of America or anywhere else that has a greater opportunity than the universities, and all the lower schools. I believe that in the educational systems of the world today, in the faculties and in the student body, lie the good right arm of any commander’s punch that is looking to knock out the enemy of international suspicion, selfish greed, and intolerance, which lead to war. Thus we can win the victory! Thank you.

• Speech in connection with Cancer Drive, Washington, DC, April 1, 1946

When the Axis powers launched their surprise blow at Pearl Harbor, their hope was for a quick, cheap victory over an America unprepared for war. Fortunately for us, they failed to reckon with an important imponderable - the fighting spirit of an aroused America.

Twice within a generation the United States has suffered unprovoked attack but has survived the crisis through sheer fighting spirit. For it was that fighting spirit that raised and developed Armed Forces of vast size and provided them with the weapons which made possible eventual victory.

The price of those victories was high. The latest one was brought with lavish outlays of treasure and the lives of 300 thousand American men and women, who died in action from pearl Harbor to V-J Day so that we at home would continue to enjoy the right to live healthy, peaceful and democratic lives.

It is a shock to learn that, during the same period, America's losses to another enemy - cancer - more than doubled our battle deaths!

Because the public has not recognized the deadliness of this particular enemy, the tide of cancer deaths has been permitted to rise each year until today this one disease takes a toll of 175 thousand American men, women and children annually.

The dramatic development of the atomic bomb opened our eyes to the tremendous possibilities of coordinated research. Under the sponsorship of the American Cancer Society, the National Research Council has developed a nationwide program of research, to be carried out by the nation's leading scientists. This plan compares to the scientific approach made by our nation to its wartime problems. Additional parts of the program will be directed toward public education and service. Properly supported, this comprehensive plan of attack gives real hope of winning the final victory over cancer.

Under the threat of foreign enemies, our people took no count of cost in supplying the things needful to victory. To win this struggle we must supply the necessary tools to arm our scientific forces. This we can do by generous contributions to, and support of, the American Cancer Society's program. Thus we will demonstrate in peace, as in war, the strength and value of our fighting spirit!

To remain at peace we must be a strong nation. To be strong we must necessarily be healthy, and cancer presents a terrible challenge to our national health. Our war effort won for us the opportunity to live as free Americans - the present fight is one for increased opportunity to live at all.

• Notes for luncheon given by Metropolitan Art Museum, April 2, 1946

We have recently emerged from a bitter conflict that long engulfed the larger nations of the globe. The heroism and sacrifice of men on the fighting lines and the moral and physical energies of those at home were all devoted to the single purpose of military victory. Preoccupation in a desperate struggle for existence left time for little else.

Now we enter upon an era of widened opportunity for physical and spiritual development, united in a determination to establish and maintain a peace in which the creative and expressive instincts of our people may flourish. The welcome release from the fears and anxieties of war will, as always, be reflected in a resurgence of attention to cultural values.

It may seem strange that a soldier, representative of the science of destruction, should appear before a body dedicated to the preservation of man's creative ideals as expressed in art, and should be urging support of the Metropolitan Museum. Even though we acknowledge that the soldier's true function is to prevent rather than to wage war, yet his necessary association with lethal weapons would seem to imply the existence of an unbridgeable gulf between his philosophy and that of the artist. Perhaps this is so - certainly I lay no claim to artistic temperament! But I do know that, for democracy at least, there always stands beyond the materialistic and destructiveness of war the ideals for which it is fought. Thus, the awful test of war is primarily a testing of the spirit, and so it is possible for the fighting man to experience, in war, a definite spiritual growth. But for simpler reasons than these, I believe that many of our veterans have gained renewed interest in art and the world of the artist.

In foreign lands American soldiers have made new contacts with portions of mankind's vast heritage of culture. Many have been awakened to the permanent value of beauty as expressed in architecture, sculpture, painting, and folk arts. Prompted by curiosity, respect and interest, thousands of America's fighting men have spent countless hours touring the art centers of Europe and the Orient.

These same soldiers have seen the destruction of priceless artistic treasures. But, and perhaps understandably, this fact has served only to increase their respect and veneration for civilizations of the past. They have tried, within, sometimes beyond the limits of military prudence, to preserve and protect these products of man's creative instinct, but war is essentially destruction. An army at war must incessantly hurl destructive force at the enemy, and, in this process, much of the world's heritage in art has been inevitably damaged and lost in the late global conflict. I am grateful to the directors of the Metropolitan Museum for their generosity in having accorded me an honorary membership for my small part in protecting these monuments.

The credit belongs to the officers and men of the combat echelons whose veneration for priceless treasurers persisted, even in the heat and fears of battle.

Another view of the fate of art in war was presented to our soldiers when, at long last, we penetrated to the heart of Naziism. There, in caves, in mines, and in isolated mountain hideouts we found that Hitler and his gang, with unerring instinct for enriching themselves, had stored art treasures, filched from their rightful owners throughout conquered Europe. Alongside bar and minted gold were found paintings, statues, tapestries, jewelry and all else that the Nazis knew mankind would pay much to rescue and preserve. Some of this has been restored - some, not easy to identify, is still under the care of the captors.

Frequently the soldier was led to attempt to express in artistic fashion something of his own reactions to the phenomena of war. For example – Mauldin's reaction to the "Brass Hats." Possibly none of the paintings and drawings that the American soldier brought back with him will ever find its way into the Metropolitan, but they are to him, in sum, vivid memories of filth and beauty, of hopes and fears, of suffering and mercy, of life and death. Moreover, they provide additional evidence that thousands of our returned soldiers will eagerly seize upon the opportunities offered by the Metropolitan and its sister institutions of art.

The freedom enjoyed by this country from the desolation that has swept over so many others during the past years gives to America greater opportunity than ever before to become the greatest of the world's repositories of art. The whole world will then have a right to look to us with grateful eyes; but we will fail unless we consciously appreciate the value of art in out lives and take practical steps to encourage the artist and preserve his works. In no walk of life can one man fail to find richer experience as he falls under the influence of beauty immortalized by inspired genius. Even for the roughest of soldiers there is more of ancient Egyptian history to be felt and understood in a lonely, graceful column rising against the sky in a naked field than there is in all the descriptive matter that was ever written on the subject.

The Metropolitan will be a more priceless treasure of the America of centuries hence, even than it is today. It is our privilege to pass on to the coming centuries treasures of past ages, and to add to these the artistic creations of our own. But now - today - hundreds of returned soldiers will profit by your help in creative effort, and thousands more will gain inspiration from your exhibits. They, who have dealt with death, will be among the most ardent worshippers of life and beauty - and of the peace in which these can thrive.

• Army Day Speech, Los Angeles, April 6, 1946

This command performance is being brought to you in honor of Army Day - a day set apart to honor the achievements of the Army of the United States and the men who have fought that our nation might continue to enjoy the liberty to which we are dedicated.

Like most things that are good and great, the American Army had its spontaneous birth in an hour of need. That need was freedom. The sturdy farmers who gathered at Lexington and Concord were the magnificent seed from which our present great fighting force was born. Through the years, at the Alamo - San Juan Hill - Chateau Thierry - the Normandy beachhead - Okinawa - Aachen, the battle for freedom has been waged by men in the uniform of the United States Army.

A year ago we were in the midst of a titanic struggle against the forces of darkness which would have enslaved the world - cut off our freedom. In Europe we were wading a bloody river along the German border - in the Pacific we were blasting the enemy from the hillsides - measuring advances almost by inches.

Today the battles have been won, but the victory is an empty one if it does not lead to a just and lasting peace. Today millions of servicemen are aiding in a campaign intended to produce greater understanding among men and nations - an understanding which is vitally necessary to peace.

One of the terms which we have given this post-battle campaign is "reconversion." There is reconversion at home - in the cross-road towns and great metropolitan cities - just as there is reconversion in Germany or I those areas of the Pacific that had once been held by Japan. The change-over from war to peace is not an easy one. No one pretends that it is, and no one denies that it is a sacred mission - it is the mission of the men of the Armed Forces, who are instruments of the will of the people of America and of all peoples who want their children to grow up in a sane and serene world. It is the job of the men of the Armed Forces to see that the

enemies of humanity cannot again make war. “Occupation” may be defined as simply as that. The depth of our responsibility in accomplishing this mission can be measured in the number of lives that were given to ensure the victory. Their sacrifice is like a flame of freedom. We can let no one, or no thing, extinguish it.

And so on this Army Day, we are reminded that we are the American Army - one in thought and being with those who fought and died that we, as a nation, might be free. Neither you, nor I, can ever forget this heritage.

• Army Day Speech, Chicago, April 6, 1946

This day of tribute to the men and women of the United States Army is a day of national rededication to the ideals they served so well.

Total victory was the product of unity - a unity achieved by people and by nations, all guided by the truth that attainment of great common objectives requires sacrifices by each of the participants. In the face of danger individual advantage was glad to bow to the common good.

Looking back upon the uneasy peace that followed the neglected victory of 1918 - which crumbled and finally disappeared in the smoke and ashes of Poland, France and Pearl Harbor - we know that to protect this victory we must remain united in working for security in peace as we did for success in war. In no other way can we fully pay the debt we owe to the veterans of the battlefield. As a nation we can, and must, fulfill our direct and obvious obligations to these men; to care for the disabled and for the dependents of the fallen; to help every veteran attain opportunity for increased usefulness to the world. But this is not enough! With our Allies, we must now use wisdom and courage to consolidate the victory and secure the peace. The goal is universal renunciation of war - the problem is to reach that goal with certainty. That is the meaning of our rededication.

The Armed Forces could not have won this war alone. No one nation can secure the peace alone. Our country, while doing every needful internal thing to fulfill the purposes expressed by its founders, must seek to fit itself as a reliable, strong, energetic partner in an international peace enterprise of global significance and transcendent import to all of us.

In approaching this problem, your Army - as an instrument and as a part of the whole people - has been given particular assignments.

Firstly, we must retain the ability to fulfill our country’s obligations in the defeated Axis areas. That means plowing up the remaining weeks of Axis doctrine and preparing the soil for a harvest which will nourish and not weaken the community of nations. There must be no uncertainty in the accomplishment of this task.

Secondly, we must, until perpetual peace is assured, maintain and constantly improve the perishable machines of our security. The people were justly proud of the planes, the radar and all the other war instruments devised and produced by American ingenuity, but our scientists must not cease their research and development in this field. In the scientific world the best of yesterday is the obsolete of today!

Thirdly, during this period of world readjustment and reconversion, while the United Nations construct the machinery of international security, we must maintain such strength as may be required from us by that organization. Later, out of this interim force, and influenced by the achievements of the U.N.O., will come the framework of our future peacetime Army.

The Army decries Jingoism and saber rattling. It believes in strength without arrogance; in firmness without discourtesy; in loyalty without servility. It lives with pride in its cherished traditions of service to our Commander-in-Chief and to the people to whom it belongs.

On this Army Day of 1946, it is the Army’s hope and ambition to honor our veterans by helping in the development of our national security as a cornerstone of the peace structure that must be built in the world. To this endeavor, those of us, still in the uniform of our country, pledge our faithful and earnest support until that day when swords are ploughshares and the reign of peace is unchallenged.

• Remarks at dinner of Cleveland Aviation Club, April 11, 1946

Since returning from Europe, it has been one of my more pleasant duties to visit a few of the regions from

which this country drew its human and material resources of victory. I am especially grateful for this opportunity to come here and learn at first hand something of the facilities and accomplishments of the National Advisory Committee's Aviation Research Laboratories. It is equally gratifying to meet with you citizens of Cleveland - of this whole industrial region - who have contributed so much toward America's pre-eminence in the air.

Your home state of Ohio has long exercised leadership in the development and advancement of both military and commercial aviation in America - and consequently, in the world. Ohio's Wright Brothers performed their pioneering miracles in both civil and military aviation, and many an air victory over Europe and the Pacific had its origin back here on the drafting tables and the flying fields of this State.

In my Army service I have witnessed the growth and expansion of the Army Air Forces, practically from the initial stages. Some of you are familiar with those first awkward steps toward air power. Many of you grew up with the Air Forces - worked hand in hand with them, both before and during the war just ended. You well know the degree of vision, courage, planning and hard work that went into our skyrocketing leadership in the air - into our victory over the best that the enemy had to offer.

Few of you, however, had the opportunity to see the manner in which the products of your labor met the supreme test. To you I bring first-hand evidence that the American Air Forces in Europe met every demand I placed upon them. The Air Force record in the Pacific is equally a testimony to the skill of American manufacturers and to the courage of the flyers. We are all familiar with the points at which our planes excelled. We remember our mistakes - and the correction of our mistakes. The statistics of victory are still fresh in our minds.

But beyond excellence of equipment and gallantry and skill in the field, I would like to give credit to an intangible element by means of which the whole Allied victory was gained. Without it your best efforts and ours - your mightiest aircraft and our most capable flyers - would have been the losers. This priceless ingredient of our power - in the air, as on land and sea - was teamwork. This is not the first time I have mentioned it.

Call it what you will - integration, combined operation, unified action - it was the teamwork of air, ground and naval forces, among the different Allied fighting services, all supported by the unified moral and material resources of the Allied homelands, that was basically responsible for our victory. Until the end, our triumphs were brought about by a smoothly functioning team which could not be stopped.

In the early part of the war, air power teamed up with sea power to meet the German submarine threat and maintain our sea-lanes to Britain and Russia - lines of communication vital to ourselves as well as to our Allies. The air-sea team effectively broke the back of Hitler's undersea force. Throughout the war it maintained an increasingly effective blockade of the German-held areas.

This same kind of teamwork in action was employed by the British air and ground forces to push Rommel back from El Alamein to Tunisia, and wipe out the Afrika Korps. Air, ground and sea power made up a three-fisted force to strike into Sicily and Italy. During these campaigns we perfected the methods of effective coordination and cooperation by which we executed the invasion of Normandy. Teamwork landed us on Omaha Beach. It took us past St. Lo and cut the German Seventh Army to pieces in the Falaise Gap. It stopped the German counter-attack in the Ardennes and carried us across the Rhine. It won Guadalcanal, the Philippines, Iwo Jima and Okinawa. Our victories were the outcome of inter-service and inter-Allied teamwork. But it would be both incomplete and unjust to limit credit to the fighting forces. There was a larger area of cooperation - with the productive genius of America. This kind of cooperation - and here the burden was upon American industry - brought our country in less than five years from the depths of unpreparedness to achieve the greatest air power of any nation in the world. It is true that the air power which you helped to create does not now exist. That is, it no longer exists as we knew it on June 6, 1944. Rapid demobilization has seen to that.

Turning now to the future and thinking of it in these terms of common objectives, by which I mean objectives that are important for the armed forces, for industry and for all America, the one that stands above all others is the attainment of permanent peace.

Toward this end there are three paths and all three must be followed determinedly and with our full strength if we are to attain the goal. The first path is marked out by the United Nations. That body, that idea, must have our constant and active support. We must be ready to meet the costs that may be imposed upon us, as a people, by the decisions of the Council. We must put behind us this great common effort the same unity of

purpose that carried us to military victory.

The second path is one that each of us can follow. It is that of increased understanding, first, of ourselves and our own important problems, and then of the people and the problems of associated nations. In this way can be attained an intelligent approach toward composing inescapable differences among nations, be these problems industrial, financial, social or political. Here it is important to remember that composing is not opposing. Moreover, it is important to remember that progress along this path cannot be unilateral. All nations and all people must take similar efforts toward understanding, if the final prize is to be won. With the elimination of ignorance in these matters, many of the traditional causes of war will disappear. The purpose is idealistic but the approach must be practical, realistic, hard-headed. In this field, I believe churches, schools, and private individuals can combine effectively to produce a victory greater than any general has ever won.

The third path is that of progressive, universal disarmament. The United States has always lived up to its belief that military formations and military preparations should never exceed in size and scope that required by the most primitive considerations of security. Indeed, time and again we have fallen below even this scale or preparation to our later danger and vastly increased costs. However, the principle is correct and as it becomes one of universal observance, the reduction of armament all over the world may not only keep pace with the gradual elimination of fear, but by acting one upon the other, progress toward both objectives should be expedited. In this regard the United States has never offended. It has never maintained forces suitable for aggression and there has been nothing proposed by any American that seeks to exceed, directly or indirectly, those basic and minimum measures that are still imposed upon us by world conditions. When, but only when, we have the certainty of universal peace we could at last enter the world of total disarmament. It would then no longer be necessary to divert our brains, our material wealth and our manpower from the positive purposes of civilization to the negative and sterile purposes of war and preparation for war.

But I hold - and I believe every thoughtful American so holds - that any premature attempt completely to disarm our own country, without comparable progress abroad, will serve only to retard us on the road to peace - the United Nations needs, in these troublous times, a strong America. I do not mean a gigantic, saber-rattling, armed-to-the-teeth America. I mean only a well arranged framework of air-sea-ground-industrial power that assures to us and to the world an ability to meet the obligations our people have assumed in the common effort to stabilize a near-chaotic world. Many peoples throughout the world desire to march shoulder to shoulder with us toward freedom and justice - toward peace. Because of our size, our resources, and the mighty engine of righteous destruction we devised in the late war, we are looked upon as one of the big partners in the enterprise. Small nations have as much right as large ones to feel secure. Consequently, they instinctively cling to a partner that is firm and strong, just as it is fair and considerate. There could be no greater calamity to the cause of peace and the confidence of small nations in following the paths we believe to be the straight ones, than premature, unilateral dissipation of our strength to the point where we would have to abandon our sworn commitments and stand helpless to defend the right.

Within this minimum sphere of security requirements we must continue to practice the lessons of cooperation and unity that served us so well in the shooting war. The problem is not one for the Army alone, nor even exclusively for the armed forces and industry taken together. It is one for the whole people. The Army’s merely a part of America, just as is industry. We must stay strong morally and physically - and in this strength we must persistently march down the three great paths toward peace and, finally, total and universal disarmament. In this great crusade you and I - all of us - have our special tasks. Each of them is worthy of all we can put into it.

• Address at Inter-American Defense Board, Washington, DC, April 15, 1946

It seems to me that none of us could fail to take inspiration from a meeting such as this. The traditional picture of a military staff is one in which you find a group of people buried in their secret places, carefully plotting the application of force against someone else. Maybe it is against all others, but in any event it is secret, and it is unilateral. Here we have the picture of the distinguished representatives of twenty-one republics and their military advisers, gathering together in the hope that by discussing these problems in common, there will

be no occasion and no excuse for the application of force. What we are really meeting for, if we will look to the final objective, is toward a place or condition where in the Americas the use of military force will not only be unnecessary; it will be something completely beyond our own minds.

There could be no greater step toward that than occurred four years ago when the Defense Board was organized, and in its, you might say, renaissance, its re-birth, at this period when all the world is in near chaos of doubt and misunderstanding. The Americas' holding up the example of their military staffs meeting together to discuss their plans and their conditions is something that not only should result to the great good of the Americas, but it should be an example to the rest of the world. Let us hope so.

This question of cooperation, of course, has its practical aspects as well as its theoretical. For example, present with us today are the representatives of the nations that provide the great American drink, coffee. If there is any United States person here today who hasn't drunk two cups of coffee, from the small ones furnished by this hotel, I would take him to be unkindly on such an occasion as this.

This business of reaching out toward the abolition of force is a very practical one. It is not enough that we stand before the world and say we throw away our soldiers, we throw away our planes, and we throw away our guns. All history has proven that that is no sound and no effective approach to the question of abolishing force as a means or a method of international political operation. If we believe thoroughly in our principles, in our own good faith, then I believe that all of us should have represented in our own armed strength - air, sea, and ground - that amount, but no more than that amount, that the world recognizes as a serious effort, a serious purpose, on our part to follow our ideals through to their logical conclusion. We should have no more, but we should have that much, and we should help each other have that much.

I believe that strength is necessary in support of good works, just as strength has been applied in the furtherance of wicked aims in the world. We gained a great victory over the Axis powers in this war, but there are still enemies abroad, external and internal, because when you come down to it, the seeds of war are in the breast of each of us. None of us, as a citizen or as an official of his government, can escape his responsibility for understanding that within him is a certain amount of greed, a certain amount of selfishness, a certain amount of prejudice. Those things are not going to be eradicated from our breasts within our time, but we can find ways to control them, to turn them to practical use, so we can get along together.

In this great world I think that the Americas have an unusual opportunity in this. I believe that in the Americas more than in other countries are still remaining those shreds of the pioneering spirit that brought our forefathers into every country of the Americas from Europe. They did not have someone to take care of them. They had to take care of themselves. That pioneering spirit, that determination to go and live their lives as they please which, as I understand it, is at the basis of our understanding of democracy, is still with us in great measure. If we can take those assets that we have of that type, work with them and develop them as brothers, and with the certainty that we are going to remain in peace among ourselves to develop our own idea of world peace, then we will be doing a great deal for ourselves and for the whole world.

I thank you very much.

• Speech for Texas Agricultural & Mechanical College muster, April 21, 1946

This visit to Texas A&M allows me to pay a first installment on two debts, both of them long overdue. One is to acknowledge, in this Easter morning ceremony, the magnificent contribution made by your college in the gaining of the allied victory of 1945. The other is to pay tribute, through this largest of all ROTC units, to the vital role played by the entire ROTC system in that bitter moment.

Through the lean years following 1918, at a time when possibility of another war seemed, to the public mind, so remote as to challenge the sanity of any individual of contrary view, the nation-wide ROTC system steadily turned out reserve officers. Between 1919 and our entry into World War II, it produced 112,000, of whom 58,000 were still on the rolls in 1941. In the early days of mobilization, when officer procurement was one of our most critical problems, we had this substantial body to employ. General Marshal called it at the time, "our principal available asset."

The ROTC of this one institution furnished the Army 7,000 officers - far more than any other college.

Figures - and I have already submitted you several - are sometimes more eloquent than words. No more convincing testimony could be given to the manner in which the men of Texas A&M lived up to the ideals and principles inculcated in them during their days on this campus than the simple statement that the Congressional Medal of Honor has been awarded to six former students, that 46 took part in the heroic defense of Bataan and Corregidor, and that nearly 700 are on the list of our battle dead. As one of the field commanders with whom served many of the veterans in this homecoming gathering, I can feel only a lasting admiration for the ROTC of Texas A&M. This admiration extends to the individual as well as to the institution that produced you.

You met the sternest of all tests. No matter how deep and instinctive our hatred of war, we still are quick to recognize that the weakling cannot measure up to the standard it sets.

Even people who have been so fortunate as to remain strangers to the terror of the diving plane and the nerve-shattering thump of bursting shells, who have not known the sickening smells, the dust, the mud, the stifling heat, the freezing cold of the battlefield or the bone-deep weariness of marching and firing and digging and crawling, who have not felt the sadness of blank files in the ranks - even these can sense that respect is won in combat only by manifestation of virtues we most admire in men - courage, devotion, endurance, discipline, optimism, mutual help, loyalty.

To these qualities there must be added, for success, still another, and vital, ingredient. It is leadership.

You veterans here know, better than others, that the highest commander cannot, by himself, provide the leadership necessary to tactical victory. He must be supported by a great organization of devoted assistants, the base of which must be the captains, the lieutenants, the sergeants and corporals - every man that has a position of responsibility over another in the battle. Through days and months of experience you veterans learned to distinguish between the true and the false, between the man who leads and the one who seeks under the cloak of undeserved authority to escape his own proper share of the costs that must be paid to achieve any positive and worthwhile purpose.

You well know that the officer who pretends to a position of human rather than of mere official superiority, who deliberately thrusts upon his men added danger, suffering or exhausting work in order that he may himself escape their full impact, is not, in the eyes of his men, an officer and a leader, regardless of the weight of the insignia he carries upon his shoulder.

During the war a broad survey was made to determine what qualities enlisted men considered most important in a good officer.

Our soldiers thought the two prime requisites were first, his ability or competence; secondly, they named his interest in the welfare of his men. As to his personal attitude, Major General John M. Schofield described it well to the cadets at West Point back in 1887. He said, “The discipline which makes the soldiers of a free country reliable in battle is not to be gained by harsh or tyrannical treatment. On the contrary, such treatment is far more likely to destroy than to make an army. He who feels the respect which is due to others cannot fail to inspire in them regard for himself; while he who feels disrespect towards others ... cannot fail to inspire hatred against himself.”

It is the commander who shares, naturally and unpretentiously in every problem of the group, who gains the confidence of his men and gives to them his own, who shares with them every turn of fortune, who takes no thought of himself until every need of all his men has been accommodated, who learns from them as much as he can teach them, and who expresses in every word and deed his pride of belonging to the whole, that invariably gains for himself the greatest reward that can come to any man.

This reward is the respect, esteem and love of his associates. Moreover, his is an elite unit. Such a man is a stranger to resentment from his men. They accord - they demand for him - a position before the world that comes only to those who have rendered honest service to their fellows.

It is this type of officer that the ROTC must develop. It cannot be done in days or weeks - it requires months of training, of study, of reflection. The nation’s war needs in officers - if war should come again to us - cannot possibly be met without the ROTC. No regular establishment can meet the requirements in numbers, while shorter, emergency periods of training, although effective in the rapid selection and specialized combat training of promising material, cannot provide the opportunity for full development of the promise into rounded, understanding leadership.

For it is not true that leaders are born - never made. That notion is a tattered remnant of a system that went

out with the bow and arrow. It is true that a real leader must be inherently endowed with certain essentials, among which are personal integrity, intelligence, common sense, and stability under pressure. But this is the raw material that reaches its ultimate effectiveness only under wise and persistent development. Given the rich stock of American manhood to draw upon, selection and training will continue to produce an even more magnificent body of unit leaders than those who, in the late war led 8 million other Americans to the most decisive and the greatest victory, with the lowest losses, that the world has known.

The ROTC accomplishes, to a remarkable degree, both this selection and this training. A college course is by its nature a selective and screening process. By and large, those who graduate are tested risks for carrying through to a successful conclusion the diverse enterprises of modern military science. The ROTC man receives much more than military training. He is subjected to an increasingly difficult series of mental challenges. He gains information and, more important, he gains tolerance, appreciation, and understanding of the problems of mankind. He grows, matures, broadens in interests. His training is calculated to give him a feeling of confidence and sureness, but not an attitude of superiority and snobbishness toward his fellow men.

In our country, we hold that every man should have the opportunity to rise to any station in his chosen profession commensurate with his ability. This is not merely a pretty theory in the Army. It is our guiding principle. We provided the Military Academy, to which entrance lies in the hands of our elected representatives of the people; we established the CMTC before the war and the officer candidate schools during the war; we commissioned specialists direct from civil life, and finally, gave battlefield commissions to men who displayed the ultimate requirements of an officer in being able to lead troops successfully in the face of the enemy. The war-time Officer Corps of the American Army was the best the American nation could provide. It had no artificial limitations due to race, color, or creed. Its record is one to thrill every true American. Its splendid leadership enabled our Army to defeat two of the most powerful military machines the world has ever seen. To say that some officers might have done more or done better should not be allowed to obscure the main issue.

The soldier of our citizen army recognizes his commander as one of his fellow men. He has no fear and must not be allowed to have any fear of that officer as a man, no feeling of inferiority toward him as a citizen of this republic. The American way of life has taught each to think for himself, to be an individual, to be self-reliant. It has engendered within him the desire for success and achievement.

At the same time he has learned, from his daily contacts, to recognize intelligence and integrity and the qualities of leadership in others. He is not a follower by nature but will extend himself to the utmost for those in whom he feels he can place his trust. He knows the value of organization and of discipline.

It is out of such stuff that American armies have always been made. To the American military commander, this truth offers an opportunity and a challenge. An opportunity in that these men can, by proper leadership, be welded into an unbeatable army. A challenge in that it calls for the exercise of the highest degree of justice, imagination, and initiative to explore and develop the potentialities of the young Americans in his charge.

The education of the officer never ends. The global nature of the recent war, with its close relationships to the political, industrial, and economic life of the nation, has made plain the need for more than purely military skills and knowledge, particularly in those who are to bear responsibilities in the higher staffs, or with other Government agencies. Here again, the educational practices absorbed in the ROTC are certain to assist in the continuous broadening and growth of the individual.

I cannot close without suggesting to you a more human and more profitable employment of the qualities developed in the ROTC than mere success in battle. We have briefly surveyed the soldierly virtues that are essential to victory in war. But not yet has been solved the problem of employing those virtues, which sustain the truth that man was created in the image of God, to serve as effectively the cause of peace as the demands of war. Must we admit that only the compulsion of a common, deadly fear can produce the teamwork that is as necessary to the peaceful concert of peoples as it is to batter and crush a stubborn foe? Why is it that the demonstrated abilities of a great nation and her allies to produce the mightiest force of righteous destruction yet seen upon the earth, cannot produce an equal progress toward the heart’s desire on every individual on that earth - the assurance that he may pursue his peaceful desires in tranquility and absence of fear?

The answer again is leadership, and again the answer must comprehend leadership in all walks of life, in all spheres of influence. Knowledge of the world - of other countries and peoples as well as our own, understanding of the need of strength to support good intent, and of the need for organization for the

constructive work of peace. These, supported by energetic, tireless leadership, are the greatest need of a near-chaotic world.

The graduate of ROTC must acquire in his makeup the elements of mental and moral fitness, the desire to help and inspire his fellows, that will mark him for leadership in any community in this land. If he is truly trained, he will be the man to rely on - the one to respect - in danger or in calm. He is one of the great hopes of this nation - of civilization itself.

• Remarks at general commission on Army and Navy chaplains, Washington, DC, April 24, 1946

To say that I bring you the appreciation of the Army for the work you have done during the war is mere understatement. A good chaplain in the Army is worth more than his weight in gold; a poor one defeats, by his example, the very precepts he is supposed to teach. So, in your work, as spiritual advisers to our men in the field, you have done work for which the men in the Army will always be in your debt.

I am not going to recite for you the statistics with which you are certainly as familiar as I am. Moreover, before such an audience as this, you can well understand that I am not going to get into any discussion about theology, fundamentalism, etc., but I am going to give you two or three convictions that I have about your position in this world. The chaplain's position in the Army I believe most sincerely to be one of the most important.

To put my first proposition bluntly and simply, it is this. Except in a moral regeneration throughout the world, there is no hope for us and we are all going to disappear one day in the dust of an atomic explosion, even as we support all of the more formalistic approaches to international peace, such as are represented in the United Nations. We must do all that we can toward progressive disarmament, for which I think we should all pray very sincerely. There must go hand in hand a mutual tolerance and understanding, a sympathy for the other fellow's point of view. In short, the training of our own minds that is certainly implicit in the Christian religion.

I believe in organization just as much as I believe in the moral regeneration of this world, and through the church there is the opportunity for organizing these moral forces so as to bring them forcefully to the world and to realize real progress.

The chaplain in the Army is no good who is merely spending his time in a negative way trying to keep his men from close contact with sin. The chaplain has to be a dynamic force along lines of straight thinking, rather than just keeping them tonight away from the wine bottles or from some other place where they will do something for which they will be ashamed tomorrow. Nevertheless, this whole problem is to try to reach the goal that must lie importantly in the hearts of all of us. We have to show what can be accomplished by tolerance, understanding, by some love of the other man, by an appreciation of his fears, hopes and aspirations and try to lead this world forward together.

I have come in closer contact with things through the chaplains of the Army than in any other place. I express my earnest and heartiest appreciation, but I say to you today that your efforts are more important than during the war. We had the compulsion of war to keep men in line. The chaplain in the Army today has a more important job than ever because of a cataclysmic period of doubt and fear and mutual suspicion. Through this we can travel only by clinging to the eternal truths. Particularly to you gentlemen here who have already voluntarily elected yourselves to do this job, my message is to urge you to keep it up.

• Bureau of Advertising, American Newspaper Publishers Association, New York City, April 25, 1946

The American newspaper, as a recorder of national achievements and of the counsel of our country's leaders, is a repository of much wisdom applicable to fundamental problems of today. Tonight, with that thought in mind, I go back 51 years to a New England newspaper reporting an 1895 Memorial Day address by a citizen-soldier whose name is now enrolled among our immortal great. He said:

"Although the generation born about 1840, and now governing the world, has fought two at least of the greatest wars in history, and has witnessed others, war is out of fashion, and the man who commands the

attention of his fellows is the man of wealth. Commerce is the great power."

"We do not save our traditions, in this country," he continued. "The regiments whose battle-flags were not large enough to hold the names of the battles they had fought, vanished with the surrender of Lee, although their memories inherited should have made heroes for a century. It is the more necessary to learn the lesson afresh from perils newly sought, and perhaps it is not vain for us to tell the new generation what we learned in our day, and what we still believe."

Those are not the words of a saber-rattling brass hat. They were spoken by one of the greatest democratic figures our country has produced, the younger Oliver Wendell Holmes, three times wounded in combat as a captain of Infantry, for a generation Justice of the Supreme Court.

What I must commend to you from the quotation is Holmes' stress on our wide-spread tendency to ignore, in time of peace, the basic military problems of our country.

Intelligent familiarity with our military problems is as essential to good citizenship as is knowledge of public schools or public finance. In a country with twenty million war veterans - one out of every seven of our population - it should be the normal thing. But objective interest in our own military affairs has never been a peace-time characteristic of our nation.

In the 30's, for instance, there were people in our country who asserted that Hitler was driving Germany into powerless bankruptcy, who were voluble experts about Japan's complete lack of oil. At the same time they did not know that our own Air Forces often had to suspend training and our own Ground Forces could not hold mechanized maneuvers because of lack of funds for gas and oil.

Today, our generation, just as did Justice Holmes', has witnessed two terrible wars within the span of a single lifetime. Yet, in the shadow of the most costly conflict of all time, we ignore the lessons of our past history and of events daily recorded in the American newspaper. We do not see military problems clearly since they come into our range of vision only as an irritating distraction to our view of a goal that beckons brightly on the horizon of our hopes - the attainment of universal and enduring peace.

That peace, once achieved, will eliminate the need for maintaining military establishments. And so, by wishful conversion of hope into accomplished fact, we refuse to look at the problems of today. We brush aside the long years of future trial and error and experiment and compromise, the solution of problems deep-rooted in human nature, the conquest of historic prejudices and antagonisms, all of which will be necessary to build a world cooperating for peace. An old Latin proverb counsels – "To the stars, through difficulties." It does not deny realism in urging constancy to a vision.

Progress toward universal and enduring peace, as I see it, lies along three roads - organized international cooperation, mutual international understanding and progressive international disarmament. All must be traveled simultaneously.

The first path, that of organized international cooperation, is under survey by the United Nations. That organization must have our active support, a support as tireless and effective as that which sustained our vast fighting forces through more than four years of bitter conflict. The United Nations eventually must guarantee, to both major and small powers, security against unwarranted infringement of national rights - a common cause of war.

In this hemisphere, we, with the other independent nations of the Americas, have worked out relationships in which mutual cooperation for the solution of common problems is the keynote. We live by the axiom that arbitration is a more effective means of settling disputes than is war. Years of development have been necessary to attain our present position, and while perfection has not been attained, our degree of success is proof of the possibilities on a global scale.

Progress along the second path - mutual international understanding - is of particular significance because each of us, as individuals, can contribute it. My own war experience with numerous Allies convinced me of one fundamental truth in human relations - that mutual knowledge tends to eliminate mutual fear, suspicion, and prejudice, the prolific breeding grounds of dissention and quarrels. Through every means open to us, we must strive for comprehension of the history, the problems and the aspirations of others, just as we must assist others to gain similar comprehension of ourselves.

Vast gulfs of social, economic and political differences still separate the peoples of the earth. Centuries and generations have gone into their development. We cannot expect to bridge them by wishful thinking or to

abolish them in a few conferences.

Again - our own conception of democracy, no matter how earnestly venerated by ourselves, is of little importance to men whose immediate concern is the preservation of physical life. With famine and starvation the lot of half the world, food is of far more current importance to them than are political ideas. The degree of our sacrifice in feeding the hungry is the degree of our understanding of the world today. And by our conduct toward the hungry now, our country and its institutions will not only be judged tomorrow, but our own progress toward a peaceful world will be measured.

To return to the issue of political understanding: time and again, Americans have proved their readiness to fight and die in defense of certain basic principles of life and freedom. Obviously, others, adhering to different philosophies, can be quite as ready to fight and die in defense of their convictions. As we make gains in mutual understanding, there will inevitably follow greater mutual tolerance in composing those differences that so often loom importantly in the more material fields of finance, trade and territory - sources of international conflicts.

Here I think it important to remember that we can be firm without being offensive in support of principles that are sacred to us. We must realize that good humor, patience, and tolerance are as important internationally as they are individually. While Lincoln's house could not stand, if divided, we know that two houses, differently constructed can exist on the same street. Good neighbors do not pry into the domestic life of each other's families even while they observe common standards of conduct in their daily association. A people whose entire history is steeped in different doctrine, may give to such words as democracy and freedom a totally different meaning than do we.

Progress along this path, it seems to me, should be a particular concern of the newspaper world. Here, I think, there is for you gentlemen, both an opportunity and a challenge. No single group can do more to facilitate progress along the road of mutual understanding than those who direct the publicity media of the world.

The third path of enduring peace - progressive international disarmament - is the one that engages the soldier's special attention. To believe that uncoordinated disarmament can liberate us from fear of war is a fatuous notion, as the files of the American newspaper bear witness. In World War II, four great nations paid a ghastly price for failure to preserve coordination. For France the result was Hitler's jig in the Compiegne Forest. For Britain it was Dunkirk. For Russia it was the long and bloody retreat to Stalingrad. For us it was Bataan and Corregidor. On the record, uncoordinated disarmament by itself is a treacherous road toward our goal. The caution to be observed is that disarmament is not unbalanced. But this truth does not lessen the importance of insisting upon progressive, universal disarmament. The results will be universally beneficial. First, the resources now poured into organizations whose purposes are essentially negative and sterile will be devoted to the constructive purposes of peace. But more than this - the effect of progress along this path will engender mutual confidence and so promote a more rapid movement along the two others. That progress will, in turn, permit further disarmament. Thus there will develop a reciprocal effect that will hasten full attainment of the ultimate goal.

In the meantime, until the day when the United Nations can guarantee our international security, we ourselves must assure our national security. But our security program, if it is to be a bulwark of democracy, must be the concern of every citizen and not merely the vocation of a small professional group.

National security, as I see it, is a state of organized readiness to meet external aggression by a quick and effective mobilization of public opinion, trained men, proved weapons, and essential industries, integrated into the most efficient instrument of armed defense, and reinforced by the support of every citizen in the measure and form necessary for the preservation of our way of life.

The security establishment comprises all the people, all our enterprises, all our Government if it is to be adequate in this atomic age. But it must so engage their efforts as to permit the full development of every aspect of peaceful life.

The security establishment of our democracy must always remain representative of our way of life. It must not be a belligerent and noisy horde, screaming threats of atomic destruction, disrupting world harmony. It must attempt to build the country into a warehouse or stockpile for war. Belligerence is the hallmark of insecurity - the secure nation does not need threat to maintain its position.

Moreover, there is no guarantee of security in military machines alone - twice in our lifetime we have

broken the most powerful military machine in Europe and, during the latest war, we reduced its Pacific counterpart to a huge and helpless skeleton.

In the final analysis, whether or not the Army can do its part for democracy depends on the citizen's interest in the service and, reciprocally on the Army's understanding of its relations with the citizen. The American newspaper can bridge the gap that has too often separated them in the past.

Upon my return to this country, I was confronted by an emotional surge that was both normal and understandable. Revulsion against war was instantaneous and almost total in its scope. It was natural, and in the view of any thinking man, to be expected. Emotion has its place in the scheme of things - it is a priceless ingredient to action. However, emotion tends always to swing to the extremes of the pendulum - logic and judgment seek to find the mean between them.

The newspaper, of course, must reflect the day-to-day attitude - even the emotions - of the people it serves. But equally the newspaper must strive to point out the path of logic. This, the bulk of our own press has never failed to do. It is doing so today. Perhaps, emotion is subsiding and we are about to face reality.

During the war you bolstered our armed strength by supporting national unity. Since the victory, the free press of America has exercised its right and its duty to criticize defects in the structure of our military establishment. That was as much a part of your essential function as your wartime effort. You have not permitted us to neglect the problem of human relations within the Army. The War Department is reaffirming by word and action that the discipline required in the military establishment is not an authorization for abuse of personal prerogative. While there must be different degrees of authority, there are no different degrees of justice. All must understand that military rank is a recognition of responsibility and not a ration book of personal privilege.

Just as we must improve human relations within the Army, so we must improve our relations with the citizens we serve. We need continual contact with the social, scientific and industrial development outside the Army. We must in turn improve our information services to keep the country informed of our problems and our progress. And we must keep ever in mind our role within the democracy - that our mission is national security - and we must not torture it into a caste of privilege or machine of aggression. But this is not, and has never been even a remote danger in the United States.

The danger lies, as Justice Holmes said, in the fact that "we do not save our traditions in this country." The dangers of forgetting the lessons of our past increase tremendously. We have seen the frightening speed with which the mechanics of military force become more complicated. The great mobilization of 1917 seems leisurely compared to the efforts we have just been through. And yet, in this last war, we took two and a half years to begin the offensive in Western Europe and more than that to bring our first forces back to the Philippines. Should future threats arise, no one will contend that we shall again have time for comparable preparations. The newspaper can make our people effectively conscious of the lesson they must not again forget.

More specifically, I believe that the newspaper can bring to our people definite understanding of the immediate roles that our security forces must play in establishing and perpetuating the peace.

Today our security responsibilities are of transcendent importance and the national interest demands that every citizen understand their nature. The campaign that engages us now - the campaign to disarm and reorient our late antagonists, to stimulate and hearten millions of hopelessly confused peoples, to stand as a bulwark for lovers of freedom as we understand the word - is the closing action of the war. It is just as essential now to provide the necessary military strength and to distribute those forces properly as it was during the critical days of the shooting war. This is the ad interim force that I have been discussing for the past few months before Congress, the press, and the people. It must be sustained and maintained, and the methods used must be certain of success. I hold that a resolute, intelligent, and frankly displayed determination to live up to our present position in the world is vital to our current and future welfare. To do less - to look to chance or personal whim for the provision of the necessary strength - is to risk abandonment of those that look to us for influential leadership and, more than this, it is to gamble senselessly with the sacrifices with which military victory was bought.

We of the United States, joined with the other free nations, are striving for a united world in which there shall be no war. While we work for the greatest human goal men can set before themselves, we must be able to

do so in security, free from external threat or menace. A secure United States will stand as a shining example of the strength of democracy, and effectively hasten the peace of the world. But weakness on our part, compelling us to desert our commitments, to violate our pledges and even to invite aggression, can bog the world in a turmoil of fear and doubt and destroy belief in our concepts of freedom. To prevent that possibility, the Army is engaged in its most important peacetime enterprise - the carrying out of its prescribed missions in enforcing the peace.

I reaffirm my conviction that the peace and prosperity of our own nation is a part of the peace and prosperity of the family of nations. We must realize that we can do the most good through the possession of the strength demanded by our world responsibilities. As in all other worthwhile efforts to discharge these responsibilities will require sacrifice on the part of all of us. We need again to take inspiration from our pioneer fathers who allowed no danger - no privation - no risk, to block the way to the freedom and independence they sought. We need to re-absorb the homely virtues that forced upon them a feeling of guilt if they avoided a road leading to their goal because it was difficult. Here in the United States they build national unity - in the Americas their sons are building hemispheric unity - with God's help we, with the other powers, will build unity in the world.

• **Georgia Bar Convention, Savannah, Georgia, May 24, 1946** (read by Mr. Gowen for DDE after DDE was called back to Washington, DC)

For several reasons it seems to me appropriate that I should bring to you an account - a necessarily sketchy account - of the American soldier of our time, with particular emphasis on his accomplishments during the past four and one-half years. In the term "soldier" I include all in the Army - officers and enlisted men - brass hats and kitchen police. They are all one.

The first reason is - the Army belongs to you! You have furnished the individuals to fill its ranks, every officer and man in it is just another American citizen performing a task prescribed, in its general sense, by you - the source of all power in this republic. The Army is of the people and is supported by them. It is logical that you should require periodic reports concerning this important feature of our national life.

Next - I have just completed an extensive tour of the Pacific areas, where, at first hand, I was enabled to see your sons, brothers and friends in the midst of their post-hostilities tasks, a valuable supplement to my European experience with them during the shooting war.

Finally - in these days when natural revulsion from war and all its beastliness is, as always, reflected in the substitution of wishful thinking for logical analysis and of fantastic charges for honest criticism. It is well for us to refer occasionally to the record, so that we may keep our thinking clear and our eyes upon reasonable objectives.

When the United States was plunged into active hostilities on December 7, 1941 there began the mobilization of our military, industrial and moral resources for the accomplishment of certain national purposes. Among these a few of the more simple and obvious ones were:

To beat off attack against our territory.

To carry the war to our enemies and accomplish the complete destruction of their military strength.

To ensure that the Axis powers - which between the two world wars turned both to dictatorship in Government and aggressive purposes against others - could not again threaten the peace of the world or the security of our country.

To undertake with our Allies a long-range system of international cooperation that would minimize if not eliminate the danger of future conflicts.

The American soldier, with his counterpart in the Naval service, and with loyal Allies throughout the world has accomplished the first parts of these obvious and announced purposes. The great achievements by more than eight million khaki-clad Americans in helping to bring about the utter defeat of the German-Japanese-Italian war machines is a saga that has been told through our newspapers, our radio, our motion pictures and by numerous professional and amateur writers of current history and biography. Yet there are parts of it that will continue to bear retelling as long as Americans are devoted to those ideals that are expressed in our nation's two

great founding documents and we continue to admire the qualities of courage, far-sightedness and sacrifice that enabled our forefathers to establish those ideals as the basic principles of our form of Government.

It is not true that the American soldier did not know why he was fighting in World War II. A common mistake is to under-rate the intelligence and the level of information and understanding of the typical American soldier. He reads his newspaper and he listens to his radio. These supplement his information from War Department programs. Long before we became engaged in actual hostilities Americans saw what was happening to people in Germany and Japan and Italy and, far worse, what was happening to the people in the countries that were overrun and enslaved by the ruthless arrogance and the armed might of those three countries.

It is possible that through long enjoyment of our free institutions and our knowledge that these had existed within the boundaries of this nation for many decades we - the average people - were lulled into forgetting, between the two wars, that the price of freedom is eternal vigilance. Possibly we believed the vicious slogan “it can’t happen here.” But the Jap attack of December 7, 1941 blasted away the last shred of complacency - even more effectively than it blasted the ships and planes and men in Pearl Harbor on that day. The American soldier quickly proved his understanding of the issues involved and his readiness to meet them with the same firmness and courage that made Yorktown and the Meuse-Argonne such bright spots in our history. To imply otherwise is to shut our eyes to the sacrifices written by a toll of 230,000 Army dead and additional battle casualties of the Army that ran the total very close to a million.

Yet, all of us have heard the charge that the Army would like to aim at establishing military control over this country. This is that type of lie that is difficult to smash merely because it is as ridiculous as those that utter it. Happily, in this case, the record itself is before us. From the time of Washington, American soldiers fighting and dying for this republic have had their inspiration in its championship of liberty. The generals and G.I.s of this war who fell in battle have joined the legions of Valley Forge to further strengthen the indestructible foundation of our system of Government. The very cornerstone of that system is the supremacy of civil law and power. Are men who fought and sacrificed for a single purpose to be charged with intent of violating that purpose? The truth is - the Army is, as it has always been, true to its heritage as the greatest defender of American democracy.

This war presented to the American soldier new professional problems - unprecedented difficulties. The G.I. proved that the initiative, resourcefulness and adaptability that we have so admired in the soldiers of Scott, Lee, Grant and Pershing have not become mere historical features of American civilization. Here are some of the things he did:

He produced the finest and mightiest Air Force that the world has seen. He did it in a period of time that left ourselves breathless and forced our enemies to rush in hysterical dismay to the bowels of the earth and to the woods of the field for some degree of safety. He developed armored divisions whose brilliant sweeps across Europe are reminiscent of the great operations that always come to mind when we mention the names of Forrest and of Stuart.

That same soldier produced mountain divisions, one of which won for itself undying fame in the country where Hannibal and the Romans struggled for supremacy more than 2,000 years ago.

He built up airborne divisions that in battle after battle proved themselves possessed of the same elan, fighting fury, and individual resourcefulness that carried the soldiers of Mad Anthony up the slopes of Stony Point, and he sustained his battles with a stark courage that was not exceeded at the “Bloody Angle” in the war between the States.

The G.I. learned to attack through woods, over rivers, through open plains. He mastered the technique of blasting the enemy out of the most elaborate types of fortifications in the Siegfried Line and in the Pacific Islands, just as he learned to tear his enemy out of the deepest jungles of Guadalcanal, Buna and the Philippines. He became the world’s most frequently employed expert in amphibious assaults against defended shore lines. Twenty-eight American Army divisions made this type of assault, some of them several times, and always successfully. As long as Americans may thrill at the record of their soldiers in battle they find no more satisfying account than that of the attack of the 1st and 29th Divisions on Omaha Beach on June 6, 1944. If any of you should doubt the worthiness of the modern G.I. as a fighting man I commend to you a study of the conditions of tide, of storm, of mines, of fortifications, of obstacles, and of a strong and ferociously fighting

enemy that the soldiers of the Fifth United States Corps faced in the grey dawn of June 6th and unfalteringly drove ahead to win a battle that was vital to the Allied success on that day. Then read the tales of Buna, of Leyte, of Mindanao and Luzon!

No matter what the conditions of battle, the American Army proved in every section of the globe that there was no obstacle too great, no risk too terrifying and no enemy sufficiently strong to withstand his skill, his courage, his endurance and his loyalty.

Thus there was accomplished the first phase of the purposes for which our country went to war.

But this, as all of us now know, did not mean that complete victory has been won.

Though we may have, in our first exultant moments, temporarily lost sight of any war objective other than mere military defeat of the enemy, we have re-awakened to the responsibilities we so clearly saw in 1941. We realize there is still much for the Army to do. Fundamentally, these residual tasks of war still involve the statesman, the economist, the educator, and governmental policy on the highest levels, but all these would be helpless in the war torn countries of Germany and Japan without adequate representation of the armed might of America. Moreover, there are additional areas, over which the tide of war has swept, where countrysides are bare, where fields are piled high with the paraphernalia of war, originally stored there to support the final attack against our Pacific enemy, and which he wisely averted by his unconditional surrender. In Italy and in France, in Germany, in Hawaii, in Guam, in the Philippines, in Saipan, in Okinawa and in Japan there are countless tasks to be accomplished before we can salvage and remove the material properties of our war time Army and permit the people and the facilities of those countries to be fully devoted again to the processes of peace.

The soldier’s task in the occupied countries is a particularly important and difficult one. There it involves the maintenance of law and order amid conditions of hardship and near starvation; of executing the policies of our Government so as to rescue the persecuted and dominate the recalcitrant, and to inculcate, so far as we may, the same veneration for the rights and the dignity of the individual that have been traditionally at the roots of the English speaking civilization.

These are a few of the tasks in which the American soldier is now engaged. They are not problems of the indefinite future - they are with us now - today they are not to be confused with the long term plans for maintaining security establishments in our country. They belong to the war that has enjoyed our attention since 1941. They are tasks set up by the American people, acting through their national Government; they are not jobs that the Army has specified or selected.

The soldier no longer has the compelling motive of imminent battle to spur his efforts, as he did only a few short months ago. The work is unexciting, is dreary and he has every excuse for a degree of boredom and homesickness, but I stand here to assure you that he is doing his duty well and with his customary efficiency and loyalty. Let no one tell you - and this despite the occasional appearance of lurid and melodramatic allegations to the contrary - that the soldier fails to understand the need for the work he is doing or that he is not carrying out his duty to his Country - to you - just as he did when the fighting was at its heaviest.

But never must we forget that the American soldier has venerated and has fought for a system of basic justice and fairness to all. He feels that these priceless features of our system must be applied to his own case. He does not believe that all the residual tasks of war should fall on the shoulders of one small segment of the population while others may be called upon to do nothing. Through my month long tour through the Pacific no soldier once complained to me about the job he was doing. He did not minimize its importance or deny its necessity. What he was concerned about was to be assured that his place, at the expiration of a reasonable tour of duty, would be taken by another who until this moment had been called upon for no military service.

So long as I am able to speak or walk I will defend the justice of this stand on the part of our soldier.

As I have so often explained to committees of Congress and to other gatherings, the War Department is striving to bring about a method whereby performance of all these tasks may be done by volunteers - what we are ordinarily pleased to call professional soldiers.

The question is, do you desire that these national commitments should be left to the uncertainties of individual preference? These purposes are intimately tied up with the sacrifices and suffering of our war time fighting forces and with the incalculable amounts of treasure that you people here at home poured out in support of their efforts. To fail in this task is to stand convicted before the world as a people unready to perform the drudgery of securing the peace, even if we did demonstrate, in war, the genius and the courage to win a fighting

victory. The magnitude of the military victory, and the greatness of our part in it, placed upon us responsibilities that cannot be shifted to others. We are, as a nation, still a principal exponent of freedom and justice, even as we were in 1941. Unless we nobly play our part now, as we did in war - there will be no peace. Freedom and liberty will gaze with dismay upon the weakness of their principal champion. Failure to perform these tasks properly, expeditiously and with certainty is to jeopardize our own future.

I can think of no greater tragedy ever to befall our Country than if our sons should, on some future date, have to walk through the Gethsemane of war, rightfully and bitterly reproaching us because in our own time we selfishly refused to complete a job that, no matter how irksome, was one that did not jeopardize life, health - not even our standard of living.

These problems I have talked over at length with many of the great leaders of this war just as I have talked them over with countless soldiers who were driving trucks, repairing equipment, guarding property, or cooking in a kitchen. I think that in my feeble way I honestly represent the composite of their opinion and their thinking. In long conversations in the Pacific with General George Marshall and with General MacArthur, with General Whitehead of the Air Force and with Admiral Towers of the Navy they have expressed the hope that we now go forward to the full completion of the task we set ourselves so many bitter months ago.

In fairness to all our men in uniform it is necessary that we continue with certainty to provide the strength - I mean through the selective service act - that is essential to the task at hand. As those tasks diminish in volume and importance or as volunteers come forward to fill the ranks, that act will no longer be needed and should and will be expunged from the books. But until that time arrives I hold that any alternative is so frightening in its potentialities that no sensible man can contemplate it calmly.

I have not spoken to you about long range planning for our national security organization: Its strength, its composition, its probable missions or the new and strange situations it might be called upon to meet. Those matters are not to be confused with the present problem. My immediate concern is for those tasks now facing our Country. Our remaining war responsibilities which demand retention of a reasonable amount of armed strength. It is to these particular problems that I ask you to give your earnest thought. There is no soldier, be he brass hat or G.I., that has anything to gain by pleading for reasonable action intended to secure and perpetuate the peace. His concern is a national - not an individual - one. His sole interest is in his country and, wherever I have met him, between Berlin and Washington and between Washington and Tokyo, he has but one hope, one ambition, that the war we have fought shall be the last one which the United States will ever be called upon to wage.

The G.I. of today, adequately trained for battle, is the most efficient engine of destruction in the world. He is a sturdy, even if inarticulate, champion of freedom - of democracy as we know it. He is the worlds greatest and most realistic pacifist - he insists that his military victory be followed up with the strength of this nation as it takes the lead in devising orderly processes for the elimination of war. He - more than eight million of him, including rear rank private and multi-starred general - belongs to that gallant band, which, between Lexington and Okinawa, has made you and me swell with pride as we say: “I am an American.”

• Gettysburg College commencement, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, May 27, 1946

No American can come to Gettysburg unstirred by the memory of those who fought, and of him who spoke here, many years ago. The battle of Gettysburg has been studied and restudied in the military schools of many countries for more than 80 years, its effect on world history has been exhaustively treated. Yet, for the average citizen of our country, Gettysburg is best remembered because one man, months after the battle, spoke for a few minutes on Cemetery Hill.

The leadership of Lincoln in the many crises of the war between the States decided the future of an entire people. Under him were united men of all walks of life, of varied religious creeds, of many national origins, of antagonistic political opinions - all into one single will for the preservation of the republic.

True leadership focuses and concentrates the discordant wills of many men into an effective union of strength, preserving them from dissolution into a futile mob. It is the essence of the democratic method, the antithesis of regimented compulsion. Successful democracy fosters leadership on every level and in every area

of national life, thus assuring progress and development. That is one of the tenets of the American faith. Our past is proof of its effectiveness.

We are intensely proud of America's history. But questionable it is that we explore that history sufficiently for the inspiration and example it could furnish toward the conquest of current problems.

Many have criticized the intensive military study given to the battle of Gettysburg. Certainly, in the light of present day armament, fire-power, mobility and communications there is little of tactical value to be learned from this epic struggle.

But Gettysburg is one contest that has been accurately documented and we know, from hour to hour, that went on. We can visualize and profit from - not the paths and formations of the armies - but the thoughts and fears and hopes and decisions that impelled American troops and their leaders in battle to do the things - rightly or wrongly - that decided a national issue and a nation's future.

Moreover, the value of Gettysburg's lessons is not confined to the soldier. A nation lives, just as it fights, according to its national characteristics.

It is by the understanding and development of those characteristics that have done most to make us a great nation, by awareness of those which might invite disaster, that individuals develop their effectiveness as leaders. A crucial conflict is a fruitful field in which to acquire that understanding.

Gettysburg witnessed, in limitless outpouring, the finest traits of our people. Heroic fortitude held the northern positions on the second day against Longstreet's hammering drives. Stark courage sustained Pickett's men as they advanced across the plain to plant the Confederate flag on the cemetery wall, their ranks torn apart by Union fire. Faithful devotion to duty was not shaken on either side by battle losses, staggering in their proportionate size. And then to the same battlefield came Lincoln, with his boundless charity, working, as always, through four years of war, to unite faction and section and section and party, to eliminate prejudice and bitterness and hate, and so establish a peace assuring eternal union. We see him and his works as a beacon for men who strive to build a better world.

A civil war was not of Lincoln's choosing. He dreaded its possibility. He sought earnestly to prevent it. But once secession was decided and the union of the States was broken, he faced the alternative of war or a divided nation and chose the harder road because only over it could the mission of this country and the life and purpose of the republic be preserved.

You, here, have been fortunate to live closely with the traditions of Lincoln and of Gettysburg. No other place and no other man in our history so sharply illustrates human ability to master personal emotions and personal inclinations on the one hand, material circumstances and meterial forces on the other. Lincoln's determination, honesty, understanding and devotion brought our people, at last, through our greatest crisis. Yet even he could not have achieved success unless these great qualities of his had accurately mirrored similar traits in the great mass of all the people.

Lincoln's leadership was founded on and had its strength in his fellow-men's recognition that here was one who represented their way of life and their aims, who shared their fortunes and their vicissitudes, who understood their problems and their wants and their aspirations as a people, who strove to serve them in his elected office without regard either to personal gain or personal sacrifice.

To few is given the extraordinary combination of qualities to carry the heavy burden that Lincoln bore. Fortunately, few are called upon to meet the tests he met. But, basic to his genius for leadership was a willing acceptance of responsibility and a firm will to render honest service.

This basis is demanded of everyone of us if the United States is to maintain its position in the world. For the measure of our leadership as a nation is the sum total of the character and sense of responsibility that each of us applies to our daily tasks. And there is nothing far-fetched in tracing a similarity between the problems of world cooperation that we face today, and those of national unity with which Lincoln struggled so long ago.

Voices were raised against Lincoln, urging that no political issue or political goal was worth the loss of a single life. Clamoring that the nation abandon its effort to master its vital problems. Whenever major crises in human affairs arise, there are always persuasive voices urging that the easy way be taken. They cite chapter and verse to allege that principle is never worth sacrifice, and they strive to arouse all the ignobler emotions within man to dodge courageous effort. Knowingly or unknowingly, they preach the doom of democracy - for in its essence democracy is the volunteer method of solving vital common problems, no matter what the cost or how

great the individual sacrifice.

To inculcate an understanding of these things is the most important function of education in a democracy. Appreciation of our reasons for venerating the volunteer method as opposed to regimentation, and of the obligations of the citizen to uphold and defend the type of government that makes possible such a system is vital to our collective and individual welfare. The privileges we enjoy impose a like responsibility to defend them - and they can be defended only as long as they are enjoyed by the masses.

Wilson said, “The highest form of efficiency is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people,” and, so far, our country has proved his statement to be true.

But never has there been a period in the history of the world when, from some direction, this idea has not been challenged. It will be again! Just as in the past it will be preserved by work, by understanding, by sacrifice, by leadership. There is no easy road. My generation is not passing on to yours a series of clean-cut solutions to all of democracy’s problems - it is merely passing on the assurance that here in our native land every assault against the system, from whatever source it has been launched, has been defeated.

Fortunately for us and our world, youth is not easily discouraged. Youth with its clear vista and boundless faith and optimism is uninhibited by the thousands of considerations that always bedevil man in his progress. The hopes of the world rest on the flexibility, vigor, capacity for new thought, the fresh outlook of the young. Age grows cautions, overly conscious of difficulties, enmeshed in the conflict of personal problems and changing sense of values.

Youth must always carry the burden of enforcing and realizing bold decisions. Older men, drawing on years of experience and knowledge of the world, may fix the line we must attain, behind which we may not compromise. But it is the young who must attain that line. In Lincoln’s war, the masses of enlisted ranks on both sides, were made up, in the end, of beardless youths. During this last war, many of you present were on the battle line. All of you had brothers or relatives or friends who fought to maintain the line for the freedom of man. Had you failed we and no other nation could have continued to live as a free people.

Thanks to the youth of our nation and our Allies the line was firmly held. Unconditional surrender of those who sought to wipe it out was achieved. Today’s problem is to see that indecision and confusion and pessimism may not threaten the permanence of the victory. Free people who, in massed strength crossed the oceans to beat into submission two huge military machines, must not become the prey of fears and doubts and misgivings. We must not permit present problems to form a wall of bewilderment that shuts off our view of great futures. The future is the special province of the young, of you and your comrades throughout the land! Schooled in the lessons of the past, unaffrighted by the present, you look ahead with confidence.

What is easy of achievement is seldom worthy of attainment and offers meager satisfaction to the spirit of man. Great goals require all the courage and tenacity and charity toward other men that is within you. The greatest of human goals is to make the earth continue to flower for the common benefit of a world populated by free peoples. The effort, wearisome though it may be and demanding and exhausting, will make you leaders of your time, worthy of succession to the generations of leaders who have built our America, and of those who will continue the task after you. The irresistible march of our people from narrow mountain-bound confines on the Atlantic Coast across the Continent, from the Gulf to the Canadian border, could not have been accomplished had our fathers been content with objectives easy to win.

Because they permitted no walls of bewilderment to obscure their future, because they recognized no bounds to their God-given ability to master themselves and their material world for the betterment of all men, they built a democracy that from its beginning has been a hope and an inspiration to the world’s races.

Never again will a Gettysburg be required to decide differences among ourselves. The eternal light that flames on the summit of Oak Hill symbolizing permanent accord among ourselves can be the prototype of another light symbolizing universal peace.

Internationally, we are now embarked on a great enterprise whose aim is to free the world from the threat of another suicidal war. It offers you and millions of other young Americans an inspiring challenge.

A vital need to success is a strong, virile America, forthrightly standing before the world as a shining example of unity and freedom among ourselves - and, externally, a tireless supporter of justice, right and understanding. What has been won for the peoples of this continent, you can preserve here and help win for all the world!

• Address to Reserve Officers' Association, Chicago, Illinois, June 2, 1946

Since your last convention, our country has waged and emerged victorious from a long and costly war. Many of your members have met a soldier's death. I welcome the opportunity to extend to all members of the Reserve Officers' Association my sincere greetings and my lasting appreciation of the job you have done so well.

There is a unique fitness, I believe, in the choice of Chicago as your meeting place. This great city of the plains, the center of a web of rail, water and roadways that span the continent is comparable to the Reserve Association which reaches out into every city, hamlet and farm to connect patriotic and selfless Americans with the formalized structure of our security organization. The motto of Chicago, "I will," is the spirit of the Reserve officer who, while working in his civilian occupation or profession, patriotically shoulders the burden of study and of self-preparation so that he may be better able to defend his country in crisis.

When danger threatened in 1941, the Reserve officers were a pool of trained leaders on which we drew to build the framework of the most powerful Army in America's history. Without them, no amount of effort or planning could have enabled us to mobilize so quickly and to launch so effectively the offensives that turned the tide of Axis victories into total defeat. The contribution of the Reserve was in keeping with the spirit of service its members have habitually exhibited.

As a city, Chicago has attained greatness, because its citizens would be satisfied with nothing less. They blanketed swamp and sand dune with homes and streets, parks and towering skyscrapers. They reversed the flow of a river to give them health and reclaimed a lake front to give them a front porch. They circled and criss-crossed the city with magnificent boulevards. They confounded the prophets of doom during our deepest depression by inviting the world to come and see what they had accomplished in a century - and the world came to see. When war struck they turned the city into one vast arsenal of production and a hospitality center whose welcome gave new heart and strength to millions of lonesome service men passing through here. The people of Chicago have never permitted difficulties, or obstacles, or fear of the future or of their own ability, to restrict their goals. This city stands, in brick and stone and steel, as a civic exponent of the American way of life.

In this latest war, the Reserve Association and, in a larger sense, our Army proved itself the fighting exponent of the American way of life. The ranks of the Army were filled by 10,000,000 citizens who left their homes and factories and fields to share in the mighty armed effort that crushed our foes.

The Army of the United States was truly the people of the United States in action. Its virtues were their virtues. Its faults were their faults. Its achievements on the battlefronts of the world were rooted in the homes and towns and cities of the nation. In its accomplishment of victory, the ingredients were a resolute courage that bore men to supreme heights of sacrifice, the stubborn will to win that ceaselessly urged men to greater effort, and the minds that wove relentlessly the enemies' destruction.

Prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor, 80,000 Reserve officers were ordered to active duty in the preliminary expansion of the Army that made possible our great mobilization. In the days that followed, when we converted our economy to a war for survival, an additional 120,000 Reserve officers were called. The Reserve gave us a substantial portion of our military leadership and its members, ranging in grade from Lieutenant to Lieutenant General, held key positions on every staff and in all combat units. They served on all fronts, and shared in the sacrifices of disablement or death. Their success stands as a tribute to the spirit and initiative of the Reserve.

Today, only a few months after its greatest victory, we see the recurring tendency to ignore the Army's achievements and to over-emphasize alleged faults and weaknesses within it. There were defects in the Army's structure, to be sure, but the carping critic would seemingly have us believe that we lost the war. Particularly does the critic aim his shafts at the officer - he would like to give a feeling of guilt to the 800,000 Americans who led our Armies to victory. Gentlemen, you and I were of that band - and I assure you now that I will go to my grave proud of the fact that I could serve with you, as an officer of the Army, in the most desperate crisis of our national history. We acknowledge need for correction. Neither humans nor human organizations can be perfect. But need for correction does not warrant or excuse criticism inspired either by ignorance or, even worse, an intent to discredit an instrument of the people that has, at least once in every generation, stood

between those people and disaster.

The wartime Army of the United States was a mass expression of America. Around a small core of professional soldiers, men and women from all walks of life, of every race and creed and color, worked and fought and died together in one great offensive team. No one questioned then whether a man was a Regular or Reserve or National Guardsman or Selectee or Volunteer - whether an officer came from West Point or the Reserve or O.C.S. or directly from civilian life. All of them together, rising above minor differences, built a magnificent unity.

They won us world leadership. The responsibility to maintain and guard what they won is now our heaviest responsibility. And here may I emphasize the word “our,” since the responsibility does not pertain merely to the heads of government or the leaders of the armed forces but to every citizen of the United States. What the citizens of the United States as a single team won, only the citizens of the United States as a single team can maintain. On our future conduct depends the peace of the world for generations to come.

Therein is a task for which each of you here is qualified to be a leader. We need a deeper realization by all our people that the continuing peace of the world depends in large measure on the strength of the United States and its ability to carry out its international commitments. While our occupation duties in enemy countries are the most tangible and visible of these tasks and require the largest part of our manpower, a balanced military force with both police and offensive capacity must be maintained in a troubled world. The United States cannot be a champion of freedom and a bulwark of democracy if it stands helpless and naked before the world.

Beyond all question the masses of our people are aware that the United States must continue strong if the peace is to remain secure. But I do not believe that there is sufficient realization of the consequent duty we have to make certain that adequate strength is maintained. The sum total of this is the urgent need for the current extension of Selective Service. A final peace, satisfactory to every nation, has not yet been written. Our strength has no other purpose than to assure that these treaties will be written in accord with those principles for which more than 300,000 Americans gave their lives.

As citizens, intimately acquainted with the basic problems involved, you can present to your fellow-citizens at home the cold facts of the case. You understand that our aim is to maintain an interim Army, adequate to fulfill the purpose of the American people - the establishment of a lasting peace. You, at least, will not be subject to the accusation that you strive for aggrandizement of the Army. In tweeds, none of you look like brass hats.

We have pledged ourselves with the other United Nations. To a world organization designed to preserve the peace by just arbitration of matters that may endanger the peace. Toward this goal we must work unceasingly. But I cannot repeat too often - until that organization is a proved and functioning establishment able to guarantee international security - the United States itself, must be in a position to guard well its own security.

Occasionally we hear predictions as to how and where and why the next war will be fought. Such talk is more than foolish: it is vicious. Men acquainted with the battlefield will not be found among the numbers that glibly talk of another war. Veterans will work and sweat and sacrifice to prevent the recurrence of such a tragedy.

Moreover, warfare has long been studied, but never yet has anyone predicted accurately the exact nature and conditions of a later conflict. But if ever again we must travel that valley of death, we know that our entry into it will be with incredible suddenness. For that reason, the peacetime establishment must be as close to a minimum wartime organization as the obvious need for economy will permit. To this end, we are now streamlining the War Department, and reorganizing the Army’s structure in the light of war and post-war developments. We feel that a close integration of all the armed forces is absolutely essential in this age. Again, in the light of lessons already in the book, we seek to simplify command, responsibility, and functions, achieving an efficiency of effort that will assure a maximum of security for every dollar of the taxpayer’s money.

There is no component of more importance to the security establishment than the organized Reserve Corps. In the past a fully effective peacetime organization has never been accomplished. The new Reserve Corps can and must become the well-trained citizen Army Reserve required to supplement immediately, in an emergency, our small Regular Army and our National Guard. The reserve will have many functions - the greatest of which

will be to provide the mass leadership which, regardless of the nature and scope of any conflict, is always a vital ingredient to success. There is also a requirement for a large group of highly qualified officers and enlisted men to augment the Regular Army and National Guard in the event of an emergency. It is our aim to give every opportunity to the officers and men of both the Reserve units and this augmentation group to develop their capacity for leadership.

The lack of leadership cannot be compensated for by rank, front, or any of the surface qualities that gain a man the reputation of a winning personality. Soldiers apply an acid test to their officers that only the true leader can survive.

Our men invariably recognize and repudiate pretense, selfishness, evasion of responsibility and dodging of effort. The officer who fakes or shirks of dodges is an open book to them. His position may compel them to obey his orders, but he cannot lead or inspire them.

The officer, however, who puts his job and his men first, who helps them over the hurdles, who know their problems, who shares their ups and downs without ostentation or pretentiousness, wins their confidence and an eager will to follow him. Moreover, he himself learns from them and in this process of mutual help the whole unit achieves maximum efficiency and morale and becomes an elite unit. Such an officer knows no resentment from his men. Rather, they demand for him a position and respect that comes only to those who have rendered honest service to their fellows. The men strive to perform their duties in such fashion as to win his approval and to reflect credit on his command. The unit, the Army, the country benefit because of that priceless quality of leadership.

This is the type of officer the Reserve must produce in great numbers.

Great numbers of our Reserve officers have now returned to civil life along with the thousands who were commissioned directly into the Army of the United States. Of these war veterans, 300,000 have already manifested their continued interest in national security by accepting commissions in the Organized Reserve Corps.

Great as is the implication for the future benefit of our security establishment, these proved leaders have even greater opportunity for service to our country in the establishment and maintenance of a secure peace. Their continuing interest in the international and military problems of our country, evidenced by their retention of their commissions will compel them to keep constantly before our people the basic factors of these problems and the responsibility of the individual citizen toward them.

The mass influence of the veteran Reserves will tend to create realization among our citizenry of our country’s need for security during these years of turmoil, misunderstanding - sometimes near chaos. Because they are leaders by instinct and training these officers will constantly support the preposition that the world needs a growth of mutual understanding, that it is important to each country to comprehend the fears, hopes, aspirations and traditions of every other. These officers will provide sturdy support for the concept of the United Nations because from their own experience they have first-hand knowledge of the terrible alternative. They will preach democracy because they have risked their lives to defend it. They will help sustain their country as a great exponent of the democratic method - a nation powerful but tolerant, firm in the right but patient in its dealings with others.

War is not only destructive, it is sterile of positive result. The most that military victory can do is to provide opportunity to attempt anew the establishment of durable international peace. Likewise, the instruments by which war is primarily waged - that is, armies, navies and air forces - are essentially negative in purpose. The Reserve Officer will help our people to see that while we must provide now for our own security - and must take no avoidable risk in connection therewith - we will be able, as progress is realized along the path of organized international cooperation, gradually to reduce the armed forces of our country and so avoid the staggering costs of their maintenance. Growing effectiveness in the United Nations will logically be accompanied by a step-by-step reduction in the resources the world is now compelled to devote to security.

The goal is a long way off and progress toward it will be tortuous and disappointingly slow. But men who have fought their way through the trials, the obstacles and dangers of the battlefield will not be deterred by these difficulties.

I can think of no body of men that has greater opportunity for service to our country than the Reserve Forces of the United States, not only as a bulwark of defense in the face of unexpected attack, but as leaders to

carry us further along the road of universal and lasting peace.

• Address to Army Ordnance Association, Detroit, Michigan, June 3, 1946

It is now more than a year since the German High Command came to my headquarters in the schoolhouse at Theims to sign the documents of unconditional surrender. Because that day was hastened by this city's production of the impediments of war, I am particularly pleased to have the opportunity of meeting with the members of the Detroit Chapter of the Army Ordnance Association. You and your city hold a place high on the Honor Roll of war work. Through you, in this audience, and the men and companies associated with you, was administered more than half the total dollar value of the Ordnance Department's procurement.

To me, your group represents two things: One, the power and flexibility of the American industrial plant; the other, the intimate relationship between civilian effort and military strength. In the first point is one source of the victory and world leadership that our fighting men won for us. In the latter, lies the key to our future security and our ability, with the other nations, to build a lasting peace.

In 1941 we were attacked because our immediate military weakness led aggressors to discount the possibility of an effective reaction. Against us were arrayed powerfully armed enemies who for many years had been engaged either in war or preparation for war. We overcame their seemingly insuperable advantage and became an arsenal for the Allied world. This we could do because the necessary time for rearmament was furnished us by the heroic resistance of our Allies, and because the men and women of Detroit and other American industrial centers, workers and management, scientists and engineers, political leaders and technicians, combining their brawn and skills and techniques, abandoned their peacetime endeavors for a gigantic effort to arm against the aggressors.

The Germans have excused their defeat by the claim that we won merely a technological victory through the possession of cities and production centers like Detroit, with men and women highly skilled in production processes. In part, that is true. The weapons of war came to us in the field in such numbers that the Allies were able to bury the enemy under weight of metal, to hit him with a crushing punch, to slash and cut his armies with terrific speed. We were in a position to sacrifice metal to save American lives.

The statistics of your production are known to all the world. Repetition by me would add nothing to their impressive and staggering proportions. But the flexibility of your productive effort remains a cause for wonder. Detroit, that to most of us before the war meant only trucks and automobiles, came to mean, in war, practically everything that we needed to defeat the enemy. Every man in our armed forces who marched or rode or sailed or flew into combat was armed and equipped to an appreciable extent by this city. Planes and guns, tanks and cannon and jeeps and trucks, small arms and binoculars and fire control instruments, were only part of your production. The amazing variety of it was made possible by the intelligence with which you tackled your job, the technical skills you applied to it, the great wealth of experience you poured into it.

The Detroit area had no corner on technology and production. All over our country, all our production centers contributed to victory. But Detroit is a symbol of the strength our enemies came to fear.

But the excuse of the Germans for their latest defeat is far wide of the full truth. The heroics and sacrifices of our fighting men was the real spearhead of our victorious organization. The feeble Nazi excuse is refuted by many instances, when outnumbered and outgunned by the enemy, our men won through to victory. Moreover, there was more to our outpouring of weapons and equipment than mere material power to produce. There was the American spirit and American unity of will.

We proved that a free people, operating within a free economy, can achieve a teamwork, an integration of every material and human resource of the nation, such as no totalitarian power can attain. That was the essence of our victory. The strength we derived from such unity in time of war is the sort of strength we must preserve to save us from future war. The victory that national teamwork won for us now provides an opportunity to build a world ruled by law, rather than by brute force. Effort and energy and sacrifice are required of all if we are to attain our goal.

A lasting peace does not emerge spontaneously from the unconditional surrender of an enemy or even from the firm settlement of boundary disputes or the signing of peace treaties. All human experience underscores the

obviousness of that fact.

Our national security is a first and essential step toward lasting peace. Democracy must have a firm base - to use a military expression - from which to project its ideals and benefits to others who may be groping or undecided in the adoption of governmental systems. We are an example to the world of the possibilities of democracy - weakness is likely to inspire contempt or disdain, rather than a desire to emulate. In order to stand securely in the world as the fearless, but understanding champions of liberty we must draw on all civilian resources which can contribute to the country's defense. Cooperation between all the agencies of government, all the economic and industrial and scientific and social agencies of our nation is essential. Security is a national structure whose strength grows with the contribution of every individual.

The Army, as one of the main agencies responsible for national security, recently adopted measures to extend such relationship. By the establishment of the General Staff Division for research and developments, the War Department has taken a further step toward the continuing application of national scientific resource to the solution of military problems.

Full success in the Division's mission requires civilian assistance in military planning from industrialists and scientists working in the greatest possible freedom to carry out their research. Security is no measured by the number of weight of guns alone, the armadas of planes that can be put aloft, or even the temporarily exclusive possession of the atomic bomb. Security is not static. Military stockpiles can become junk because of a single scientific development and the security they lend can be wiped out by a single laboratory experiment.

Idolatrous worship of weapons because of their bigness or destructiveness can jeopardize a security program that is not keyed to the future through continuing research. The destructive power of a weapon is not necessarily the index to its combat effectiveness, now or later. Only close scrutiny by men qualified to evaluate all factors involved in the attainment of an objective can decide whether or not any specific weapon is the most effective means to attain its given end. Only they can accurately suggest the lines along which exploration should be conducted for the development of a better weapon.

Unified effort by civilian and military agencies was the outstanding characteristic of our war effort. The measure of cooperation then achieved should not be considered the ultimate. Our national security depends on its continued growth. As you well know, research is not a commodity that the Army can buy at a quoted price and have delivered to its warehouses in properly sized and marked parcels. A weapon already in existence can be ordered, but research is a technique where results cannot be predicted. Military training does not prepare adequate numbers of men in that technique. Nor should the Army be forced to depend on its own efforts to develop the best guarantee of security, so long as we have at our door, within the democracy of which the army is an essential part, the vast technical and scientific resources of civilian life. Cooperation between civilian and military agencies will assure us the finest in scientific research.

There appears little reason for duplicating within the Army any commercial research or manufacturing organization, which by its experience is better qualified than the Army to carry out some of our tasks. A case in point is our world communications net which tied the theater commands to the War Department. Commercial interests make this type of communications their business and are organized to plan, engineer and operate such a system. Peacetime cooperation would make possible the easy integration of these facilities in time of war as an organic part of the Armed Forces.

In general, the more use we are able to make of outside resources, the more energy the Army will have to devote to strictly military problems for whose solution there are no outside facilities or which for special security reasons can only be handled by the military. We need every resource for the thorough exploration of the wide fields that lie before us.

The nation must not only develop and fully exploit for man's betterment all the possibilities of nuclear fission, but we must do the same in innumerable other fields.

We have no monopoly on scientific talent. We do not control all the raw materials of research. We do not possess scientific facilities that others cannot duplicate. But we have all three in such measure that we can, through cooperative effort, maintain a national stature that will earn us continued international respect and prove a sound insurance against disaster in any future emergency.

I would like to stress, however, that our security program must be far more than a lop-sided dependence on offensive and defensive weapons. Scientific effort and scientific research produces more than guns or shells or

bombs. The social sciences, and the humanities also, play a dominant part in building a security structure and lasting peace. Only by the development of our total national resources - intellectual and material, scientific and social, economic and commercial - can we have a firm foundation for our security structure. It must be based on a sound and healthy national life in which the individual citizen willingly sacrifices for the common benefit.

Progress in this direction will measure the value of our contributions to the whole problem of eliminating war. We cannot reach this goal overnight or attain it by any amount of wishful thinking. Only by the slow and thorough processes of education through every element of our people - of the world - can it be won. In the schools and factories, on the farms, in offices and homes, it must be taught as a part of good citizenship.

You men this evening can help immeasurably in developing truly American attitudes toward the problem of peace and by continuing to devote a portion of your research and development to our security. We do not need the largest standing Army in the world, if we have the finest. We do not need to make our country a warehouse for war, if we develop techniques that obsolete weapons of aggression. The security of our country demands brains, not brute force, keen minds, rather than stockpiles of weapons. Above all it needs a partnership of the American people in which all our elements and all our enterprises shall cooperate for the increase of our security. Let us not allow ourselves to grow embarrassed in using the word “patriot.” Let us rather strive to deserve that title. For it is clear that by remaining true to ourselves - to our country and all for which it stands - we can best advance that greatest of all human goals, attainment of lasting peace!

Our forebears did not hesitate to put every ounce of their energy into the realization of their ideal - a free, prosperous and united America. Because nothing could break their iron determination, they achieved their goal. Our ideal today is a free, prosperous and cooperative world. Only if we are secure will we be free to work wholeheartedly and determinedly for this result, for in the presence of a deadly fear, logic, reason and tolerance cannot live. National unity is the root of our strength - a truism we must not forget as we champion democracy and stand for justice and right in a united world.

When the Axis challenged us to fight for freedom, the answer roared out of the factories and offices and shops of this area, of all America. It was carried into the heart of Germany, out across the Pacific into the cities of Japan by Americans true to the traditions of Valley Forge and the Argonne Forest.

Now, we freely pose for ourselves a challenge to attain a greater goal - a secure, peaceful and free world. That challenge is worthy of all that’s in us. Progress toward it is the greatest heritage that we can bequeath to the future generations.

• Material for NBC Address, June 4, 1946

Two years ago, the eyes of the world were fixed on the coast of Normandy. We launched the mightiest armed effort in all history. Its target was a continental fortress, rendered as impregnable as German mastery of war could make it. On our attempt depended the future of the free world.

We were strong in the heroism of our men, the might of our weapons, the unity of our people and the aid of our Allies. Thereby, in the space of hours, we broke the fortress wall. In a few weeks, our armies were loose in its interior corridors. In eleven months, we exacted unconditional surrender of the enemy.

I shall never tire of paying tribute to the American fighting man - on the ground, the sea, and in the air. In Normandy, as on every battle front, he proved himself better than the best the enemy could oppose against him. Skill and courage and endurance and, above all, loyalty were woven together to form a superb fighting man. His record, on battlefields that spanned the globe, is eternal proof of his mettle.

The job he began and carried through to its combat conclusion is not yet complete. Only firm and just peace throughout the world can bring an end to our endeavor. Victory won in blood and sacrifice demands of us effort and sacrifice to establish peace.

To that goal the people of the United States have committed themselves. Through their Congress, they have charged their Armed Forces with the responsibility of enforcing on the enemy the terms of surrender. Only so can the foundation of peace be laid.

That task, vast in its geographical extent, complex in the human relations involved, has been assigned to the Army. Only adequate manpower can make it an effective performance.

The Army is engaged in a vigorous recruiting campaign for volunteers. But the pool of potential volunteers is drying up. Selective Service must supplement enlistments if men who have been drafted are to be discharged after eighteen months service.

For this purpose eighteen months of service is a fair contribution to ask of any young man. The security of our own country and the continuing peace of our world are worth it. It is far less than we asked of the soldiers who fought to make possible a peaceful world.

They gave years of their lives. They knew the terror of the diving plane and the nerve-shattering thump of bursting shells. They experienced the stench of battle, the dust, the mud, the stifling heat, the numbing cold. They flew through flak-studded skies, fighting their way into a paralyzing assault on the very heart of the enemy. They felt the sadness of blank files in the ranks. They gave their lives that we might have the opportunity of building a peaceful world.

I cannot believe that the American people will, by refusing a far lesser sacrifice, desert the cause for which our men fought and died. If we falter in our effort for peace, the fault will be our own. We must not fail. The American tradition is to finish whatever we start, however hard the road.

Today, we commemorate a high tide of American achievement. May the memory of the men who drove the Luftwaffe from the skies, who parachuted in darkness back of the enemy lines, and who in the dawn stormed the beaches and climbed the cliffs of Normandy for us, harden our resolve that this time we shall not lose what heroes have won.

We have survived a terrible war. A little effort and sacrifice now can minimize the possibility of another one.

• Notes for talk to Women Magazine writers, June 5, 1946

U.S. Army Requirements, Introduction

The governing mission of our Armed Forces is, first, last and always, the military security of the United States. The statement of this mission has not changed in the history of our country; its implications have grown through the years. To accomplish this mission nowadays, the Army must maintain adequate forces, must furnish them the most modern equipment, must properly disperse them, must keep them at the highest attainable peak of training and must supply their constant needs. Such a program includes the obtaining of the necessary personnel, the maintenance of scientific research and development activities, the securing of the necessary bases, the provision for realistic training and the procurement and shipment of the essentials of military life.

I speak today of personnel requirements for the Army for the fiscal year 1947. The individual is the basic essential. Without adequate manpower, assigned tasks become impossible of accomplishment.

Let me emphasize that I am not speaking at this time of personnel requirements for the post-war peacetime Army. Today we face the necessity for an interim establishment, the minimum force for that transitional period between the shooting war and the return of the world to the healthy condition which characterizes true peace. When will that time come? Who can say? Certainly we know it will not come until the victorious nations are able to withdraw their forces of occupation with the assurance that the conquered nations are ready to take their places in a peaceful world order. Certainly the Army of the United States cannot attain a true peacetime status until at least all duties assigned to the military by armistices or peace treaties shall have been discharged.

Secretary Patterson has informed you of the personnel we will require during Fiscal Year 1947. He has emphasized that we want only the minimum necessary personnel. He has mentioned the tasks and the assumptions that determine our requirements. Specifically, the tasks facing the Army now are as follows:

1. The occupation in Europe, Japan and Korea.
2. The training of new men to replace long-service men overseas.
3. The maintenance of lines of communication and supporting installations in the United States for the occupation forces.
4. The provision of forces which can be made available to the Security Council of the United Nations.
5. The maintenance of the key points in our national security structure, such as the Panama Canal, Alaska,

and the air bases along the approaches to the United States.

6. The maintenance of an adequate program of intelligence and research and development.

7. The overriding requirement to present a strong military posture in a world which is still unsettled.

Let us review each of these tasks or missions in some detail.

Occupation: The mission of occupation of conquered countries is a heritage of war. It is as much a part of the war as the campaigns. And it is tremendously involved.

In Europe, General McNarney and General Clark are charged, as a part of a quadripartite agreement, with maintaining order among the 18 millions of Germans and Austrians in the United States Zone and simultaneously assuring demilitarization, pacification, and normal rehabilitation. This is a large order, especially when you consider that it follows in the wake of awful devastation and concerns a group of humans desperate from hunger, bewildered by disaster, and frustrated in belief. We have by our victory overcome a whole social order and must see to it that there is no reversion to the Nazi ideology which was so firmly implanted before. We must continue with the weeding out of subversive elements.

In the Pacific General MacArthur has a double task: He must control 73 millions of Japanese and assist 17 million liberated Koreans to rebuild their nation. He is faced with problems comparable to those of Europe which he must solve under similar conditions.

Training: It is easy to think of the Army as the striking forces in the field and difficult to visualize the complexity of activities which is necessary to keep those forces at their peak. To maintain strength there must be a constant flow of replacements and those replacements must be trained. Effectives must be furnished - not merely new recruits.

Lines of communication and ZI installations: As long as the tasks of occupation last, we must support the troops engaged on this duty through the maintenance of established lines of communication and the provision of forces in the United States to see to their care, and, if necessary, their reinforcement.

United Nations: Participation by the United States in the United Nations will mean more than the mere furnishing of a home for that body. Its charter includes provisions for a security force to be supplied by its member nations. When firm commitments for these forces have been established, the United States must contribute its fair share of land, sea, and air units.

Bases: In order to perform our principal mission for security, we must retain physical control of the bases necessary to this mission. Even though distant bases may not be sufficiently strong in themselves to withstand a concentrated enemy assault, their possession in sufficient numbers affords dispersion and should assure us of an early declaration of enemy intent. This in turn will give us an opportunity to shape our countermoves and final plans. We know that a ring of bases will not constitute an impregnable fortress but that primary bases in Panama, Newfoundland, Alaska, Hawaii, the Marianas and the Philippines, supplemented by communication links and outposts, will furnish a degree of insurance well worth the cost.

Intelligence - Research and Development: Added insurance which is absolutely necessary in order to keep the United States abreast of world developments and aware of any growing threat is an adequate system of intelligence. The need for such a system is recognized during hostilities and must receive equal recognition in time of peace.

I have said that a part of the mission of security of the United States is to furnish our forces with the most modern equipment. That means we must continue research and development. During the war the United States proved that it was second to none in technology and industrial achievement. But this was possible only because of the concentration of effort on the prosecution of the war. Now that there is no such motivating force it is the responsibility of the military to insure continuing progress.

In World War II we saw clearly the development and changes in new weapons that were achieved under the impetus of the war itself. Great advances in aircraft and in armor, and finally the atomic bomb, have revolutionized our concepts of defense.

We like to feel that our aircraft are of longer range and greater capacity than those of other nations but we cannot afford to grow smug in that thought. We have to assume that other nations will produce them too. And similarly we must plan that other nations will in the future develop weapons just as awful as the atomic bomb. The time may come - and I certainly hope so - when some means of international control will be devised to prevent the use of atomic weapons, but until that time actually arrives it is absolutely necessary that we be

prepared to meet the threat, however remote. We must be in such a position of readiness that we can gain time for mobilization of our manpower and our industry before hostile action makes it impossible; otherwise we should be inviting defeat before we could strike a single blow in defense.

Strong Military Posture: The presentation of a strong military posture goes hand in hand with our mission of overall national security. While aggression has always been foreign to our principles, it is our duty to maintain ourselves sufficiently strong, defensively, to deter possible aggression by others.

Assumptions: In March Secretary Patterson, General Spaatz and I presented to the Military Affairs Committees of Congress the plan for the strength of the Army during the fiscal year 1947. The Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, was present and explained the elements in the international situation which result in a requirement for men in the Army and money to support the Army. At the time we presented that plan, we stressed the major assumptions which appear on this chart. The War Department assumed:

That the occupied peoples would remain tractable despite a large decrease in our forces.

That quadripartite occupation would continue in Germany, and that the British Empire, the Chinese and the Filipinos, at least, will eventually take part in the occupation of Japan.

That we would continue to use prisoners of war and other foreign nationals in appropriate positions to fill a part of our manpower requirements in connection with occupation.

That the disposal of surplus property would be expedited.

That peace treaties of other arrangements would be consummated, relieving the Ground and Service Forces of occupation responsibilities in Austria and Italy.

That, finally, the United Nations would rapidly become increasingly important to the maintenance of world security.

We also estimated that we were taking an optimistic view concerning each of these assumptions in an attempt to set down a rock-bottom minimum requirement for manpower and money. I had previously written personally to all commanders overseas and at home to make a special point of the need to cut requirements to minimum figures.

The developments of the past few months have had a serious impact on our original plan. Nearly three months have now passed and we can begin to see how the assumptions are working out and what the effects may be on the estimate that the Army could reduce its strength to 1,070,000 by the middle of 1947.

Here is an outline of the present situation. With our projected strength on 1 July of this year we can still do the job, even though certain of our optimistic assumptions have not materialized in Europe, and General McNarney has had to ask for a few thousand more men than originally planned. We shall be able to satisfy his needs because of closing out the India-Burma and China Theaters a little faster than originally estimated, and by making a call on the already heavily strained operations within the U.S. If the requirement for Army manpower in connection with operating the railroads had in fact materialized, there would have been the gravest question as to the Army’s ability to meet current needs.

Looking forward to beyond 1 July of this year, few factors are yet certain but almost all indications we have are pessimistic.

Turning first to Europe, we estimated optimistically that before this date a peace treaty would have been arranged with Italy and our present commitments there would certainly be eliminated in a few months from now. In spite of the great efforts of Mr. Byrnes and his associates at the recent conference in Paris, we do not yet have even an assurance that a peace conference will be called to settle the Italian matter. Even after a peace conference meets and agrees, there are going to be at least several months before the peace treaty can become effective.

We estimated optimistically that a peace could be arranged with Austria and that by early in 1947 all U.S. military personnel cold be withdrawn. In Paris, the U.S. representatives could not obtain agreement even to discuss an Austrian peace treaty.

We estimated optimistically in March that the Federal Liquidation Commission would be able to dispose rapidly of the surplus property throughout the world, thereby relieving the Army of the task of maintaining and guarding this property. Our estimates for the end of this fiscal year and the middle of 1947 were, of course, predicated on being relieved completely of this responsibility. Disposal has not progressed as fast as originally estimated and this is one of the reasons why General McNarney has had to ask for an increase in the number of

his troops as of 1 July of this year.

We estimated optimistically that the Army in Europe would be relieved of all care of displaced persons as of 1 July 1946. The situation has been such that the President has found it necessary to direct that this care be continued until at least fall of this year.

We estimated optimistically that the occupied peoples would remain tractable despite a large decrease in our forces. This applies to Austria, Germany and Japan and also the liberated area of Korea. Today we are faced by the sobering realization that the situation, at least during the next few months, is inconsistent with this assumption. The ration in Austria is rapidly approaching a starvation level, if it has not already reached that point. I have a report from General MacArthur that Japanese people are now staying in bed deliberately to conserve energy, and that women and children can be seen collecting roots and grass to put some bulk into their stomachs. These conditions have come about due to the disrupted economies and in Germany in particular due to the fact that, in spite of U.S. pressure, the Potsdam agreements to treat Germany as an economic whole have not been put into effect. This condition of starvation and misery can only lead to unrest. Both General McNarney and General MacArthur now indicate that if order is to be preserved, the only alternative to additional food shipments is the provision of additional troops.

As to the soundness of our assumption that the United Nations would rapidly become increasingly effective in the maintenance of world security, your judgment is as good as mine.

With the background I have given you, I now think we can together face squarely the realities of the coming year as they involve the required manpower and financial support for the Army. There appears no hope that the tasks which are the Army's can be undertaken with less than the approximately a million and a quarter men we estimated for the first of 1947 and the 1,070,000 we estimated for the middle of 1947. The true facts are that the detailed components of these estimates are falling by the wayside as the situation develops less optimistically than originally assumed. The outcome we are not able to estimate in men and dollars at this time other than that there will be no reduction in our previous estimates. That outcome will depend to a considerable extent on the conference in Paris next month, on the food which the U.S. is able to send, and soon, to the starving countries where our troops are committed, and on many other factors, such as the disposal of surplus property and the progress of the displaced persons program.

You have now been presented the picture and I regret it is a sober presentation. It leads clearly to the conclusion that we must retain in being arrangements which would provide with certainty the manpower which we have already presented to Congress as being absolutely necessary to do the job, and that, in addition, these arrangements must be sufficiently flexible to take care of requirements which we cannot estimate with accuracy for at least the next few weeks. It is equally clear that some additional requirements are likely to develop. An essential is adequate manpower, and the only way this manpower can be provided is through the extension of Selective Service. If action is not taken which provides this manpower, then drastic revision in our foreign policy and in our international commitments will be forced upon the nation.

• Radio address for Mutual Broadcasting System for anniversary of D-Day, June 6, 1946

On behalf of the American soldiers who fought under my command in the liberation of France, I deeply appreciate the tributes of President Gouin and General Delattre. And, speaking of our soldiers, I thank the French people for the armed aid and fighting inspiration they gave us from the first hour of D-Day until the unconditional surrender of the Axis. We shall not forget the part they played.

On this occasion, commemorating the greatest combat achievement of the American soldier, I must give him my personal thanks for a stupendous assignment magnificently accomplished. Every problem, every risk, every crisis in a venture that was certain to influence the world's future, he handled with superb intelligence and courage and stubborn will to see his job through. He earned immortal fame.

One who can most fittingly represent him will speak to you in a moment - 1st Lt. Alexander Ziblitt, former enlisted man and patrol leader commissioned on the battlefield in North Africa, who wears the Silver Star with Cluster, the Purple Heart with three Clusters, five Stars on his Campaign Ribbon, veteran of three invasions, who went into Omaha Beach on D-Day and was hit, losing a leg. He speaks from Walter Reed Hospital. I have

the privilege of introducing Lieutenant Ziblitt.

• Address at Norwich University, Northfield, Vermont, June 9, 1946

I have tried earnestly but futilely to marshal the words that might convey to you the sense of distinction I feel in the honor conferred on me today by Norwich University. I am here in the name of millions of Allied fighting men, authors of memorable victories in the Mediterranean and in Western Europe. I will never be able adequately to express the greatness of my pride in their accomplishments. So, I am unable to make them, or you, understand the depth of my humility when a great institution such as this calls on me to act as their representative to receive tribute to their soldierly virtues.

What they have done is now part of democracy's record - but there remains to us the task of determining what we are to do with the victory that they, and their comrades in the Pacific, gave to us. No one of us can, in this duty, escape a conviction for self dedication, because if our nation's preservation was worth 300,000 battle deaths and a million total casualties in a single war, then we as individual members of that nation and beneficiaries of their sacrifice can do no less than give permanence to their accomplishments.

The constant danger to democracy lies in the tendency of the individual to hide himself in the crowd - to defend his own failure to act forthrightly according to conviction under the false excuse that the effort of one in one hundred forty million has no significance.

In his initial prospectus of Norwich a century and a quarter ago, Captain Partridge wrote: "...in every republic the due cultivation of a proper military information is indispensably necessary for the preservation of liberty." With that statement and in that conviction he founded this great college, and pioneered the establishment of the military-collegiate institutions of our country. In a very real sense he gave to the country, in an hour of greatest need, thousands of young men, trained in both military and civil fields, thoroughly grounded in the fundamental essentials of complete citizenship and sound leadership.

He did not consider himself helpless to act effectively. He saw a need of the country - he applied himself to its fulfillment without stint - without seeking to shift to the shoulders of the crowd the feeling of personal responsibility that his own beliefs inspired in him. He was a leader. Had he been less ready to exert himself and had our military-collegiate training system remained unborn, there would have been no pool of ROTC graduates on which to call when the hour of crisis arrived in 1941.

The existence of that large group of college-trained military leaders and specialists set forward by many months the time schedule of our preparation for action - months that were vital to success. Our nation will always be indebted to those citizen-soldiers who had the foresight to prepare themselves to aid in its defense. In our gratitude we must include also those other far-seeing men who, in the example of Captain Partridge, sensed the country's need of trained citizen-soldiers and took upon themselves the burden of supplying it.

This type of leadership is more needed than ever before; lacking it, this country - the world - faces disaster. With it, here and elsewhere, the world is on the brink of its brightest era.

In peace, as in war, there are many factors which are mandatory for successful enterprise and successful endeavor. Specialized skills, determination, willingness to work, subjugation of self to the welfare of the group, loyalty - these are the building stones for the construction of every worthwhile human edifice.

These virtues, which are most admired in men, flourish in the fertile soil of our American democracy. They are visible on every hand and in all walks of life; they are at once the reason for, and the result of, our greatness. These factors, so vital in themselves, cannot, however, succeed in and of themselves. They require another indispensable quality to weld them together, to canalize their energy, to develop and shape and mold them into an efficient and productive whole.

Again I refer to leadership. Without leadership, action by masses is blind and erratic, sometimes exhausting itself in extremes of violence and at other times listless; seldom productive, always subject to disorder. But with the introduction of the quality of leadership an immediate unity is achieved.

I am not speaking principally of the leadership exercised by those in high places, although they must set the pattern for all. I mean, primarily, the day-by-day influence of all those, who by reason of their qualifications, regardless of profession, race, or standing in the social or economic world, are capable of leading another.

In war the highest commander cannot, by himself, provide the leadership necessary to military victory. He must be supported by a great organization of devoted assistants, the base of which must be the captains, the lieutenants, the sergeants and corporals - every man that has responsibility over another on the battlefield. The issue of victory or defeat lies, finally, in their hands.

The veterans among you have learned to distinguish easily and quickly between military leadership which is real and that which is shoddy. The fraud dodges responsibility, shirks effort. He coaxes or tyrannizes to gain his end, and so loses the respect of his subordinates. But the genuine leader is firm and strong in all things affecting the fortunes of the group. He strives to serve those under him and to understand their human desires, hopes and fears. He shares their lives and - inevitably - gains their confidence and a unique loyalty that is the most satisfying reward any man can win.

To this sense of satisfaction every man can fairly aspire, for the assertion that the leader is born, never made, is a definite fallacy. Application and study coupled with worthy purpose and desire to serve are of far greater importance than any endowment of brilliant talents.

The freedom of the individual and his willingness to follow real leadership are at the core of America's strength. Ours is at once the most effective and most challenging social structure; the most effective because it inspires all ranks to the height of individual initiative; and the most challenging to leaders because it demands of them continued portrayal of the finest virtues.

It is this pattern of system that we seek to apply to the task of insuring that this peace we have won at such tremendous cost will be a lasting, an enduring peace; not an uneasy cessation of hostilities such as we so bitterly experienced between the two world wars.

We peer into the future for a sure path to that goal. We hope to cast the light of mutual understanding upon the dark shadows of envy and suspicion and hate in which mankind has groped its way perilously close to destruction. But the path to peace will be a long and rocky climb. We are only beginning - which makes the task peculiarly one of your generation.

The first step is to determine the essentials of the problem. We in this democracy earnestly believe that in adherence to the philosophies of individual liberty and free enterprise lies the surest way to peace and happiness. But we do not believe in using force to impose our system upon others - and since many others may believe in their particular systems as devoutly as we do in ours, we must teach by example. If our country is to aid unhappy millions of the world toward a better life in our concepts of democracy, the United States must be an example to command respect - the country must exhibit the qualities of leadership which, in the individual, is always productive of results.

First then - we need a strong United States - firm in the right and in support of principle, tolerant of human error, ready to help the weak, but standing before ourselves and the world as the shining product of efficiency in democracy.

I do not mean the swashbuckling, arrogant strength of the bully. I mean, first of all, the social, economic and spiritual strength that comes from unified adherence to the same ideals and a thorough-going practice of the cooperative methods that are implicit in the system of free enterprise.

This must be supplemented, in the world of today by a respectable posture in the matter of military strength. Much of this military strength is, and should be, latent. The latent portion of our strength is represented in the spirit of our people, in our unabashed patriotism, in our industrial and scientific genius, in our reserve forces, of which you and others like you throughout the country, form such an important part.

But in the current state of world transition from war to peace, from destructive chaos toward orderly procedures, we need a more readily available strength. The amount we need is that required to meet the solemn commitments our country has made throughout the world and a sufficient framework of organizations behind them to secure us in peaceful activity and to give confidence to those that seek to emulate. Not a man or a gun should be maintained for aggressive purpose - but every American, and every friend of America in the world, has the right to know that they can count on us for a full share in upholding the democratic ideal. Because of the tasks now facing us in the world - because performance of these tasks means the solidification of the military victory and the establishment of opportunity in which to work out the world's problems of universal peace, I firmly assert that there is an obvious limit to our unilateral disarmament. Weakness and nakedness cannot serve us now. We must rely on the war system of providing the necessary strength until the problems of that war have

been solved. And so I stand for present continuation of selective service; not as a peacetime policy of the United States, but as an assurance to ourselves and others that we will have the strength to carry to complete fulfillment the purposes for which we went to war.

The second essential to the problem is the development of broader bases of mutual understandings between nations. Culture, traditions, habits of thought, economic opportunity, social systems and forms of government differ, in some degree, in every nation of the world. Just as understanding of the characters of his soldiers is a requirement for the successful platoon leader, so much the nation that hopes to lead, strive for fuller understanding of all other peoples. Realization of their fears, their hopes, their aspirations, their suspicions - and the causes for them - are essential to us, and to all others. The churches, the schools, the governments and the individual citizens of all the earth must strive for this understanding. Its development will build a constantly easier road toward the ultimate goal - its lack will surely bring us finally to disaster, if not extinction.

The final fundamental is the successful functioning of a legal organization designed to adjust traditional causes of international friction. The United Nations must be made to work. Vermont has now given one of her greatest sons to furtherance of this purpose. His character and record, equal to the vital importance of his task, give encouragement to every thinking American.

The purpose of the United Nations is peace. We must not - we dare not - admit the possibility of failure. Defeatism cannot be tolerated. No matter how acute may become our differences with any - or what the degree of readiness we must achieve, under any threat, to assure our safety - we must constantly, unceasingly, strive in the spirit of the United Nations charter to adjust our differences legally. In the success of that organization will come freedom from starvation, needless suffering, wasted lives, universal unhappiness.

To support the United Nations effectively, it is clear that America can contribute her full share only if she is strong. Strong in the right and in the power to defend the right! The strength of the leader is in the will and the spirit of his followers - the great Vermonter now undertaking the technical and deeper problems of developing an effective world organization deserves and must have the earnest, dynamic and unceasing support of every single one of us. I deem it an honor, now, to pledge to him the full use of whatever poor talents Providence may have given to me.

You men, and others like you throughout our country, are equipped to lead us, in safe stages, toward our goal. With your appreciation of history’s lessons, you will fight the indifference, the blind complacency, the selfish inertia that more than once have let us drift into a war that might have been prevented. Moreover, you will bring under your banner a constantly increasing army of citizen-soldiers determined, with you, to win the peace. With the qualifications of determination, good humor, firmness and optimism, I know you will let no setback, no discouragement, diminish the effectiveness of your efforts.

We work for a better world and constantly experience social and political advances. But man’s problems are recurrent - they appear to be mastered but crop up again in new form. Progress constantly integrates society more closely. Inter-dependence of man upon man and nation upon nation is the growing characteristic of our times. It imposes new problems and emergencies in the world of today and of tomorrow - that is the nature of this life.

To you of the graduating class, your time to begin taking over is at hand. Within hours now, you will be called on to assume roles that with the years will constantly grow greater in importance and responsibility. Your role is that of citizen leaders of the greatest nation on earth during one of the most critical periods of its history. You are an essential part of the nation’s strength against the dread possibility of war, but more importantly in providing constructive leadership for peace.

If today I were compelled to send you as leaders of platoons into battle I would say to you - be of good heart and confidence; you are trained to supply the leadership your men will need; you understand the essentials of the task assigned you; thousands of others will be at your shoulder constantly helping you toward the objective; your faith in the cause for which you struggle will carry you through every trial; in the constancy of your devotion your fellow citizens will always find a source of pride and gratification! Success is yours for the winning!

I can think of no better message to give you as you go out to lead your fellows in the winning of international cooperation and enduring peace! And I can think of no brighter crown that the history of the future could accord to America than that she led the way to the attainment of that goal!

• American Alumni Association, Valentine Hall, Amherst, Massachusetts, July 11, 1946

There is, for me, an understandable pride in the privilege of representing before this distinguished body those millions of fighting men to whom your generous expressions really apply. Yet the services for which I am being so signally commended by the American Alumni Association involved circumstances which we are determined shall never reappear upon this earth.

Toil, sacrifice and death had once again to provide a shield for democracy against the murderous assault of dictatorships reaching for world dominion. War, in unprecedented scope and destructiveness, swept over great portions of the earth's productive centers, leaving in its wake broken economies, governmental chaos, and starving millions.

Conflagration brings the need for clearing away wreckage before constructive work can begin anew. Our own country is now engaged in this process both at home and abroad. Here we are reconverting industry from the demands of war to those of peace. In a dozen directions, among them housing construction, we are beginning to make good the suspension of normal production during the past five years.

We are trying to bridge the vast gulf lying between the administrative systems, controls, and activities to war and the accustomed processes of a democratic state based upon free enterprise. Abroad, we, with other nations, are engaged in rescuing the persecuted, feeding the hungry, re-establishing order and encouraging peoples to adopt democratic processes.

In an atmosphere of confusion and fear, and where great portions of the earth's population seethe in misery and in hunger, efforts to substitute mutual confidence for mutual suspicion, and rule by law for rule by the sword cannot prosper. As a consequence the interim or transitory tasks now facing us achieve an importance transcending humanitarian impulse and current necessity. Success in them is prerequisite to full realization of our fondest hope and greatest goal - elimination of war. To reach that objective, each of us has a part to play! Indeed, I firmly believe that an indispensable factor in the problem is an awareness by every American that he, personally, and the democracy of which he is a part, are living in a decade of test before the world.

One of the Army's duties in these urgent years is that of occupation of conquered territories. Whether in the shattered and leaderless cities of central Germany or in the more stable and organized areas of Japan, the difficulties and delicacy of these tasks require substantial numbers of men for their performance. So long as our government continues occupation nothing could produce a more dangerous situation than an American weakness that would encourage recalcitrance or open rebellion. Such a result would have pyramiding consequences of grave import for everyone of us. The purposes, the risks and the requirements of occupation must be so clearly placed before the American people that there can be no lack of comprehension of the issues involved.

This is but a single example of the direct relationship between the fortunes of the individual and national success in the accomplishment of immediate tasks.

Another is that of reintegration into the country's productive life of the millions of men and women that served in the Armed Forces. Within a matter of months, twelve million Americans produced the finest Navy, Army and Air Force the world has known. They successfully met every test of history's most gruelling war. Save for an insignificant percentage they displayed a courage, endurance, intelligence and capacity for leading and following that can be fully as valuable to America at peace as they were on the battlefield. Already, since the end of hostilities, experience at dozens of universities has demonstrated that these men are better fitted to cope with normal civilian problems than when they went to war. Almost invariably the veteran group, in every school, stands well toward the top of the class - and this in spite of the fact that for the veteran formal education has suffered an interruption of from two to four years.

Just as the military developed the leadership to utilize these qualities of our youth in battle, so now must you, and others like you, produce the pattern of leadership that will best employ them in peace. Any failure will mean irreparable loss to the United States as well as to the individual - and the cause would be traced directly to industrial, social, political and cultural organizations that could not provide the necessary leadership to utilize the greatest of America's assets.

Only a strong, prosperous America can inspire others to respect democracy and seek to apply its precepts to their own lives. National strength is not exclusively or even principally measured in guns and airplanes and ships and tanks, necessary as these are in the current conditions of the world. Our strength is represented in the uninterrupted productiveness of our mines and farms and factories and in the efficient performance of transport and communication systems. Effectiveness in this vast economic pattern depends upon people - just as success in battle depends upon men. Since the genius of our particular civilization is free enterprise, the contribution of every individual is necessary to the teamwork which alone can produce an America of greatest influence in the search for peace. If any group of individuals seeks only its own immediate profit at the expense of others in a common enterprise, it inevitably lessens the efficiency of the whole and thus, eventually, defeats its own best interests.

The basis of teamwork is justice, fair-play, consideration for the rights of others, and an understanding that the success or failure of the whole involves like fortune for all the parts. Never before has it been more important for us to demonstrate the truth of Wilson's assertion – "The highest form of efficiency is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people."

Small wisdom is required to recognize our continuing need for the quality that was the heart and soul of our military victory - patriotism. That word - that quality - must be revitalized in our speech and in our conduct. Moreover, it must be amplified in our understanding and practice as a virtue that cannot be confined within geographical limits or behind barriers of race.

There was a time when an American could be, and generally was, utterly unconcerned with the outer world because the oceans set us safely apart from all other peoples. Those days are gone. Vast spaces of the earth once measured in months of travel have been reduced to daily schedules of hours and minutes. Every nation is neighbor to all mankind. The need for international teamwork is no less than for that among ourselves.

Equally important it is to realize that there can be no assured peace and tranquility for any one nation except as it is achieved for all. So long as want, frustration and a sense of injustice prevail among significant sections of earth, no other section can be wholly released from fear. The more terrifying become weapons of concentrated destructive power the more applicable is this truth. The glowing future of peace, confidence and freedom that we visualize for every individual within our borders will not be completely attained until other nations can, in some degree, achieve comparable goals.

Always we must seek and urge increased devotion to those things covered by our flag. But we must urge, also, that to confuse patriotism with jingoism is stupid and potentially dangerous to ourselves. Love of our own country must inspire us to serve our own national interests by perfecting teamwork within and by seeking a common good for the benefit of all mankind.

Thus, our country, the greatest product of democracy, shall be to all men a shining example of what democracy can accomplish - a worthy champion of right and justice and freedom throughout the world.

Every cooperative effort in the community, the nation, the world, demands sacrifice of some sort from every individual. But patriotism is the expression of the will to sacrifice. In the school and home and church, in every agency concerned with the training of youth, stress must be laid on the development and amplification of this virtue so that cooperation, possible only where a common bond unites men, may become the watchword of our social, economic and national life.

Here is a great task for every man who by training or occupation finds himself in a position of leadership. To help produce, foster and sustain this unity of purpose and action - to promote clear understanding of the relationships between this domestic unity and the future peace of the world - are, I submit, tasks peculiarly appropriate to the Alumni Association. As in all mass efforts - leadership is an essential ingredient; leadership in all walks of life, in every type of activity. No other is better suited to its exacting and important requirements than the graduate of the American college. There can be no worthier purpose nor any more glowing reward than an entire world - peaceful, tranquil, prosperous! The alternative will not wait, the time to attack is now.

• Speech for Army Medical Department, 171st anniversary, July 27, 1946

Today I am privileged to bring to you from the comrades you have served so well throughout the world,

sincere birthday greetings and expressions of gratitude.

With victory but lately won, we first think of the Medical Department in terms of the recent war, but its support of American soldiers, during the Army's long and unending service as the defender of our democracy, began even before we were a nation.

In the summer of 1775 the Medical Department was born when a small group of civilian physicians dedicated themselves to the task of caring for the wounded in the battles around Boston. With inexhaustible fortitude they braved constant danger to obtain stocks of medical supplies and unselfishly tore from their own backs their shirts to serve as bandages. Today the organizational outgrowth of that inspiring beginning has at its disposal the resources of an entire nation to care for the sick and wounded. On the battlefield it takes charge of the stricken at the very moment of individual disaster and cares for him devotedly and skillfully until he has been returned as a healthy man to combat or has been transported to highly efficient medical facilities in the homeland.

Even when viewed only from the narrow standpoint of battle line efficiency, the Medical Department was an invaluable asset to our Commanders of this war. In the recent European campaign 30,000 more wounded men were treated, healed and sent back to the front line than were numbered in the entire average strength of the Medical Department of that Theater. In the quarter-century intervening between the two world conflicts it so improved its technical proficiency that the percentage of fatalities resulting from wounds was cut in half. Although the Army fought under every condition of climate and terrain, and in areas where disease was traditionally the rule rather than the exception, it suffered less from crippling epidemics than ever before in its history.

But even more significant than these material contributions to victory was the moral effect upon our fighting men of a human, devoted, efficient Medical Corps. The knowledge that the utmost in surgical skill was present in the front lines and would remain constantly with the wounded until he had returned to health, was one of the greatest of the factors that produced the morale to defeat the Axis in Europe and the Japanese in the Pacific.

Unbounded appreciation and admiration were freely given by our fighting soldiers to their comrades who were armed only with stretchers and First Aid kits. These sentiments were best expressed by the unanimous insistence of our front line regiments that their medical detachments be awarded a battle badge equivalent in its implication to the one that decorated the combat infantry. A greater military accolade than this, no department, no service, no unit could receive.

For all that you have done I bring to you the Army's tribute. But your most enduring monument lives in the hearts and minds of thousands upon thousands of American families where a loved one has come back from the wars because of your skill and devotion; and where there exists realization that except for the Medical Department of the United States Army, there would be many times multiplied the white crosses that mark, throughout the world, the last bivouacs of brave Americans.

Today you are 171 years old. That stretch of years covers a record of true achievement; a record that will extend on into the future so long as America has need of an Army - until, under God's guidance, man has universally repudiated rule by force, and battlefields shall belong solely to generations of the past.

• Address to Constituent Assembly, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, August 8, 1946

There are no words in any language to describe adequately the satisfaction I have experienced in the kind invitation of President Durta to visit the great country which this Assembly represents. Ever since victory was achieved in Europe, it has been my ambition to visit each country that contributed a portion of the strength that brought about the defeat of the Axis. My purpose has been to pay a soldierly tribute to the officers and men and the women who shared the hardships and sacrifices of the recent campaign and to bring to their relatives and friends assurance that they were represented on the battlefield by men of valor, courage and fortitude. In carrying out this purpose I have looked forward eagerly to the opportunity of coming to Brazil. The troops you sent to Europe fought under the severest of battlefield conditions. They wrote a record that will inspire Brazilians throughout centuries to come. It was a record of successful advance, despite every difficulty that

mountainous terrain, bitter weather and a vindictive foe could place in their path. It is, indeed, an honor for any soldier to salute the brave men, living and dead, who carried Brazil's standards abreast of those of the other allies to the final victory over Hitlerism.

But I did not come here solely to add my word of praise to the fighting record of Brazilians. Rather, I hope to add my voice to theirs in pleading that the sons of democracy may never again have to endure the ordeal of war in order to protect freedom from the forces of aggression. No man who has witnessed war can fail to stand with those who believe that there can and must be found a better method of composing international differences than by resort to brutalizing force. Yet men who love freedom will always fight when necessary to preserve their liberty - the one thing dearer than life itself is the democracy in which we believe and by which we live.

The problem, then, is to assure ourselves that we may live peacefully together, one nation with all the others and with certainly that we shall preserve to ourselves and our children our own system of government and our way of life.

These things of course are the primary business of diplomats - not of soldiers - but the uniformed men of your country and of mine have pledged their very lives as evidence of their support of our democratic ideals. This, I hold, gives to each of them, including myself, the right to speak out in support of any sane and human program that promises to lift from the backs of men the scourge of war.

Democracy is essentially a political system that recognizes the equality of humans before the law. It makes no distinction between the great and the small or between the rich and the poor. This form of government rests upon two great foundation stones. Of these, one is an abiding faith in the dignity of the individual, in the eternal value of the human soul. The other foundation stone is a system of free enterprise - the right of men to earn for himself and his family a decent living by the sweat of his own brow and the toil of his own hands. Democracy recognizes the right of each to think, to act, to worship, and to speak according to his own convictions and his own conscience. The single restriction is that he must not trespass upon similar rights of others.

This same principle I believe can lead us towards the durable peace that we seek among nations. Each such nation must be recognized as the possessor of certain inherent rights - in the observation of these rights there can be no modification based upon size, power, grandeur or geographical location. None must seek to dominate another and no nation, at least a democratic nation, will seek to interfere with the right of any other to conduct its strictly domestic affairs as it sees fit. Each must realize that there can be no enduring peace for any except as it is achieved for all. The goal must be a true concert of nations.

On the world stage the United Nations is now attempting to implement the charter that was written at San Francisco. Its purpose is to bring about this equality of right and this common respect for each.

For the United Nations, the Americas, North, South and Central, have provided a shining and tested example. Through the Pan American Union, the western world has been charting out the path that leads to realization that justice, prosperity and respect are possessed by all, when they are unfailingly accorded to each. It is true that perfection has not yet been attained, but we have gone so far among ourselves, in achieving this attitude of the true neighbor, that could the spirit, the tolerance and the practical wisdom of Pan Americanism be extended today to the whole world, we could even now largely abandon our worries about individual security. Men of my profession would soon find themselves unneeded by the world and I believe I voice the sentiments of every thinking and experienced soldier when I say that the sooner we can lay aside our swords, the happier we will be.

Even more than is the case in other forms of government, a democracy requires the devotion and unflagging support of its individual citizens. A democracy means government of the people, by the people themselves, and without their support and active participation it cannot survive. Patriotism is an essential to a democratic government. This patriotism naturally concerns itself, among other things, with the security of the nation. According to the prevailing conditions of the moment, it insists that the country shall be shielded by such measures of armed force as may be required by the local circumstances. Armies, navies and air forces must be sufficiently strong - they must be well equipped and highly efficient - above all, they must themselves be inspired by selfless devotion to the country which they serve. But patriotism must also be intelligent and if it is intelligent, it will see that in a practical and lasting friendship among nations is to be found more security for its own country than can be provided by any armed force, no matter how powerful. Consequently, even as democracy seeks to assure its own protection against outside interference, it must also seek to promote those

international relations that will make the existence of armies and navies unnecessary.

There is no strength equal to the strength of an enduring friendship.

And so I have a special satisfaction in coming to Brazil because, like the people of my own country, you have affirmed and are reaffirming your faith in the basic concepts of democracy. We are kinsmen in our fundamental faiths of political doctrine and human rights. When any two people live by the same basic principles - when they will fight for those principles, and those principles only, then they are truly related. So I come to you as a simple soldier and individual citizen of North America, as a comrade of the war, as a friend and as your kinsman in Democracy. I seek - as does the American Army - to draw closer to you, so that my own individual efforts may be directed always by the certainty that a cooperative and undying friendship continues to exist between us. As a soldier who had the honor to serve in the same general war theater as the sons and relatives you sent to battle, I value this opportunity to pledge my efforts in support of everyone of you who intends to foster, to nurture, and to strengthen this friendship and this cooperation. The warmth of the welcome that I and my wife and my party have received in your country leaves me with the conviction that we share these sentiments. So with pride and with sincere affection, I salute your flag, your great President, and this Assembly, all as the representatives of people who through the ages will march down the road to peace, together with my own. In so doing we shall assist cheerfully and generously, all others to progress along the same path of human happiness.

• Speech at dinner at the Presidencia, Panama, August 13, 1946

Words cannot possibly express the depth of my gratitude for the high honor paid me by the Republic and President of Panama. In the generous words of the President's commendation, there is especially stressed my tour of service in the European Zone in the late war. It was a type of service we profoundly trust may never again be repeated on this earth - we strive for a peace that shall endure to the end of time.

Moreover I should like to suggest that it is easy to over-emphasize the contributions of the individual in war. Even those upon whom fell the great responsibility of high leadership can never fail to realize that they may appropriately take credit for those services only as representatives of those that served with and under them. Cooperation was the key to the Allied victory - cooperation among individuals and among nations.

Tonight I think it fitting that I should pay tribute to the Republic of Panama as a member of that great war team. The loyalty of the Panamanian people to the cause of democracy, the unremitting efforts of the government and governmental officials to make available their resources to meet war needs, and the spirit of cooperation in which Panamanians worked with representatives of my own country, all contributed directly to the security of this vital strategic area, and so to final victory.

Concerning the importance of this area none of us can have any slightest doubt. Its security is the particular responsibility of the United States and the Republic of Panama, but the significance of this security extends to all the Americas and indeed to democracy throughout the world. Because of this importance our vigilance can never be relaxed.

Both of our democracies will always support the great effort of the United Nations to substitute rule by law for rule by force throughout the world. Nothing that we may do now or in the future to make ourselves secure can be reasonably construed as a lack of faith in the world's ability eventually to eliminate the scourge of war. Our sole purpose is to see that democracy and this region may live in such security as to contribute the most to realization of the United Nations purpose. As we progress we shall be able to turn our attention more and more from problems of protection to those of production. This is the final goal for which we strive.

Mr. President, may I assure you again that my wife and I have been deeply touched by the cordiality of our welcome and by the great honor you have done us. These things have a multiplied value to us because of their implications that our two countries will continue always to work as equal partners on common problems.

I pledge to you that it shall always be my purpose to promote that perfection of cooperation as we devote ourselves to the vital problems of security and enduring peace.

• Address at Veterans Day, Nebraska State Fair, Lincoln, Nebraska, September 1, 1946

For me this is something of a homecoming. My roots are deep in the farms and prairies of the Missouri Valley region and today I have that satisfying feeling of being back among people with whom I was raised, whose language I speak, to whom I belong! As a soldier, I have the additional satisfaction of meeting with Nebraskans on a day set aside to honor veterans whose heroism and sacrifice helped to forge the Axis defeat. In this tribute to its sons and daughters, the State of Nebraska recognizes their magnificent contribution in war and their focal position in our country's future. To them all of us owe a lasting debt. From their influence all of us expect new and greater strides toward a better state and nation and world.

In our country the soldier of World War II is rapidly assuming, or preparing to assume, that place of leadership that his special experiences, his widened knowledge, and his increased comprehensions of human relationship indicate for him. Many thousands of our veterans are now filling the campuses of colleges and universities throughout the country, and proving themselves both eager and earnest students. In the average, these men are past normal school age and most of them have been long absent from their studies. Nevertheless, their scholastic record is overwhelming proof of their determination to better themselves and the world in which they live.

From almost every campus in the country come enthusiastic reports of their sincerity and their performance. They have brought to the country's schools a wholesome, vigorous spirit, and through them we are building up in the ledger of our human assets increased credit balances of well educated men and women, matured by experience and schooling and competent judgment. They are becoming daily a more and more potent influence in producing a stable and strong America and therefore a peaceful and orderly world. My own deep respect and admiration for their performances in Africa and Italy, in England and on the continent of Europe, is reinforced by their conduct now. Good soldiers then, they are good citizens now. No one can ask more of Americans.

I earnestly hope that among the veterans here are members of the 134th Infantry, of the splendid 35th Division. I reviewed the regiment, then commanded by Colonel, now Major General Miltonberger, in England, just before it left for France. Less than one month later it participated so gallantly and effectively in the great battles in Normandy, that the French Government has recently awarded the Croix de Guerre to this great Nebraska regiment. I will read part of the citation, which reached the War Department, through the French Embassy, just before I left Washington: "...It (the 134th Infantry Regiment) particularly distinguished itself by its bravery and combat spirit during the attack on Hill 122, on 15 July 1944. After having taken this position by assault, very strongly fortified and mined and occupied by an enemy very superior in number, the 134th Regiment of Infantry, exploiting her initial success, broke through into St. Lo, which had been defended for a week by an adversary determined to resist at all cost."

The Regiment is now being reconstituted as part of our National Defense Program. I congratulate it, and each of its present and future members on the receipt of this well-earned decoration which will adorn its battle flag.

If all Nebraskans, veterans and others, are of the same mettle as the men of that Regiment, they will not be daunted by the inevitable challenges of peace whose solution demands devotion and sacrifice, the same qualities that were expended in such generous measure to bring us military victory.

The manifold blessings we have enjoyed since the cessation of hostilities just one year ago have been accompanied by manifold problems. Some of these problems affect all of us directly, and all of us must help solve them. One of these great problems is hunger, an inevitable aftermath of war. Starvation is the implacable foe of social, scientific and potential progress. A hungry world is a restless and disturbed arena in which the agitator and political charlatan find ready followers, for men will sacrifice principle and peace to win food for their families.

This particular problem has been greatly lessened in vast areas of the globe through sacrifice last winter and spring by both our own people and the peoples of other favored nations. The harvest that you in Nebraska are now reaping, bountiful beyond precedent and paralleled across the country, lessens still further the fearful threat of major famine. You who work the soil are contributing to the opportunity for peaceful progress and the elimination of hunger as a political weapon.

Less materialistic, but no less important as a factor in the development of lasting peace, is the quality of neighborliness, the hallmark of the Middle West. Its extension on a global scale is an essential factor in developing a guarantee against war. Good neighbors, as your personal experience confirms, make good communities in which development and betterment of the individual is assured. Equally, good neighbors among the states of the world can shape a community of nations in which all men may live in peace, enjoy the fruits of the earth and develop its resources for the good of those who inhabit it.

The increase of the quality of neighborliness among the nations is as essential to national security as is an adequate military establishment. The social and the military aspects of security are mutually complementary. Efforts to promote unity in the world by exploring the field of human relations, developing the common ties that bind men, lessening the differences and bridging the chasms, will be wasted unless they are accompanied by the strength to enforce peace should some international gangster attempt to disrupt it. On the other hand, strength alone will be futile in maintaining permanent peace unless the nations of the world continue to grow in knowledge and understanding of one another. Mutual understanding and tolerance will build up a moral force that one day will be strong enough to make all nations secure. There are many ways of describing the role which we hope the United Nations will play in world politics, but I believe the very nub of its mission is the promotion of the neighborly virtues among all nations, great and small.

The barriers to neighborliness are fear and prejudice spawned by ignorance. We have broken those barriers within our own country and are making definite headway on the road to their destruction in the Western Hemisphere. Moreover, despite two World Wars in our generation, I believe we have, in the last few decades, gone farther toward creating the foundation on which a world peace can stand than in many preceding centuries, because we have dispelled much of the ignorance of one another that darkened relations between the nations. A century ago belligerence and perpetual readiness for aggressive war were the almost universally accepted index to national vitality. Today there is a long and increasing roll of powers, great and small, with whom even an insanely criminal agitator cannot envision the United States ever engaging in war.

The barriers of fear and hate, I believe, will be still further reduced in years to come by the veterans of all nations who have seen many peoples and recognized among them all the common human impulses, the common needs, the common aspirations that bind mankind.

Manifestly, unilateral development of the neighbor spirit is not enough if manmade and impenetrable walls are established to separate one segment of the human race from all others. That is a critical and disturbing problem which we must face squarely. Two nations, just as two people, cannot be friends if one only is so disposed.

Yet it is difficult to understand why a generous gesture should be rebuffed, or why a ready and helping hand should be struck aside. If suspicion and distrust are permitted to shoulder aside the neighborly effort and should eventually provoke a war, what possible progress for mankind can result? Entirely aside from all of the losses, human and material, aside from the sufferings and privations of war, even a successful conflict cannot advance us directly along the road to an enduring peace. If we agreed that the basis of lasting peace must be based on mutual understanding, we see instantly that war with its fanning of hatreds, prejudices and antagonisms can be nothing but a setback along the main trail.

We have a glaring example today. Germany has been defeated and it is clear that unless we had fought and destroyed the German military system we would ourselves have become its slaves. But did victory bring peace and understanding between the Allies and the Axis? We have just begun, in an atmosphere of chaos, privation, resentment and even hatred, the task of educating the German people to abandon force as a major instrument of national policy. Allies, which, under the compulsion of a common fear achieved almost global unity, find themselves unable to agree on an endless series of important questions. All about us is conviction that we ourselves must provide assurance that we can protect our homes, our principles, our rights, and our way of life.

Yet so clearly do we see the need for eliminating war that we must parallel this effort with a determination to do all that lies within our power to bring all others to a realization that resort to force cannot possibly result in anything except destruction, privation, sorrow and even more acute problems, difficulties and quarrels. No mater, then, how impatient we may become with those who openly distrust our motives or reject our friendly advances, we must continue tirelessly to devote to the problem every bit of patience, understanding, consideration and tolerance of which we are capable. By remaining certain of our capacity to defend ourselves,

we will demonstrate to the world that our support of peace does not result from hysterical fear, but from the highest interests of all mankind, including ourselves. If we are strong we can be firm without truculence, we can compose without appeasing.

On our side we must appreciate the sentiments of those who have been victims of war, who have had their homes burned, their children and their aged brutally massacred and their country devastated. Revenge is an understandable, even if sterile, emotion! Such victims will not brook interference with their efforts to seek out and erect every possible safeguard against a recurrence of their nation's tragedy; we cannot scorn that very human and natural purpose among people who have been scourged and tortured by an aggressor.

The task, then, is not merely to get others to understand us - we have a reciprocal duty with respect to them. Differences in traditions, educational systems, governmental ideals and war experiences can all have a major effect in delaying attainment of a common ground where argument can be peaceably resolved. But the clearer our realization of the cost and senselessness and stupidity of the alternative, the harder each of us will work! There is one powerful influence constantly working toward progress in eliminating war which must not be overlooked. It is the mass public opinion of the world. Today the people of no nation want another global war. Even to the eventual winner it means bankruptcy, chaos and despair, and destruction of thriving cities and farm communities. All people, no matter how strong they feel themselves, are desperately striving to insure themselves against another holocaust. What all of them want is a chance to raise better corn or rice or wheat crops, to build better homes, to provide better futures for their children, to live in lasting peace.

I know this is what our veterans want. They are now back home restored to their own communities. These men, who only a relatively few months ago were proving themselves relentless wielders of war's most terrible weapons, today are students, clerks, machinists, farmers, above all, good American citizens who are striving to better their families and their communities. They have proved their unimpeachable loyalty to basic American ideals. In their activity as citizens - and I know it is the hope of my generation that their civic interests will increase and expand - they will adhere scrupulously to the American way of government by ballot and majority will. They will avoid any danger, no matter how remote, of an outbreak in this country of the poison which infected a few German veterans after the first World War and which, within a decade, debased and degraded the German nation into a brutal tyranny, scornful of human rights, dedicated to the supremacy of bullet over ballot. Our people fought a war to free the world of gangster philosophies and they will not permit their appearance under any guise here at home.

Here in Nebraska we stand in the very heart of the greatest stronghold of human freedom, of government based upon equal rights for all. This country cannot escape its destiny as the shining example of what democracy, as we know it, can do in the promotion of human happiness. Anxious eyes throughout the earth will watch us fearfully but hopefully during these chaotic years. Both in the internal unity, general prosperity and moral strength of our own people and in our respectable, strong but understanding position before the world, we must realize that we must lead the world toward democracy, or it will lead us to ruin.

All of us, those who lately wore the uniform and those who worked that others might fight, can show our faith in and our devotion to free systems of government only by making it work here. Democracy can never be stronger than the readiness of its citizens to sacrifice for it. The privileges of democracy cannot be indefinitely enjoyed unless always there is an equal zeal in meeting the obligations of citizenship under it. For all of us it is clear that there is still work to do - work that puts our country above all else, but performed in the realization that by devotion to America we are assisting world progress.

And now a final word to you veterans - above all, I would counsel you to be good neighbors in your communities, conscious of your responsibility to your fellow men, willing to work and sacrifice for the common good. You have proved your amazing versatility in shifting from school and field and factory to the victorious prosecution of global war, and in the reversal of the process. Your country and your world need the same skill and spirit in the establishment of peace. You are entitled to a better world than the one into which you were born. Continue as you have started and you will have it.

• **Address to convention of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Boston, Massachusetts, September 3, 1946**

I am honored and happy to be at this national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This is the sort of opportunity a soldier likes best, to meet men with whom he has a common background of experience and basis of understanding. Gentlemen, that is what I have written down. Permit me a second to try to express a little more fully what is in my heart. I am intensely proud of every one of you - from G.I. to brass hat - from kitchen police to tail gunner - from captain of a ship to deck hand. I would like to meet each one of you and render to you a most sincere and respectful salute. You men bear the proudest of all titles. You are defenders of democracy, and I am humbled in your presence. I have a definite sense of fellowship with you and know that many of you, like myself, are thinking at this time of the triumphant hour a year ago when truce returned again to a tired, chaotic world. I know, too, that you are mindful of the comrades who fought valiantly and died that we might be able to gather together in freedom and strive to do our part in building a lasting peace.

You, who have carried the fight to the enemies of right and peace, hate war with an intensity known only to the veteran. You have witnessed war's terror and agony; the maiming and the pitiful waste and destruction of battle. You want peace, a just, reasonable peace and not a jerry-built structure that will topple and crash from a twisted, insecure foundation.

That longing is shared, throughout the earth, by the people - the masses upon whom descend the sacrifices, the losses, the sufferings of war. Our country's political leaders are working tirelessly toward this goal, in a world where they need the spiritual and material support of a strong, united nation.

We have proved our possession of the potential strength, the vitality, the productive power, and the technical proficiency to wage successful wars. But we have also a past record - and I say this without intent of criticism because the emotions which cause it are so humanly normal - of leaving the field of world conflict as soon as the shooting changes to mere drudgery. Conflict does not necessarily end when the shells and bombs stop falling. There is still the clashing of nationalistic aims and hopes and, more particularly, fears; there are new economic, political and physical pressures, new hatreds, prejudices, understandable ambitions for revenge - all the inevitable aftermath of World War. They cover the earth as the enemy of international harmony.

A year after the curtain has dropped on active campaigning we find ourselves with certain concrete commitments abroad. They were set by the highest policy-making authority in the nation and their necessity has been publicly recognized. In spite of the over-hysterical public demand for complete demobilization, following instantly upon the Japanese surrender, the inherent good sense of our people and its Congress came to the rescue to provide the means to carry on in the face of conditions as we find them today. But I remind you, we appraised those conditions with an almost dangerous optimism. We allowed for no margin and now, simultaneously with the defeat of some of our hopes for a shrinking task, we are making still further cuts in our defense activity. Every detail of this situation is important to you and to future peace.

Again emphasizing the need for unity and strength, the United States has a far more important world role in this chaotic interim than the occupation of conquered territories, the manning of bases and the care of vast amounts of public property. We are either going to take, or fail to take, our natural position in the world as a rallying point for those who yearn for the way of life you and the nation fought for in our past wars. Myriads of hopeful but fear-ridden eyes are watching us to mark our posture. More is expected of us than moral probity, even thought he first requisite is that our moral position should be unimpeachable. Supporting our ethical standards there must be a calm resolution and a healthy security. Only thus can we inspire, rather than hopelessly disappoint, the uncounted millions who seek assurance that we, the world's most powerful stronghold of democracy based upon the rights of man, will stand firm and strong for the justice and freedom that form the only secure foundation for peace.

These things I believe you approve, but this approval cannot be given and forgotten. It implies a determination to face the sacrifices involved, including those comprehended in maintaining a sound national security. Modern armies, navies, and air forces are forbiddingly expensive and this interim period of heavy draft on our resources, if it should be protracted, will result in a requirement for real financial sacrifice. But I would not be standing here today urging the vital importance of national strength, as the world understands such strength, unless I were completely convinced that the alternative is too devastating to contemplate.

The Army is thoroughly aware of the vital need for avoiding unnecessary expenditures in contriving and administering its part of this national security. We are resolved that insofar as our intelligence can devise the country shall receive maximum security with maximum economy. We shall work unceasingly to maintain a

military establishment in step with the pace of scientific advance, and with efficiency constantly striving to cut the cost. The adjustment of our security forces so that they shall be in balanced effectiveness to meet the nation's needs is a task at once complicated and urgent. The nature of war has changed more in the past few years - and particularly on the morning of Hiroshima on August 6 of last years - than in all previously recorded history. Scientific developments have tremendously upset our concepts of security. The weapons we have formerly known, however destructive and terrible, have never been decisive in themselves.

But the values of the factors in old-time military equations are no longer stable. Today, a whole continent can be a potential target. One atomic missile could paralyze a city and blot it out of the national economy for all effective purposes. By bacterial warfare a ruthless enemy might seek to destroy our nation, using our own citizens as human weapon-carriers to bring the germs of death into every home in the country. More than ever before it is certain that there is no separate air, sea, or ground warfare - just as a whole nation is the potential objective, so is the whole nation and everything and person in it the only organism by which successful war can be waged.

Our defense force, integrated among themselves and with our brilliant scientists and our amazing industry, must keep fully abreast of all these possibilities as long as their remains the chance of their use against us. Cruel cost will be inescapable. The resources of the nation simply cannot bear the sinful waste of pouring treasure into identical fields of endeavor, duplicating results but not doubling security. In the light of our present needs, the whole area of security must be examined and reassessed so that all sectors can be covered without duplication, and, even more important, without neglect. This is a problem to which I invite the continuing concern of every veteran.

The uniformed services belong to the American people - not to the officials temporarily commanding them. Their size, their nature, their organization - all these deserve your fullest attention, first to assure yourselves that the nation is not recklessly exposed nor flaunted and ridiculed as it labors to promote world order; nest to see that you do not go bankrupt to support to support duplication or obsolete formations.

Even with the greatest of economy, the necessity of continuing to pour treasure and effort into unproductive military strength is a painful one. But the vital obligation is upon us, during this unpredictable aftermath of world struggle, of standing in unassailable integrity for those things which struggling people know in their souls are the only sure paths to elimination of war.

To say, however, that this condition is necessarily clothed in permanency is pure defeatism in our search for peace. We have set up and are operating in the United Nations the mechanism to carry out the will of the great proportion of nations. Admittedly it is only a mechanism, and its future depends on world-wide practice of those virtues of understanding and of tolerance that are the essential characteristics of cooperative enterprise. No man who appreciates the meaning of war - particularly any future global war - can refrain from participating in promoting this practice.

The task is not easy. It becomes especially difficult when we feel forced to wonder whether every friendly gesture of our own, every well-intentioned proposal, is being twisted by another into a sinister design. When we believe that courtesy is met with rudeness, generosity with arrogance, then patience grows thin. Yet our determination in this particular effort must be inexhaustible, because on its successful outcome depends the whole future of civilization, ours included. Moreover, it is only through patient study and exploration that we can discover the basic reasons why any other should seemingly obstruct progress toward a goal that holds out such promise to all mankind. Smouldering hatreds, national prejudices and a fearful reluctance to rely upon anything but force will not disappear easily. Every leader recognizes that in welding together a group for a common purpose, some of his followers fall into line easily, others are difficult. In pursuing his purpose he must exert his full ability and strength to bring all into cooperative action. Particularly he strives to discover and eliminate the reasons that inspire the recalcitrant members of the team. In the same way, if our nation is to be a successful leader of the world toward peace, it must exercise, in full measure, all the qualities of leadership. We must show firmness in the right, uncompromising support of justice and freedom, respect for all, and patience and determination in winning over any that through fear, hope for revenge, or any selfish purpose, are blinded to their own national, as well as the world's best interests.

I leave these thoughts with you because I know you veterans have a particularly alert concern for all matters affecting the welfare and security of this country. I am thankful this is so. You are marked men - you

cannot escape positions of influence, particularly in moulding thought in that field in which you have had personal experience - the defense of the nation. That experience, both in foreign fields and here at home, has increased your capacity for special and general leadership. You will recall the critics of Selective Service in the tense months of 1940 - imitated more recently by the critics of the project for Universal Military Training - crying that military service would stifle initiative, curb imagination, and produce unthinking robots. Actual experience in our country is to the exact contrary. Military service had broadened minds, opened up new horizons, and increased both a realization of our nation's meaning and a sense of international responsibility. Student veterans of every university in the land today provide proof of this assertion in the excellence of their scholastic records and the maturity of their outlook.

The primary purpose of military training is, of course, defense of the nation, whose very existence has so recently depended on the patriotism and self-sacrifice of her sons. But these by-products, accruing to the individual, are weighty factors, also, and one of them is the serviceborn comradeship and mutual understanding exemplified in this great veterans' organization, comprising Americans of diverse creeds, races and origins.

Such understanding extended to all peoples is our only hope for the eventual solution of the difficulties which now beset the world. There are many factors on the debit side of the ledger, many discouraging and seemingly insurmountable obstacles to be overcome. But on the credit side are hundreds of others. Among these I count as one of the most important you men and your veteran comrades throughout the nation. Your loyalty, your valor, your experience, your leadership, will keep this nation strong, considerate, and united, and determined in the search for peace. Your past services to our country fill all your fellow-citizens with a pride that cannot possibly find expression. Your future opportunities for service to her stand even more glowingly before you.

• Notes for Freedom of the City of Edinburgh, Scotland, October 3, 1946

Humbly but proudly I accept the signal honor conferred o me today. I shall treasure this distinction the more because I know it is not intended as an individual reward for personal accomplishment, but rather, as a tribute from you to the unity achieved among the fighting men of democracy with whom I had the privilege to be joined in the days of war. From the depth of my gratitude for your choice of me to represent them here, I thank you. Among them were the fighting sons of Scotland, who sustained unblemished the world-wide military renown of this warrior race. They fought like Scots - I cannot add to that in expressing a soldier's admiration for their soldierly characteristics.

The freedom of Edinburgh is a precious gift, associating its possessor with a rich, illustrious past. This ancient city, in its more than a thousand years of recorded history, has witnessed man's emergence from the Dark Ages - his labored steps toward a society governed by law and ethics rather than by the whim of an autocrat. It has watched tyrants swell with conquest only to disappear in the wrack of war. It has seen a new world opened to the Western peoples and has helped to populate that land as another home for their beliefs and traditions. It has participated in the growth of man's mastery over the elements of nature and his conversion of their forces to his service.

This place was first a strong point where men gathered for protection against their enemies. To it they later added a church in answer to their spiritual hunger. In time, they established schools for the satisfaction of their intellectual demands and finally they sought here the economic and social benefits arising from new triumphs over the earth's space and natural resources.

Cities result from these human aspirations because only in association of life and effort is growth possible for men. Left to himself, shut off from the stimulus of his fellows, barred from a share in other's problems and their solutions, man is almost a static being. Edinburgh is neither the oldest nor the largest of the world's cities, but it typifies, better than most, man's age-long search for peace and betterment of his lot and his tortuous progress on the path toward it. Race has here fought race, Roman and Pict and Scot, Saxon and Dane and Norman. Faction has fought faction; cavalier and parliamentarian, Jacobite and Whig. The Firth of Forth split your country into two hostile camps. But strife and conflict and division have been succeeded by peace and unity because essential community of interests, typified by the city, triumphed over barriers of selfishness and

prejudice separating men.

Cities, like Edinburgh, far from being mere structures of brick and stone, are living symbols of mankind's fundamental need of and faith in cooperative action.

In this truth, I think, we find the key to another instinctive reason for the growing hate of war that now possesses the world. War is no longer a light adventure of expedition into romance, matching man against man in test of the stout heart or the skilled arm. Instead, it is aimed against the cities mankind has built; its goal is their utter destruction and devastation.

Modern war lumps fighting man and helpless child, fortification and school and factory, into a first priority bombing target. Overnight war, which has always been repulsive in its human suffering but considered an inevitable accompaniment of human life, becomes utterly abhorrent to men. The addition of the atomic bomb to the armory of weapons intensifies our horror, because it has multiplied the possibilities of destruction. The process that required hundreds of planes and hours or days of assault has been reduced to one plane and one bomb.

But it is not merely new weapons that have intensified man's terror at the thought of another armed conflict. The product of war has always been suffering and hunger and death. There is a new product - the conviction that obliteration of our cities can send us reeling back into the primal darkness when relationship within the clan or tribe was the largest common denominator among men. Destruction of cities is the return of barbarism. Forced dispersal of cities, breaking them up into tiny cells, hidden underground or in the mountains or deserts, to save them from destruction, is no better. In either case, the city disappears and the path of human progress is reversed.

The tragedy of such fears is that they exist at all. Constant dread of war is better, only by comparison, than war itself. Deadly fear diverts from productive activity man's efforts and his resources, it stifles clear thinking and stultifies moral and spiritual beliefs. There are no differences today among the nations that require war for their settlement. Edinburgh stands as witness that barriers of opinion, discordance of religious creeds and political opinions, all the accidental divergences among men that set one group or one people apart from another group or people, can be overcome without armed conflict, and to the resultant betterment of the whole.

The intensity of passion that two centuries ago separated Lowlander from Highlander was perhaps far less susceptible to friendly solution than any rivalry separating men today. Yet for generations Highlander and Lowlander have been one Scottish people. What you of Scotland and Edinburgh achieved, all men can achieve.

But wishful thinking or optimistic talk about the possibility of universal peace cannot accomplish the elimination of war from human life. Positive measures, many of which have already been adopted, must be extended and maintained. The aggressors of the world must remain convinced that aggression does not pay.

Almost a century ago a great American, Abraham Lincoln, whose statue stands in your city commemorating the Scots who died under the American flag, said: "Among men there can be no successful appeal from the ballot to the bullet and ... they who take such appeal are sure to lose their case." Evidence of that statement's truth confronts us in the economic, military and moral bankruptcy of the German nation, in the collapse of the Japanese Empire and the loss of every gain it made in a century of militant expansion. But we do not want to prove again by test of war the truth of what he said.

The task is not beyond the strength of the peace-loving peoples. All nations have exhibited their share of fault and history is marred and sullied by their misdeeds toward others. But gradually man is coming to see that he is inescapably neighbor to all others in the world. The Atlantic, now, is comparable as an obstacle to the Firth of Forth of the ancient Scottish chieftans. Here among yourselves, neighbors by accident of geography, you have also become neighbors within the meaning of the Bible's immortal parable. Certainly we can hope and certainly we can strive to see that the lesson may spread to the remotest corners of the world.

True enough, there are many and sore differences among the nations. But they can be resolved. Twice in a generation the major powers of the United Nations have been allied in a World War against a common foe. In battle and victory, they built a solidarity unknown over such wide areas since the beginning of history. Its continuance and increasing strength is an essential complement to the uprooting of the aggressor philosophy. It will be a long and difficult road. Disputes are inevitable, many of them serious and full of danger. But I firmly believe that we shall succeed.

The moral position of those nations that lead to this goal must be unimpeachable. Steadfastness and

readiness to sacrifice in support of right and justice must be complete. Particularly must all realize that security and peace and freedom from fear cannot be attained for one except as it is attained for all. World neighborliness must be achieved, else we will in a twinkling, travel a backward route over mankind's long and laborious progress from his ancient caves to the present.

We have come far along the road to a cooperative world. We must not turn back now. And here at Edinburgh I cannot feel pessimistic about the outcome. For this city, in its centuries, has seen mankind advance farther on the road to unity than we have left to travel. None of us can fail to gain renewed courage from that realization.

• Speech at Edinburgh University, Edinburgh, Scotland, October 3, 1946

By reason of the great honor you have bestowed upon me I now become associated in some degree with the future of Edinburgh University. All Americans are deeply indebted to this institution because we have long been the beneficiaries of much of your primary work. Many years ago, for example, some of your sons, venturing across the sea, became the parents of certain of our colleges and the virtual founders of our medical science. But for myself, beyond any sense of group obligation, I shall henceforth feel in this school a direct and personal interest. Obviously, the honor you have done me does not make me heir to the virtues that have earned for this school a world acclaim. Also, I clearly realize that your great courtesy has not conferred upon me any vestige of the right to advance a single suggestion that touches upon the University's aims, its methods or its academic practices. Yet there is one field in which you and I are commonly concerned - and in this field I make bold to leave you with a few, simple, personal thoughts.

I hold that the time must come when civilization will put men of my profession in the ranks of the permanently unemployed. Moreover, I believe that the principle weapon available to civilization for bringing about this result is logical, intensive and inspired education. The educational institutions of the world, and more particularly those that compare to Edinburgh in position of leadership, have an opportunity and a responsibility that, while obviously important to human happiness and progress, may also be measured in terms of human existence.

Civilization might not survive another global war. But regardless of speculation on that point it is certain that the several nations cannot permanently afford to seek assurance of their respective security solely through dependence upon expensive armaments. Yet today there is no other solution to this problem. Each country, no matter how peaceably inclined, feels impelled to keep itself prepared against the possibility of aggression - to maintain a protective shell of military armament around the social customs, political systems and economy by which it lives. The world reacts to fear in the manner dictated by its experience. The price of peace still appears to be measured in the sinews of war. And so sweat and toil and thought and material assets that should go into creating a greater degree of human happiness, with improving standards of living and culture and contentment are diverted in large measure to armies, navies and air forces- sterile in promoting human progress and not even successful, except in comparative fashion, in removing from man's mind the fears that gave them birth.

Because permanent cure for these current, necessary evils must be based upon reason, logic, knowledge and breadth of understanding, the recourse must be to education. Hysteria, prejudice, hatred, arbitrary doctrine and even impractical idealism can be worse than helplessness; regardless of intent they are frequently the cause of quarrel - never the cure!

A distinguishing phenomenon of latter day life is the speed of travel and communications, shattering distance and drawing the world together into a community of neighbors that found its time equivalents a century ago in the county or in the state. In such an increasingly constricted area and intimacy of relationship the effect of any significant action anywhere is almost immediate reaction elsewhere; we learn that everything we do in medicine, agriculture, chemistry, engineering and politics has some related, sometimes completely unexpected, result in another section of the globe. It is no longer sufficient to train individuals to expertness in specialized fields, the man and the world must be educated to a realization of inescapable relationships between all areas and all fields of human thought and effort. If those relationships are adjusted and developed in a spirit of cooperation and mutual helpfulness, we will see the dawn of civilization's most glorious era. To promote the

cooperative spirit there must be tolerance, patience and mutual effort at understanding basic traditions, philosophies and roots of fear. This is a mission of the educator. Persistence in the face of discouragement, even direct rebuff, and zeal equal to that of the crusader are essential ingredients to the whole.

As progress is made and mutual fears are replaced by mutual confidence, armaments will shrink in conformity. Finally, disarmament, which obviously cannot be unilateral, will come to be accepted as a universal aim - and rapidly thereafter will come the day when the world truly believes in future peace, and the soldier's skill and accomplishments will be important only to the historian.

Education, world-wide education, through schools, through the churches, the public press and radio, through the written and spoken word; education that must eventually surmount every barrier of language, geography or man-made obstruction is the main highway to this goal!

I, a simple soldier, have ventured to speak here of these things because of the earnestness of my conviction that schools must supplant armies, that right and justice must rule above force. I believe that if every soldier of democracy of World War II could stand here with me today he would join in saying – "Teach our sons that they live in one world, a world that can either be the home of prosperous and happy neighbors or the desolate cemetery of warring nation!" Soldiers and civilians alike realize that science has brought us to an age we call the atomic. We are on its threshhold and what it holds for us of good and evil is largely obscured from our vision. But plain it is that the world can have happiness and prosperity or it can have war and fear of war; it can be led by statesmen or by soldiers, not by both; it can have agitators or educators, it can be ruled by prejudice and passion or by logic and understanding. And Edinburgh University can help the world choose wisely.

Thank you again for an honor which I shall treasure to the end of my days.

• Response to toast to DDE's health, Edinburgh, Scotland, October 3, 1946

Less than two days ago, my family and I arrived in your country, at Prestwick, the airport known to many thousands of Americans as their wartime point of entry into the United Kingdom. In that forty eight hours this country has made us, virtual strangers in your midst, feel that here we are, nevertheless, at home. Though we may be woefully ignorant of your customs, traditions and even of important details of Scottish geography and history, yet by reason of your hospitality and the sincerity of your friendliness, we have experienced all those satisfying feelings that man has always associated with his own community and his own family. So numerous have been the tokens of your friendship and so generous your welcome that were we to assume for a single instant that you intended these purely as personal tributes, we could not, in all conscience, accept any one of them.

But we are happy and proud that in thus surrounding our visit with continuous evidence of your kindliness, you have given expression to something that is far deeper than any sentiment of admiration for individual accomplishment of personal regard. The heart-warming words of the Lord Provost mean much to us because they are a tribute to a friendship between two great nations that live by the same ideals of human rights. The extraordinary generosity of the Kennedy family and of the Scottish people, through the medium of the National Trust, in making it possible for my family and me always to be certain of a home among you is truly valuable because it symbolizes a basic kinship of peoples and their readiness to live together peaceably and in contentment. The action of this great capital in conferring upon me its gift of Freedom of the City and the great honor paid me by your world famed university are really priceless because they were inspired by our common pride in the selflessness and sacrifices of the Allied fighting men who so recently were striving in the Mediterranean and in Western Europe for the freedoms by which both your country and mine shall eternally live. When the Lord Lieutenant of Ayrshire, General Sir Charles Fergusson of Kilkerran, and the Secretary of State for Scotland, with representatives of your armed services, met my wife, my soldier son and myself at Prestwick, we were the more deeply touched by realizing that they did not come to do honor to an individual or to a family; fundamentally, they were paying tribute to the Allied Comradeships of World War II. Possibly, also, they were remembering the friendship that has existed between this Empire and my country for 140 years, in the conviction that such friendships are mightier than any Army, Navy or Air Force.

On the part of my family and myself, I assure you of our unwavering support of these sentiments, and we

are happy that we may, for this brief period, live among you in the hope of convincing you of the sincerity of our gratitude.

I am proud that in the latest war, in the defense of freedom, I was privileged to associate with the fighting men of Scotland and of this great Empire. In those days differences, natural differences based upon nationalism, were forgotten in our common devotion to the one great cause. The Allied crosses now standing in such tragic profusion throughout the world may differ in color or design but, wherever they are found, they are identical in their proof that free men will always die for freedom - but will go to war for no other purpose.

For all my wartime comrades, I hold the same feelings of admiration, affection and obligation as do their friends and neighbors within their own localities. Regardless of his race, his nationality or his creed, the Allied fighting man carried high the torch of liberty. To those of Scotland, of all the Empire, of America, and of all the other Allied nations that joined together to defeat those that sought to destroy freedom, all of us owe an everlasting debt. Each of us must do his share, each in his homeland, to see that there shall be no lack of care for the widow and the orphan of our fallen. We must see that there shall be accorded to each returned veteran full opportunity to realize again, in his own community, the full advantages of the system for which he fought. Particularly must we see that he is accorded full opportunity for realizing a normal family life; the sound Christian principle that the family is the basic unit of civilization is even more true than ever before!

Because of the feelings that my family and I hold in this regard, we are particularly happy that the home you have made available to us for possible future visits to your country, is only one of a group of such homes on the same family estate; all of them to be inhabited and enjoyed by veterans of your own blood and kin, men I hope to make my close and personal friends. We are especially pleased that Sir Iain Colquhoun and his associates of the National Trust, knowing the earnestness of our sentiments, have avoided elaborate modification of the apartment they and the Scottish people have provided for our use, thus assuring that there would be no interference with the great projects you have for assuring homes to all your own.

All that I am thus so feebly trying to say, I think was better said by a Scottish pipe major who came to our dinner table on our first evening in Culzean, to extend his welcome in the traditional playing of the pipes. When he paused in his music to drink a toast, he said, “May the friendship between your people and mine stand always as strong and steadfast as Ailsa Craig itself.”

Although my family and I find ourselves completely helpless I attempting to express to you the depth of our gratitude for your graciousness and hospitality, yet we pledge you that so often as it is possible for us to do so, we shall continue to return here to be inspired by the spirit that we know has motivated you in welcoming us - the spirit in which we trust the whole world may one day dwell.

My Lord Provost, again may I extend to you personally, as our host today, and as the representative of this beautiful city to which my family and I will henceforward consider that we partly belong, my profound thanks.

• Notes for Maybole Ceremony, Maybole, Scotland, October 5, 1946

I am delighted to meet you of Maybole today to begin an association that I know will be happy for my family and myself. It is a special honor to be welcomed into the community life of this village here in the country of Bobby Burns. I was born and raised in small towns of the prairie lands of the United States and I know that there is nothing impersonal about the relationships existing among the dwellers of the small community. It is the next thing to being accepted into the family itself, and I assure you that my wife, my son and I are exceedingly proud of your readiness to count us as part of Maybole.

I look forward to meeting and talking to the veterans with whom I served in World War II. They were part of those Scottish units that in numberless wars have established a soldierly record that was carried without blemish through the latest conflict.

My family and I will take special pleasure in discovering for ourselves many of the bits of loved ancient history that you know by heart. Centuries before my own home town of Abilene, Kansas, was more than an uncharted spot in an undiscovered continent, Maybole was an established community where men planned and worked, and were sending forth their sons to places beyond the seas to lend the vigor of their hands and brains to the building of the modern world. In America we count ourselves fortunate that a significant and valued

portion of our population has Scottish forbears. Good citizens and valiant protectors of their present home, they never fail to celebrate St. Andrews' Day, and in every way show their justifiable pride in the land from which they sprang. They take great pains to preserve the burr in their speech, to quote the poems of Bobby Burns and to remind us that the best of our music is but pail imitation of the beauties of the bagpipe.

Much of your blood flows in the veins of America, so from the beginning, my family and I cannot feel strangers to you. Add to this knowledge the warmth of the welcome and the wonderful hospitality extended to us by Lord Ailsa, by his family and by all of you, and you can see why we say, "We are proud and happy to be of you as well as with you."

(Note: These notes were merely referred to prior to giving speech.)

• Farewell message given to Scottish Office, October 9, 1946

Tonight marks the end of the first visit my family and I have been able to make to Culzean, the home that the Kennedy family and the Scottish Trust have made available for our occupancy here in the beautiful Carrick region. Everywhere, during our few days in this country, we have encountered only genuine hospitality and a gracious welcome. I have renewed valued wartime comradeships and all of us have formed new friendships. We should like all who have contributed to the enjoyment of our visit to know that we are deeply grateful and are already looking forward to our next opportunity to return here. Again I subscribe to the toast of the Scottish Pipe Major who said, "May the friendship between my country and America continue as strong and steadfast as Ailsa Craig."

• Address at Cambridge University Luncheon, October 11, 1946

During the war years I was associated, here in Britain, with you citizens in the free world's struggle against aggressors who threatened to enslave the race. The Allied Partnership of those years was for me a rich experience - and a most satisfying part of that experience was the knowledge that here I dwelt among people of courage and tenacity and of unswerving loyalty to the principles of justice and freedom. So long as I live, I shall cherish the comradeship with British fighting men and British civilians that was my wartime privilege. They gloriously proved, as their fathers and forefathers before them, the stamina of their stock.

But, happily for the world, the history of this nation is not a mere record of martial accomplishment. The bravery of the British people has been matched and surpassed by intellectual achievements and by unceasing efforts to expand the domain of man's knowledge. Your victories in war do not overshadow your conquests in the sciences of peace. And so this degree, joining me in a personal manner to your school - a major and continuing force in Britain's intellectual triumphs - has a particular significance and implies a type of compliment that not even the highest of military decorations can convey. Proud, indeed, I am to receive the honorary doctorate of Cambridge!

Universities are far more than shrines of learning and warehouses of knowledge. For many centuries they have been the source and origin of unquenchable fervor that compels us to search and work for a fuller life. They have pioneered in research, explored the recesses of matter and mind, taught their students to live by the external values of right and reason, and have frequently anticipated by decades and generations the slower evolution of the political world. All of them, with Cambridge still one of the leaders, fully gives to the world material accomplishments, inspiration and practical example in every field of human effort. Today, as we strive through the United Nations to bring men together into one world community with the high purpose of bettering man's lot and assuring him the blessing of peace, Cambridge can turn far back into its own history to give us a valuable example. Seven centuries ago when your "Nations" was a proved and functioning organization, Cambridge was, in miniature, but in a very real sense, a United Nations.

To this town journeyed students from all the countries of the known world, national and social differences ignored, prejudices forgotten in the common search for increased knowledge. Intellectual curiosity and hunger for learning bound them together. In their quest for truth and greater understanding, the men of Cambridge

recognized no bar of race or time. The philosophy of the Greek, the law of the Roman, the science of the Arab, the wisdom of the Hebrew, the wonders of the Orient, were all grist to their scholastic mill, welcomed and studied and sifted for the least contribution to thought. In their universe of knowledge they permitted no barriers to the free flow of learning and its interchange among men who sought it. There was a realistic conviction of mankind's essential unity and a clear realization that geographic differences of birth were nothing in the light of the oneness of common destiny. "Of one blood are all races of men" was for those students an accepted fact.

Unhappily the clear thinking of that earnest band did not gain the strength to defeat the blight of unrestrained sectionalism that thereafter spread through the world. But there is no need to assume that the victory of prejudice and hate and fear must be permanent. Thought these eternal enemies of peace and progress cannot be eliminated merely by taking thought or by pointing out their barren futility, yet why should schools despair of success in an undertaking which they once so nobly started?

All of us agree that war between your country and mine is unthinkable, if not, indeed, impossible. Yet we forget two wars and both of us fell heir to the prejudices and resentments that inescapably attach to any opponent in armed conflict. How, then, have we come so far that we cannot even visualize recurrence? The scholars of Britain and the United States, in their study of each other's institutions and customs, in their sympathetic appreciation of differences provoked by local needs, and in their presentation of what they learned to generations of students, have been builders of peace between us. Their penetrating awareness of fundamental purposes and goals has given to the two peoples an understanding of each other that can never be erased.

That mutual understanding is not a matter of a common language, though undoubtedly facilitated and strengthened by it. Possession of the same language, as we ourselves found out, is not a prevention of war. The roots of understanding are far deeper. We have learned that we are joined by common ideals, by the things that count.

Today it does not seem strange that twice, with the current century, we have staked our national lives against a common foe in defense of common beliefs and principles. Yet had anyone on either side of the war predicted such a partnership for us in 1914 and 1941, he would have been scorned if not stoned. Now, our friendship is rooted in mutual acceptance of an idea and not in a blood relationship or commercial barter quid pro quo. We believe that among nations, as among individual men, all - the weak as well as the strong - are entitled to redress of wrong by due process of law and arbitration. All these things we had to learn - we did not realize them in 1776 and 1812. Our scholars and our schools taught us - the hope is that the whole world may experience a similar enlightenment.

The alternative is a dismal, gray world where men are impelled, not by the higher civilized attributes that Cambridge has always stood for, but solely by the stench of fear and the primordial instinct for survival. If man is not to live by reason and logic and right, the race will perish.

No more fascinating age that this has been presented by the world to a new generation of men. Man has split the atom; he is about to travel faster than sound; he has designated an organization through which nations can, if they will, act in cooperative concert and so produce the fresh miracles that only unity can bring; ancient scourges of the body have been eliminated and more will soon be conquered, barriers, other than those that man erects himself - trembling before the assaults of science, distances shrink; by comparison with the ancients each of us is a Joshua in his enjoyment of time and a Marco Polo in his ability to wander where he will.

The only thing that can prevent today's infant from living in the Golden Age of history is faulty teaching. They must be taught what the students of Cambridge perceived so many centuries ago - what your country and mine have learned as between ourselves in the century following after 1812.

• Address at Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, New York City, October 27, 1946

Both the name of this Medal and the distinguished character of the group by which it is presented arouse in me feelings of the deepest satisfaction and pride.

You memorialize a great patriot in your name, a man who stood for all the sturdy virtues that have brought this country to a position of world leadership, without which the future would be indeed dark for our people and for all peoples.

It is high distinction to have one's name connected with the name of a man who lived to serve people - not to use them - a man who, throughout his life, fought that every citizen, regardless of race or creed or riches or poverty, should have access with all others to the privileges, the opportunities, the freedoms of American democracy.

He was a realist as well as an idealist, and he preached also that implicit in the privileges of American citizenship is an equal obligation to support and defend the system by which those privileges are accorded.

He clearly saw that, just as there can be no peace for any one nation in this world unless there is peace for all, there could be no prosperity and contentment for any single class or any single group in the United States unless it was for all.

He believed in Americanism - he believed in unity, and in those things are the strength of America, not merely in its military forces, naval, ground and air; it is in the heart of America and what it can do and what it will do for America.

An added factor in my pride and satisfaction this evening is that I am privileged to appear here along with one of the great songsters of our age, with two Admirals of the Fleet, who have spent their lives in the United States Naval Service. On this Navy Day I count myself fortunate that I can be on this platform with two men, who, by their leadership, have done so much to add fresh lustre to the great traditions of our great Naval Service.

Finally, I should say that a further cause for gratification on my part is that now, to some extent at least, my name is connected with all those who in past years have received the Medal of Honor from this great Association.

To enroll a soldier's name on that list does not necessarily signify personal achievement, but rather it constitutes a tribute to the armies that he has the right to represent.

To those soldiers who fought and won this war and brought to all of us the victory and the peace, my admiration, my devotion, and my gratitude are profound.

I feel certain tonight Theodore Roosevelt would have joined me in these sentiments, because he was akin to them in courage, in service to his country, and in his love for freedom.

Mr. Chairman, again I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

• Notes for Herald Tribune Forum, New York City, October 30, 1946

The United Nations fought the most costly war of all time in the hope that aggression and fear of aggression might be banished from the world. The alliance, in numbers and geographical extent and scope of agreement, exceeded any previous operational enterprise conducted by men. Battle reverses and disasters could not shake our unity; conflicts in strategic requirements could not defeat cooperation. Strength was pooled in a joint effort for victory and resources were banked in one trust for the speedy promotion of that end. Possibly it was only the basic instinct of self-preservation that made the wartime union so effective - but, at the very least, the experience proved that cooperative accomplishment among great nations remains in the realm of attainable objectives.

The treacherous attack at Pearl Harbor galvanized into action America's deep-rooted hatred of aggression in all its forms and manifestations. With our Allies we pledged to purge the world of Axis tyranny and enslavement, and having accomplished victory, tirelessly to seek a lasting peace.

The United Nations fulfilled the wartime phase of their pledge. They are now engaged in an enterprise aimed at liberating mankind from fear of war through the establishment of a world organization for peace. Their efforts are spurred by the realization that unless the world breaks away from traditional habits in the international field, humanity can look forward to nothing but suffering, impoverishment, and possible self-destruction.

Changing concepts in America's international responsibility and policy have an inescapable effect upon the Army. In certain inward aspects our Army does not and must never change. The basic tenets of the American soldier's creed, loyalty to country and faithfulness to duty, are inalterable. But though its spirit remains unchanged, the nature of important tasks given it by its master, the people, and its means and methods for their

performance never cease to change. These departures from traditional notions of the Army as nothing more than a combat arm of the Government are fully as profound as those changes in its composition, organization and armament which are constantly compelled by speeding science.

In planning to cooperate in the development of a peaceful world, our government has given the Army police and administrative tasks in conquered lands not normally considered within the scope of military responsibility in a democracy. I hope it is clear that the Army did not seek to become the governing body in any conquered land nor does it have any desire to retain such a task. Quite the contrary! But, in keeping with its tradition, it is carrying out that vitally important work faithfully and efficiently in response to the orders it receives from you, through your elected representatives. It feeds the hungry, clothes the naked, heals the sick, houses the homeless, educates the ignorant, strives to make possible the rebirth in a peaceful life of those who a short time ago were slaves of totalitarianism. The army is doing these things because our country believes that unless we give peace and democracy an opportunity to take root in fields where aggression has bred for generations, our victory in the second World War will turn to futile waste.

A few, possibly from sincere motives, allege that this Army is a disturbing element in the world scene, terming it a standing threat to other peoples. But the countries against which, it is hinted, our Army may be aimed, do not need intelligence sources to recognize the absurdity of such charges. Our forces at home are, by every possible standard of comparison in this troubled world, the merest nucleus for security. Our badly diminished forces in occupied territories are there solely to enable our nation to maintain tranquility and to fulfill its pledged part in the establishment of peaceful governments and economies. Throughout those territories our troops are so thinly stretched as to merit the continuing attention of each of you, lest weakness encourage defiance and invite unrest or uprising, which might set in motion a chain of circumstances with deplorable consequences.

The Army fully shares the yearning for peace of the earth's multitudes. But so long as there shall exist the possibility of attack from any quarter, it will never waver from its duty of standing as America's shield. On the other hand, the Army repudiates the defeatism that sees another world conflict as inescapable.

The distorted and tragically shortsighted judgment of those who speak of inevitable war is not accepted by men who endured four years of sacrifice, toil and danger. Neither is it shared by those who think in terms of war's ultimate desolation of civilization itself. If world order is worth struggling for, we do not advance the cause by predicting failure in advance.

There is no people in the world today that could profit by a global conflict, regardless of its outcome. There is no major government that can be blind to the risks of deliberate provocation to global war. There is no corner of the world where is not felt a desperate need for peace in which strained economies can be repaired, cultural processes revivified and living standards restored or bettered.

These things give hope and heart to those who work earnestly for lasting peace, but they do not mean that war cannot occur. Great tragedies do not spring out of logic and reason. We found in 1914 and again in 1939 that abuse of power, lack of restraint in its exercise, lust for its increase, breed war. We learned that, though the world's masses may recoil from the thought of war, wherever they are regimented, inarticulate or tragically misinformed, a mere miscalculation by a few officials of another's intent or strength can result in conflict. In many regions local passions, misguided fanatics and age-old prejudices can all bring about crises of the gravest kind.

The world organization is striving to develop machinery to control such dangerous outcroppings of human weakness and greed for power. Until that has been accomplished, demagoguery, fed on fear and hatred, can still bring misery to millions of weary people. While this situation endures, we must realistically face the need for military strength adequate to our times and our position. Every American, as well as the Army, owes first allegiance to our country. No crime could be greater than blind exposure of America's heritage to ruthless attack, merely because we hate war with a consuming hatred. To work for peace does not excuse you, or the Army, from the toil of assuring our own security.

The disputes that yet separate nations can hinder, but they must not prohibit attainment of the common goal of all peoples. If there is room in our own country for every shade of political and social and religious thinking and expression, there is room in the world for different philosophies of government, so long as none is dedicated to the forceful imposition of its political creed on others. Those who talk war as inevitable should

understand that the misgivings and fears they arouse, the uncertainty they provoke, can impede and halt universal development of peaceful relations, in which lies the only complete security. Prudence and realism are mandatory - but irrational fear, impossible of solution, is the first step toward collapse of all orderly effort among men and nations.

Cooperation can be established between peoples of divergent social and political beliefs if it is based on mutual respect and mutual understanding. Both of these are important, even though development of international understanding is not a direct responsibility of the Army, yet the effect of progress in this direction is so profound upon our security position, that the Army views with intense satisfaction every effort by individuals, and by private and public organizations of our country, to disseminate truth, to combat falsehood and promote international confidence based on knowledge.

In the degree of respect we enjoy in the world of today, the Army is a definite factor. It is a visible and convincing pledge that we will effectively foster freedom and oppose aggression wherever our influence extends. But the international respect we now have is not exclusively based on military readiness. It can be weakened, and even destroyed, if at home we permit our fundamental unity to be torn apart by pressure groups and selfish factions. The respect of others, and therefore our influence toward peace, will likewise be lost if we should now retreat from stout defense of the ideals for which we fought the war. Never must we become so weak, in any or all of those moral, military and industrial factors by which the world measures national vitality, that our ideals must be abandoned, our obligations unfulfilled and our peaceful efforts flaunted.

Our influence for freedom and peace throughout the world depends on the men and women of the United States, determined to fulfill their proper responsibilities. Only they can master the future, using the agencies of their government as the instruments of their will. The Army is only one, but a most important one, of those instruments. Its soldiers, whether they be privates or generals, kitchen police of general staff, are implements of the American people’s will.

Every man in the service is at his post to uphold the tenets and ideals of American democracy. All of them merit and need the intelligent interest and support of every citizen. Otherwise, there can be no success in the great program in which our Army plays such a critical role. The servant cannot succeed except in the measure of the master’s will. It is the glory of the Army and its proudest boast that it lives only to serve the nation.

• Address at Lafayette College, Easton, Pennsylvania, November 1, 1946

I feel a high sense of distinction in the great honor done me by your college. I accept it as a representative of the great Army that broke the Nazi stranglehold on Europe and, in the Pacific, redeemed our pledge to the heroes of Bataan and Corregidor. In the past year, that victorious Army has been largely demobilized and returned to civil life. At the same time there has been recruited a new Army intended for the maintenance of world peace and the effective execution of the international responsibilities assumed by the American people. We can now look back with satisfaction to the accomplishment of a demobilization second only in size to organizing for war and we look forward to the future with deep conviction that military weakness on our part must not again permit the fruits of victory to be lost.

Many of the problems encountered in the process of demobilization were previously met after the first World War. A distinguished alumnus of Lafayette College, General Peyton C. March, whose family for almost a century has been intimately associated with this school, blueprinted for us, then, the path to be followed and the mistakes to be avoided. He charted our demobilization procedure in his report to the Secretary of War, and, in reviewing the lessons of that conflict, he drew a conclusion whose general acceptance in this country could have diminished the possibility of a second World War within our time.

In 1919, General March wrote: “The position of this country has, in many important respects, undergone marked changes of far-reaching effect. Its geographic position, upon which it has long relied largely for its military defenses, may no longer be regarded as isolated from the military operations of any possible powerful enemy. Its present international position must be recognized as being attended by tremendously increased responsibilities.”

Unfortunately, my generation chose to ignore this warning. We resumed our faith in geographic immunity

behind the oceans that separated us from Europe and Asia, whittling the armed forces to a point one step removed from extinction. From the standpoint of national security, our choice was obviously hazardous and foolhardy. When war did come to us again, it took us two years to get our power mobilized while others bore the weight of battle.

But in the larger international sense, our impotence between the wars vitiated our influence abroad and was understandably seen as a symbol of isolationism and indifference to any except local interests. It was a renunciation that embittered many friends of democracy.

This time, however, our government has announced its determination to maintain the ideals and the peace for which 300,000 of our men perished in battle. It is a principal duty of your generation to support that determination and make it effective - for if the fearful tragedy of global war should again engulf us, you will pay the major portion of the price.

The present strength of our armed forces, reduced though it has been to a fraction of its wartime peak, is nevertheless one of our substantial pledges that the United States is prepared to guard its victory. But military strength is only part of - not even the most important part of - national strength in support of peace. If nations are to choose democracy voluntarily, they must see democracy work in its most prominent stronghold, with prosperity, security and justice for all, with respect for the will of the majority, but with the rights of every individual held sacred. These ends will be achieved only by essential unity among ourselves and with the people devoted to the nation's cause. On this point there must be no misunderstanding. As a leader toward peace in a free world our influence is measured in the demonstrated health of our country - its moral, industrial, social health. Whoever, out of immediate self-interest, damages that health is failing his country - he is hurting himself. The time has come when every significant action that any individual or group of individuals proposes should be gauged and measured in the light of their earnest consideration of national welfare. The opportunist thinks of "me and today" - the statesman thinks of "us and tomorrow."

There is no short cut or easy way to lasting peace. A staunch will and the strength to enforce it are demanded. The weak have no assurance of peace. They can only accept the future without influence upon it. But those who are strong, both in the justice of their cause and their resolve to defend it, can assist the world to freedom from war.

The obstacles, numerous though they are and often even honored as the heritage of centuries, are not beyond conquest. Man-made they can be removed by man, given the time, the will and the leadership. It will take a fixity of purpose equal to the indomitable resolution and fervor in the great heart of Lafayette, life-long champion of liberty among men and self-government among nations.

That illustrious soldier-statesman, to whom this college is the noblest of memorials, witnessed, as a young man scarcely out of his teens, the birth of democratic self-government on this continent and fought for its survival through a long and often hopeless war. He was convinced that only in elective government could men find satisfaction of their political needs. Before he died, Lafayette saw democracy gradually extended through a slow and painful process in which three steps forward were followed by two steps backward. But he retained his youthful zeal and never lost hope or courage. The rightness of his principle and the greatness of his goal inspired him to untiring effort.

Many of you who are students here today have already given years of your life in our latest struggle against tyranny by the few and enslavement of the many. You in your youth, like Lafayette, bore your share of mankind's burden and vindicated the faith that men, having once enjoyed the freedom of self-government, will defend their liberty to the utmost. To you I bring my special greetings and assurance of my lasting gratitude.

In the wave of cynical reaction that follows every war, some will be inclined to belittle your military accomplishments, likening the universal service for defense we freely imposed upon ourselves to the universal servitude for aggression imposed on the Axis peoples by their masters. Between the two, you will recognize a gulf as wide as that between liberty and bondage. Cynicism cannot debase the wartime record of American youth. But it can dull your zeal for the tasks that lie ahead unless you realize that the future of the world lies in the hands of youth. On you men, who are students today, depends the sort of world we shall have tomorrow, whether we shall continue to advance in the spirit of Lafayette, daring much and enduring much, that you and those who follow may possess a better life.

Our present effort to effect another fundamental change in human relations by the liberation of our world

from war and the fear of war is a natural extension of the democratic ideals. Equally worthy of every man's devotion, it has already been advanced some distance toward fulfillment. To those who cite two world wars within one generation as proof of war's inevitability, we need only remember that men of Lafayette's day could recall the time when minor boundary disputes set armies in motion and a question of lineage or family dynasty could engulf the world in war. We have made definite progress, but we have not yet reached the millennium when arbitration and reason will entirely replace force.

As leader within the community of nations on whose strength and guidance countless millions depend, the United States must not shirk its responsibilities, however onerous they may be. To falter in the course we have chosen, or to isolate ourselves once again, can well be the prelude to another world conflict. No other sequel is possible, should the United States, the earth's most powerful force for peace, abandon its present position. Into the vacuum will rush the same evil elements which nullified democracy's triumph in the first World War.

General March's warning 27 years ago is far more urgent today. Our geographical immunity has totally disappeared. Our responsibilities have multiplied. Both selfish interest and the world's future press us to a firm resolve that we shall never again through our apathy or weakness permit aggression another chance. We must remain strong and I do not mean strong in the narrow military sense! I mean the mental, moral and material unity of a nation! If we are ever to build a world peace, the time is now.

• Extemporaneous talk at alumni dinner, Lafayette College, November 1, 1946

If I may say to your first, sir, I thank you very sincerely and very humbly for a most beautiful tribute, one that I feel really belongs to three million men that brought back from Europe the victory that we are really still celebrating.

Whenever I open my mouth publicly in the presence of such a company of speakers as I have heard this evening, I cannot escape the feeling that I am akin to a man who was invited to a weekend party. He was a bridge player of the sort we call a "jackleg." He was very much of a dub, but there were three men there who were experts, and, perforce, he was drafted for a fourth. As the game went on he became very much interested in this thing. He wondered how he was doing. The thing became almost an obsession with him. He wiped his brow and fumbled around and kept wondering what did these experts think of his bridge. Finally it came his turn to deal. Unfortunately, he made an error, and the pack was not properly distributed. He heard one expert turn to the other and say, "The moron can't even deal!"

In this situation you can well understand how a man should long to have the wise-cracking ability of a Hope or the musical ability of your Glee Club or the silver tongue of the famous orator from the Platte, but it is rather human that men should wish to be some one other than who they are. For example, I have no doubt that there have been some of these late Saturday afternoons when Mr. Mylin could well have wished that he were somebody else! At the very least he would have wished, even in his own right, to have the ancient magic lamp and to have suddenly produced for the second half the reincarnation in their full physical bloom of a Heston and a Thorp and an Eckersall and a Heffelfinger, and show those so-and-so's what would happen!

However, this longing to be someone other than what we are is not quite universal. Of that I have proof. In my headquarters during the war came General Marshall one day. Aside entirely from his official rank, his great standing as a soldier and an American led us to do everything for him that we could possibly do. We showed him every honor, every courtesy that the exigencies of war would allow. Among other things, of course, there was a band to greet him and there were the motorcycles to escort him around, and we had our best-looking WAC driver driving his beautiful car and two orderlies in my headquarters happened to be watching the performance as he drove up to my office one day. One of these soldiers was just plain G.I. but the other one had gotten his first promotion. He had the single stripe of a Private First Class, and he had gotten very rank-conscious. They leaned on their brooms as General Marshall came us to the office, and the lower-ranking one said, "That's the kind of job to have in this war!"

The other one thought it over a bit and said, "I'm not so sure. I don't think so much of it."

This was astonishing to the first one, who said, "What's eating you? Why wouldn't you want a job like that - with a great big car, motorcycles, a beautiful gal driving you? Wouldn't you want such a job?"

The other fellow, examining the stripe on his sleeve said, “What chance has that guy got for promotion?”

Needless to say, to defend the caste system, we soon had to make that fellow a second lieutenant! We couldn’t have any soldier who didn’t have any bad word to say about the brass!

I am afraid, of course, by this time, that some of you people are thinking about the old advice of the lawyer who said, “When the facts are on your side, talk facts. If the law, talk law. If neither the facts nor the law, just talk.” Unfortunately, I have lost a bit of faith in this business of talking. While I have never favored talking Generals too much, this afternoon and this evening I have had a perfect example of how useless it all is. Those of you who were at the convocation this afternoon and had to listen to my wonderful opus, will remember that I pled for democracy. I believe in it fanatically and with all the words I could think of I preached its advantages.

But I come this evening to an alumni meeting of this college, of which I am now the newest graduate, and I am shocked to see that not only do we have one-party government, merely one slate of candidates presented, but the President himself reaches out in the audience, designates the man to make the nomination, and even when that man has forgotten one member that he shouldn’t he just calmly announced later that he was in power anyway!

As your very latest graduate, far be it from me to presume to ask why I may not put in a slate of my own. Far be it from me even to intimate I would like to vote No, but I would like, as the newest graduate, to have it recorded by the President that I did vote Yes. Let me say that much out of my democratic principles.

Before I sit down, gentlemen, I should like to say seriously this one word: It is my conviction that there is no agency or no institution of civilization that can do so much for the world today as its educational institutions - specifically its colleges, colleges that take the lead and set the pattern for our educational system.

We must teach understanding and knowledge of each other. Fears tend to disappear when we have eliminated ignorance of each other. Little boys are afraid of the dark and we are afraid of the unknown. I cheerfully and promptly admit there are conditions in the world today that make the attempt to exchange information and understanding a most difficult procedure. But whenever the educator or the leader in any walk of life becomes discouraged in front of the difficulties, the rebuffs - sometimes he considers them insults - let him remember to think of the problem in the terms of its terrible alternatives.

When anyone thinks of war with any complacency, with anything except the greatest revulsion of which he is capable, if he faces that on the one hand and on the other its demands of him in the ultimate in patience, in an attempt to understand, in good humor, everything that he has got in him, then I am certain which way he will go.

In this great business the colleges must teach us not only how to be skillful in our own professions, how to make more money than if we had not come to college; they must teach us how to live. The world needs to know how to live - how to live together.

So, because of this conviction about the mission of the college, its opportunity and its responsibility, whenever any college chooses to select me for an award of any of its degrees, I have an unusual thrill of pride. When this great and historic Lafayette College asked me to come here I accepted, as your President will tell you, promptly. He had to make only one visit to my office. I am proud to have my name associated with this college, and more especially this evening, after I have seen the enthusiasm, the obvious devotion of all of you men now of affairs of the world to your college, which means to me your devotion to the principles for which education should stand and is standing.

I say to you, I could not be prouder under any circumstances that I can think of. Thank you very much.

• Army Notre Dame Game Address, November 9, 1946

It is fortunate that Americans, in the midst of nagging concern over national and international problems, can witness or listen to a friendly contest such as we have here in the Yankee Stadium today.

Nothing will ever occur in my life that could surpass the heartening satisfaction of watching certain inherent qualities of American youth come to the surface under stress - whether it be in the grim compulsion of battle or in the friendly struggle of an athletic contest. They are the qualities of courage, stamina, resourcefulness and loyalty to the team that have, from generation to generation, enhanced our nation’s

greatness and shielded it against every attack.

These are national characteristics that must be fostered now and in the future. They are indispensable in the armed forces - need for them was never greater than it is today.

Like this football game, our tremendous national struggle that began in 1941 is not yet over. We have yet to finish the job. The Army has been charged with the critical task of occupation, which requires the maintenance of adequate strength here and abroad. We are striving to man this Army through voluntary enlistment.

I hope that young Americans will study this prospect carefully. At no former time has the Army offered such advantages in pay and retirement, such educational opportunities or variety of service. And, whatever your Army job may be, it will be a real and personal contribution to the welfare and security of our own great country and to the harmony and peace of all the world.

• Remarks to Advisory Council to Women's Interest Unit, Public Relations Division, Washington, DC, November 14, 1946

I have been told that you have already listened to four lectures and are scheduled for four this afternoon. I would like to make two points with respect to that. First, I am not going to deliver a lecture, and second, if anyone wants to get another cup of coffee, I will not only understand that but will applaud.

I think that to try to give a specific talk on War Department problems and Army difficulties, and so on - you will hear so much of that that you will be completely filled up, if not fed up - I should like to talk on a little broader line on what is this Army, what is it for, and what are we all as a body doing about it. In these days when people are gathered together with a serious purpose such as this body has, one of the first things that comes to our minds and must be discussed is the condition of the world. We find it psychologically and physically disrupted. We are very much concerned about the health of the world, and we are very fearful about that deterioration of health, psychological and physical, or call it economic or industrial, and political health, will degenerate to the point of real crisis, that is, war.

When you have these same conditions with respect to yourself, you call a doctor and you say, "Doctor, I have a pain in my chest," and you listen to him and talk to him. The doctor can do many things. He can give you medicine, but usually he takes the position of an adviser in a specialist and it is up to you to follow his regime that he lays down, to take his advice, and see whether it is good for you and follow it. He can't do it for you; he can't be with you every second and it becomes, in other words, your responsibility.

Now, the Army in its greatest role with respect to the population and the Congress and the President is nothing in the world but a doctor. It is your professional man that tells you in regard to certain international eventualities what could happen. What you might do. A regime to get you out of trouble, cure you if you do get into trouble, but generally speaking to prevent that trouble.

If we take this analogy which I admit is not too accurate, and push it a little further and let the crisis come on and you suddenly are rushed to the operating table, or the nation to war. Even in that instance, the Army or the fighting forces are not the whole show. In the most dangerous war in history that we have just completed, we have had a perfect example of the need for teamwork. The surgeon in the operating room is really a man who practices a certain skill for which he has been highly specialized. Someone had to provide the building in which he does his operating, someone had to provide the bandages, the nurses and his assistants and everything else to come to his aid. Someone made his instruments so that he is nothing but a particular part, but in this instance a very critical part, of the team that heals the body. Again in the case of war, that is exactly what the Army is.

The thing that is so encouraging to be about a meeting such as this is that it is either a conscious or unconscious manifestation of our need for cooperation.

Now, I will bring up another word - democracy. I don't know how you define democracy as we practice it, but to me it can be defined in one word, "cooperation." The democratic system is one that says we give to every individual the greatest freedom in the world. We believe that he is a dignified part of the universe, is endowed with certain inalienable rights and the only way, therefore, that we get him to team together to do a group job is through cooperation, and that cooperation comes about through the respect of the individual for the system of

which he is a part. This Army is only part of that system that you provide for and in which you live. This Army is of America, maintained by Americans, and its boss is you. No one else. It is you who gives it orders through the Congress and through the elected representatives you send to Washington. We do not make policies. We haven't a single thing to say as to whether we shall or shall not get into war. We are an operating agency and we do what we are told. If its function is to be a professional adviser as to what you should do in avoiding crises or how you should get out of a crisis, it also has a job of marshaling together those services such as the surgeon's and nurses, the hospital corps, and beds and buildings to take care of you in war, and if possible to extend himself into the field of preventive medicine so that you don't get sick. That is what we are doing. We are merely a part of the body politic that has been given in this age of specialization, a specialist job to do our part for the country. Nothing else.

I should like to point out the need for strength today as we struggle so earnestly toward peace. We believe that if we have any great war again, it will be between governmental systems; if we want to use a bigger word, ideologies. It is, therefore, to our benefit to get the greatest possible number of people in the world to believing in our ideology, our system - people that believe the individual is a dignified person who has certain rights before the law. In other words, put it this way, any nation that has and observes a bill of rights is a natural ally of ours. If we do believe any future war will be between governmental systems causing them to support that view, that would be the only reason for a global war. Can you imagine the United States going to war to determine whether or not the Standard Oil will have a greater share of the oil fields of Iran or Persia or some other foreign country or whether the Shell Oil Company will get them? We won't do it. The only time we will fight is when we believe the system in which we live has been endangered. How can it be endangered except by someone who believes in something else?

What we want to do is to be strong as an exponent of democracy, of the theory of cooperation, and that doesn't mean being strong merely in a military sense. I mean strong in our internal health, in our social, moral and economic position which is the true core of your strength anywhere. Unless we are strong before the world, why should Brazil or Argentina or Liberia want to follow our system? If we are crippled at home, if we are in bad health, if we can do nothing, if we can't promote the happiness of our own great population, if we can't promote the prosperity and happiness, which after all is the purpose of democracy and its true foundation, then why should they want it? Part of that strength and part of it only is your military strength. Until the day comes when we can persuade the nations of the world to abandon the stupid thing we call war, we have got to have part of that strength that says there may be no interference from without.

The nations of the world watch us to determine whether we are strong enough; at least this strong, so that we can think clearly at home. Anybody possessed by hysterical fear does not think clearly. Unless we have that amount of strength against external forces that give us a certain feeling of security, we will make foolish decisions. The man hysterically fearful either runs and a Munich results, or in his stupid belief that he can bluff the other fellow, he goes too far the other way. The strong man can go down the middle of the road. Someone once said the man who is sure of his footing doesn't have to mount a horse.

All the Army wants to do is to fit in its proper niche, in assuring to the United States that strength, that feeling of certainty that will allow it to assert its full influence in the leadership for peace, and any soldier who doesn't have as his ultimate ideal the development of conditions that put all soldiers out of a job is not fit to be a soldier in the American Army.

So I come back once more to what I see as the purpose of this meeting. It is to assure cooperation in a number of lines. I don't believe that any soldier should get up in front of you and merely plead for a strong Army. If he is talking to you about our need for men, he is merely taking a particular segment or section of our problem and trying to present that to you in how own particular field. Fundamentally, he is not pleading for a strong Army; he is pleading that the Army be given a chance to do merely its part in assuring the United States the security that it needs for clear thinking, and a position of leadership along with its other strengths, economic, industrial, social, and above all, moral strength that it needs to do its job in the world.

Just one word, a little bit more specifically about the Army. We do take your sons, and your brothers, and your friends, and relatives, and we do put them in the Army, and we need them. You will hear, or probably you have heard, all of our troubles with short-term men, and the great wastefulness of using 162-months men. I am not going to talk about that but to assure you of this: that the people leading the Army are just as concerned

about the 18-year old boy, the health of America, and the health of those boys - their moral, mental and physical health - as anyone else can be, short of that boy's own mother. If the Army is doing its job honestly along the lines I have indicated, it is just as concerned in sending back to the body politic a healthy, matured, fine youngster as anyone can be, because, as I say, our strength lies there; not merely in our guns, planes and tanks. So I want to assure you that so far as the conditions of the world today will allow, so far as our own human frailties can encompass those jobs, we are taking those boys with the utmost concern for their moral, mental and physical welfare, and with the utmost seriousness in the approach to this whole thing. We are not only trying to improve them but to send them back to you a better people. The Army, so far as it is able to do it, is guided today in all the great fields and problems by men who themselves have been in battle, have been in company with the fine young lads that have gone up there without the slightest quiver or hesitation and laid themselves down on the hills of Europe and Asia to stay there forever. Their respect for those boys is just as high as it can be and their concern for their country is just as high as it can be. There is no brass hat that I know of who is trying to keep any soldier in in order to keep some gilt on his own hat a little brighter. They don't have to care about that. I have had the most fantastic offers made for some of my men if I as commander would let them go. They are truly trying to handle these boys not only in the human way as you understand and as we understand humanity, but in order to give them a real job to do for the welfare of their country and to condition their minds to what this country has to meet in the future, until that happy day comes when all of us can take off these uniforms.

Q: What about the Army in relation to the atomic age?

DDE: The atomic age, let us say, has dawned. The effect of the atom bomb upon the Army in the future is something that no man can yet tell you, but it has gone this far with us that I have already directed that our so-called planning be divided into two sections. There is one planning section that I am breaking away completely - by the way, this has not yet been published - from all connections with current planning in terms of guns, tanks and planes, and divisions and ships or anything else. They are to go into a room by themselves and their only consultants are to be the scientists of the future, and they will do all of their planning in the realm of what you might call the super-blitz age. There is where they are going to live, and they are going to think in those terms. My hope is, of course, that there will be effective ways and means developed by which the atom bomb will be outlawed. Personally, I am concerned that the outlawing of the bomb means the outlawing of war, and I hope it comes around that way, but it is conceivable that for the beginning of war we might have an atom bomb outlawed and still war comes, so we have to have a solution for that.

With more specific implications for our present day armies, the atom bomb is not yet available to nations of the world in such quantities or in such scope that it would be a generally used weapon of war. That day will probably come unless the United Nations make some kind of progress. Then it is difficult to say what will happen, to what extent one nation could carry out destruction on another. It depends very often on the availability of raw materials or skill in making the bomb and speed in making the bomb. Please do not get the idea that two or three bombs would defeat the United States or anything larger than Honduras. One cannot think of destroying a country merely by a few little raids. Anyone who has been to Germany and seen the terrible number of literally destroyed cities realizes that is true. For the present, we have to take what is left from this war, think of its benefits in terms of making it more efficient as we go ahead, thinking of the time when war becomes less of a struggle between armed forces as we have understood them and merely a struggle in basic destruction. How fast can somebody destroy your centers of industry and population as compared with your possibilities to do the same thing. If they can have a flying bomb launched from Madrid to land in Chicago, it is absolutely impossible to stop it after it is launched, and it can only be stopped before it is launched. About all you can say is that for the moment the atom bomb is not an influence on the tactics of the battlefield as we fought the war in the Pacific and in Europe, but every day that goes ahead and somebody else is getting closer to the secrets we have and the same productive capacity, it is becoming more and more. I think war will become more of a struggle in basic destruction and endurance! The endurance of the kind that England had when it was hit with the blitz in 1940. That is when I believe that discipline among the whole population will be so

important. Because it will take tremendous fortitude and tremendous control to keep from yelling “uncle” right that second, and if you yell “uncle” you have said goodbye to your right to assemble in a meeting like this.

I admit that is a very poor dissertation on the atom bomb but nobody yet knows enough about the atom bomb and its possibility of destruction to make it much more accurately unless he is kidding the planners.

Q: How can we go back and impress the women of their individual responsibility to support this democracy?

DDE: Personally, I think no person is a good citizen of the United States until he has correlated in his own mind privileges and responsibilities. As I see it, liberty which we pride can be destroyed in either one of two extremes; license on the one hand, and neglect on the other. If you are going to enjoy the privilege of getting on the train and going wherever you want, it is up to you to say, “How do I retain it for myself and for my children?” I believe if I were given the job of presenting ideas of this kind to my associates and my neighbors, I would constantly keep stressing that democracy is cooperation; that when we work together, we tend to see the other fellow’s viewpoint, but we both see we must work toward our objective measured by the index of how good it is for the country. If it isn’t good for the country, it isn’t good for the system by which we live and therefore it is out. Of course, I couldn’t possibly give specific advice on how that job is to be met, but I do know this: if we awaken in everybody in the United States the need to cooperate, and look at these things in the light of the privileges and rights and opportunities we have enjoyed, we can’t go far wrong. I believe we can’t go far wrong.

• Notes for address at CIO convention, Atlantic City, New Jersey, November 20, 1946

The invitation from your President to appear before this body gave me a feeling of unusual satisfaction. Not only do you represent a vitally important segment of our nation, but this occasion gives me still another opportunity to pay personal tribute to the soldier-worker partnership that was so effective in bringing America victorious through a ghastly war.

The mainspring of our offensive power was gallantry supported by a weight of shell and bomb that ground down and pulverized the enemy. When the chips were down, we could always count upon an ample supply of material means, provided by the American arsenal. You manned the nation’s war plants; you bridged the oceans with Liberty and Victory ships whose clattering winches spelled out enemy defeat; you saw to it that the cost of victory in American blood was reduced by the sweat of American labor. When great emergency demanded special effort, time and time again our unions loyally responded. American labor rightly shares in the laurels won by American troops on the battlefield.

There is no need for me to expound upon the importance of American labor to our position before the world, and to our own future happiness and prosperity. Nor need I extol the benefits that have been brought to the American working people during recent decades by labor organizations. Men of my generation, familiar in their youth with the specter of insecurity that haunted many a family whose meager shelter and clothing and food depended on the father’s prolonged hours of toil and sometimes miserably small pay, are living witnesses of what has been accomplished. My own work-week during the year before I entered the Army in 1911 was 84 hours.

This progress has been possible because we live under a free system. Moreover, a practical result of this progress has been to enhance the enjoyment by the average American citizen of the rights, opportunities and freedoms which, under the Constitution, have been for a century and a half legally and properly his. These freedoms, rights, and opportunities are the core of our American way of life; in the measure that all of us are determined to continue in their possession, each will accept personal responsibility to preserve them against threat from without and obstruction from within.

Security against threat from without is fundamentally the task of the soldier. Clearly, however, the most certain and satisfactory insurance against outside interference lies in the perfecting of international agreements and organizations having as their purpose the abolition of war. For that reason we owe unstinted support to the

United Nations Organization. Selfish interest - as well as altruistic impulse - dictate unswerving devotion to the cause of permanent peace, and its promise of universal disarmament. If our American democracy is proved workable despite our differences of race, religion, origin, and group objectives, surely it can be made to work among nations of differing governmental systems, provided there is mutual respect and understanding. The sole restrictive principle is that no nation shall seek to impose by force or threat its own system upon another. I cannot forget that twice during our lifetime major powers of diverse races, creeds, color, and aims have been allied against a human foe. Surely, in this fact we can find another hope for peace-time collaboration.

The United States must forever stand in the forefront of those that strive for the common objective - nothing must deter us from advancing the day when mutual respect will replace mutual prejudice in international relations; when mutual confidence will replace mutual fear. When that day comes the soldiers' task will be completed. Until that day, his readiness to discharge his obligations to the nation is a matter of deepest concern to all of us.

I have not come here to urge on you the support of a great Army. Rather am I concerned for the vital tasks that you, the people, have given us. I tell you frankly that to me it is a tragedy that the human family still finds it necessary to devote so much of its toil and resources to guard against the possibility of interference by one or another of its members. But until all nations abandon force as a medium of international policy, common sense and experience demand that we maintain a protective shield adequate to our needs; my hope is that each succeeding year will see these needs diminish.

Our immediate requirements in manpower reflect the urgency of the unfinished tasks of World War II. Today, by every standard of measurement based upon geographic area, national welfare, population, and the responsibilities which we have assumed before the world in the interest of permanent peace, our Army has been gauged at the lowest possible level. Our forces of occupation have been so scaled down that we are seriously stretching their ability to carry out the commitments which our leaders have made with our Allies. Yet it is their job to see to it that the last spark of militarism among our defeated enemies is forever stamped out, and to lend a helping hand in the slow, difficult task of setting up new social and political economies. In those occupation forces no man's task primarily concerns our national security. Their sole purpose is to carry out the United Nations' policy toward recently subdued enemy populations. To reduce them further is to invite unrest, even defiance, with new challenges to the peace for which we are striving.

To man the strategic outposts of America - some of which your sons and brothers won back from the enemy by blood and sweat - we need garrisons. We need a reasonably-sized air force. We must maintain a small ground contingent to meet our obligations to the United Nations organization. We need other men to keep all these forces supplied, replenished, and healthy. To meet all these requirements for both ground and air forces, our so-called "Interim Army" is rapidly scaling down to a strength of 1,070,000. Under conditions as they are today, failure to provide enough is not economy - it is recklessness which we cannot afford.

I do not mean to stress the subject of war. Particularly do I deplore talk about the inevitability of war. Such talk smacks of the Hitler technique that brought the world to sorrow and his country to ruin. It produces hysterics - and no man, no nation ever acted or thought wisely in the grip of hysterical fear. But I would be failing in my duty were I to disregard our own bitter disillusionment since 1917 and our need to assume the great burdens that realistic appreciation of conditions forces upon us.

One of our present difficulties is that, because of the short term periods of service which Congress recently found it necessary to authorize, we have a turnover of well over 40% per annum. You, as leaders of labor, realize the inefficiency that this heavy turnover represents. As you would expect, these short-term enlistments are proving unreasonably expensive due to the large proportion of the individual's service that is spent in elementary training, in transit overseas and in terminal leave; moreover, they swell the veteran's rolls disproportionately to the service they have rendered. Their efficiency is relatively low. Our aim is, then, to procure three-year voluntary enlistments. I'll appreciate your help in this continuing effort toward efficiency and economy.

Relating to our current problem but with answers not necessarily the same is that continuing one, in the immeasurable future, of national security. Some have expressed a reluctance to support a national security program, alleging that soldiers might be used as agents of some aspiring dictator in oppressing the people. However justified such a fear might have been elsewhere, the record in this country since 1775 clearly reduces

it to the ridiculous. American soldiers have died in many lands to defend the freedom we prize - we, the living, strive to serve the real commander of the American Army, the people themselves. Your sons and relatives and friends make up the Army, and, as citizens you issue its orders through the congress you elect. It is your Army and no one else's - and the strength and composition of the defense forces that are to be put around you and your children are matters that call for your unflagging interest. It is up to you to see that these forces are no larger than necessity demands, that they cost you no dollar beyond the minimum requirement. But in discharging this duty it is equally your responsibility to weigh all of the factors in the problem in which your lives, your fortunes and your liberties could eventually be the stake.

I do not want to leave unchallenged the bugaboo so often used by ignorance or prejudice, that military training results in harm to the individual. The records of every university in the land demonstrate the contrary. Not only are veterans proving the natural leaders of their classes, scholastically also they are establishing a record whose excellence amazes every experienced educator. The average man benefits from military training, and should there be raised the old bogey of "regimentation of the mind," I ask you to look at the veterans among your own ranks to see whether you can find any evidence of it. The average veteran has developed in leadership, in initiative, in mental maturity and in self-reliance by reason of his service. The medical check-up and his physical hardening incident to his duty are positive assets. He is a better citizen because he has borne his part in defending all citizens, and because he did so in a crisis that demanded full play for the best of man's virtues. It is my earnest conviction that until concerted disarmament is an accomplished fact, the security of our country as well as the individual's chances in the deplorable event of another war demand some degree of military training of all our young men. Without training the individual is useless in helping defend the nation - and if thrown into modern battle his chances of survival are meager.

I ask you to believe this of me: When I recommend to my civilian superiors and to the Congress the requirements of military preparation, I am thinking only of one objective - the continued opportunity of your and my sons, and their sons, and all that may come after them, to live under the same rights, the same type of government, that we ourselves have enjoyed. Every man who is now carrying a gun, I would far rather see, if it were possible, driving a plow, mining coal, healing the sick, or working at an enterprise of productive value to the nation. This includes myself!

It is proper to emphasize, however, that national strength, even in the military sense, is not founded exclusively, or even principally, upon ships and airplanes and guns and soldiers. Rather it is based upon the country's productive capacity, which in turn, and apart from availability of material resources, is shaped by the unified purposes of our people. National solidarity is a requisite for national security.

The security of our nation and of our personal liberties is, when analyzed, the resultant of 140,000,000 determined wills that, come what may, this security shall not be impaired. When, if ever, any significant portion of our population renounces the system that assures freedom without anarchy, justice without coercion, then our security will be lost from within. If any large section falters in the discharge of its responsibilities to the nation's security, then we become easy prey to a threat from without. So, while the uniformed member of the soldier-worker team provides our protective shield, the worker has an equal responsibility for insuring internal health and social, economic, moral strength. Any symptoms of collapse in this basic structure instantly attract aggravation. Liberty can find destruction in either of two extremes - license on the one hand, neglect on the other.

I venture to dwell upon this relationship between worker and soldier because of my rooted belief in our democratic way of life. We enjoy it because our fathers, through suffering, privation and courage, established it as the basis of American Government. It insures our right to meet here together; to express our individual views; to work in a calling of our own choosing; to worship our God according to our own consciences. The basic justification of the United States Army is your determination and mine that we shall live undisturbed in that democracy. And as by universal accord the risks of disturbance from without subside, so can our nation dispense with its armed forces and devote all its energies to a richer harvest. The fact that you have asked me, a soldier, in time of peace, to express my views to you is evidence that you recognize our essential partnership and its implications. It means, I hope, that you realize that the responsibilities of organized labor extend beyond the limited objectives with which it is commonly identified. Rather they extend over the entire field of national welfare.

We have demonstrated that our system of free enterprise, run by free people, can outproduce by a wide margin any other economic system. Germany was equipped with the industrial plant, the scientific talent, the inventive genius calculated to dominate the world. But enslaved labor, regimented farmers, chained management proved to be no match in the emergency of total war, for free labor, free agriculture and free management. Victory was the payoff for freedom. Out of freedom was born the creative capacity to overcome every obstacle that confronted us.

Creative capacity is more than the mere foundation of our own national security. It is, today, a major factor for peace. The whole world is eager for the tools and tractors you produce. Hunger and want are the deadly foes of peace. At this moment there is need for the wealth of your production lines that ease and expand the business of living, that increase the productiveness of the earth. The steady hum of your industrial plants and the flow of your products to empty markets are as important to good order in the world as they are to our own prosperity and strength.

The continuing efforts of organized labor to bring the good things of our country's production to the hands and homes of those of our own people who work at their creation call for every encouragement. As long as these efforts are in harmony with our national welfare every citizen must applaud. A prosperous virile citizenry is both the purpose and the strength of democracy. So if the United States of America is to retain and enhance the effectiveness of its leadership in the new venture toward international harmony, we must, first of all, stand before the world as a shining example of the superior advantages of self-government - the social, economic and moral advantages. We cannot expect the world to show great interest in a cooperative international mechanism unless cooperative effort, which is the essence of our democracy, is successfully practiced in the homeland of its principal exponent. To maintain our national health, all groups that make up our nation must be united in their willingness to give and take for the common good.

Beyond our own frontiers or government seeks to extend these basic tenets of democracy to our dealings with other nations. We who have lived by these principles know them to be the best foundation for a just and permanent peace, the only security which is absolute. Strong in the knowledge of a united, purposeful nation at its back, your Army can protect your way of life, and fulfill its part of the mission in ensuring an enduring peace.

Let me repeat - unless we perfect our cooperative method to sustain prosperity for 140 million people here at home, unless every one of us, every group of us, weighs every action in the scale of national welfare, then the foundation stones of our security will crumble and vanish.

But if we truly practice cooperation, then the every increasing virility and productiveness of America will not only make certain of the soundness of our shield, but will help to lead the world along the cooperative path that penetrates forever deeper into fruitful fields of human happiness and contentment.

• Address to Economic Club of New York, Hotel Astor, November 20, 1946

Today is one of unique experience for me. This afternoon I fulfilled an engagement to speak before the national convention of the C.I.O. at Atlantic City. This evening I meet with a group of men who, I suspect from a reading of the roster, have in their control a measure of the finances and the industry of this country that for a simple soldier is incalculable. I deem it a great honor not only to meet here with you but because I met with that other great segment of America this afternoon, a group representing millions of the laboring men of the United States.

Just as any general, no matter if he has the brilliance of Napoleon and Caesar and Frederick wrapped all within himself, can win no slight skirmish without the fighters, so all your brains and all your wealth cannot produce a bushel of corn unless there are hands to do it.

I would not have the courage to appear before this body this evening except for one reason. I am a zealot in the cause of democracy, and I believe that democracy, if we have to define it in one word, we must use the word, "cooperation."

Woodrow Wilson said, "The highest form of efficiency is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people." And we proved that in war. We proved that this country, with free management, free labor, free enterprise, free

farmers could take a country like Germany, that had regimented personnel in every single activity - if they didn't acquiesce cheerfully they did so at the point of the bayonet or of the pistol - and we could utterly destroy it. There is nothing that the United States cannot do if every single man in it, capitalist and laborer, government and the people that are governed, put their hearts into that thing.

I believe that every right-thinking American today is more concerned with the perpetuation of the fundamentals of the system that has made this country great than any other single thing. And he must go back, if he is going to be useful in that crusade, to analyze carefully what we have done in the past. And always he will find that it has been cooperation, not fighting among ourselves, not refusing to see the other fellow's viewpoint; it has been a group effort, freely undertaken, that has produced the things of which we are so proud and which are represented in what we call today the American way of life.

I have heard people say that the cooperation achieved among Allies in the last war was merely the result of a common facing of a deadly enemy; that the basic instinct of self-preservation forced us to stay together. But we did stay together. Therefore, it is possible.

The cooperation that has made America great at home can be applied, if we work hard enough at it, to the whole world. If diverse creeds, races, colors, group objectives can be sufficiently correlated here at home that we have become the greatest and mightiest nation of the earth, then the fundamentals of that system an be extended to the earth, and we will realize that there is room for different systems of government provided only there is mutual respect and tolerance, and provided, always, and provided necessarily that no single one of these governments attempts to impose its system on any other, no matter what the means they may use.

We have gathered together this evening to hear two men who are going to dwell upon subjects that are unquestionably close to the hearts of men concerned in the political and social economics of America. You understand that I am simply an added feature run-in here, possibly to take up time.

But what I should like to say is this: No matter what they tell us, no matter how much we hear, no matter how much our minds are clarified, we have not done our duty merely by clarifying our own minds and being sure of what is the right thing. Christianity did not spread with our crusaders. There were apostles, there were men who carried the faith. It has been the same with all the other great religions. If you do learn, if you have any reason to believe that you understand something of the cross-currents that are sweeping our country today, and which cause us often great concern as to the future, whether it be of one year or of twenty years, then you have not discharged your duty until you exercise the full measure of the leadership that is given you by reason of your full understanding, and you become crusaders to spread that truth. You cannot sit down and do anything.

Shortly after we had finished the Tunisian campaign, and a tremendous bag of Axis prisoners were in our hands, a group of Allied officers visited my headquarters. They were getting ready to set up on other corners of the world a command something like that then existing in the Mediterranean, and they wanted the secret of Allied success. They insisted upon charts. They wanted to see where the black lines went and where the dotted lines went. They wanted descriptions of the organization. They wanted the charter by which we operated. And it was all very difficult, because cooperative effort is based upon mutual confidence and mutual understanding.

There is no charter, no laws, no anything else that can make this country work except a realization on the part of all of us that all of us are a part of it, and each must do his share. Finally, my answer to these people was this: "You sit down across the table to work on a problem concerning the war with your opposite number - French or British or Polish or what have you." I said: "Ordinarily we sit down in this spirit. I have got something to do here, and I wonder what that so-and-so across the table is going to do to prevent me, and how can I get out of it." If you sit down to the table and say: "That fellow across the table is trying to win this war, and I wonder what I can do to help," there will never be any difficulty in Allied cooperation, and your command has set up itself.

In my talk this afternoon to the C.I.O., which was a prepared one, I plead for only one thing - cooperation - because cooperation will make this country great. All of the things in which I am concerned, the security against external threat, the safety of this nation depends absolutely upon a solid nation behind it. Guns and tanks and planes are nothing unless there is a solid spirit, a solid heart, and great productiveness behind it. The productiveness of this nation is important in more than just to make us strong, as we deserve to be strong; it is one of the greatest elements in the campaign for peace today that you can imagine. Hunger and want are the

deadliest fears of peace. If the productiveness of our farms and of our factories will roll off to ourselves and to the people across the world, the path of permanent peace will be much easier. That is what all of us must understand, and it is what I told them. I should like to leave that one word with you.

Gentlemen, for any man to receive here the commendation given to me by your President, and the scroll of this great body is an honor which he cannot ever forget. I assure you it will be one of the treasured evenings of my life, and will always live in my memory. Thank you.

• Notes for talk to state directors of Selective Service System, Washington, DC. November 21, 1946

When it was suggested by General Hershey that I meet with the State Directors of the Selective Service System, I accepted with alacrity. Long wanted to express appreciation in person.

Six years ago you were feeling your way in the first call for men.

The success which attended your effort from the first is tribute to men who conceived the plan and to the skilled administrators in State Headquarters who instructed, trained and inspired the scores of thousands who carried them out.

As a citizen I am proud of the record, as a soldier I am proud of the contribution of the soldiers who had a part in it.

In a highly complex economy it is not possible for each individual to determine where and how he can best serve. People abhor dictators but accept majority will. Record of Selective Service is proof.

The system based on principle that each shall serve as determined by jury of neighbors.

Guided by this principle, Selective Service made possible mobilization of largest military force in our history. Registered more than 45 million, classified 33 million, furnished in excess of 10 million to armed forces.

Beyond its specialized task, it stimulated the enlistment of almost 5 million men - and played an efficient part in maintenance of industrial production's force.

The end of war did not end your mission. We must be strong.

The Army required for enforcement of peace and maintenance of national security will number 1,070,000 as of July 1, 1947. Will use Selective Service only when necessary.

The advantages of volunteer force is obvious.

During the six month period ending in October, enlistments were at fairly steady weekly average of 10,000 except last week in June and two weeks prior to Oct. 7.

We who are charged with effective planning for national security have one basic mandate - we must build on a reasonable foundation of realism.

As of now we have been unable to decide whether or not the War Department should seek an extension of Selective Service for recruitment of the interim Army.

While the G.I. Bill of Rights still continues, the amount of benefits to be derived from it depends on the end of the national emergency.

Over and above our immediate concern with the interim Army, we who are charged with the national security are committed to the support of a realistic program of military preparedness, based on a well-trained and technically proficient Regular Army, a system of U.M.T., and an Organized Reserve and National Guard which will utilize the trained manpower produced by U.M.T.

For this program - if it is approved by the Congress - the continuation or adaptation of the Selective Service machinery is essential.

The soundness of the Selective Service System's organization and administration has been demonstrated. Unwise to discard it too soon.

• Notes for address to Industrial Associations, Chicago, Illinois, January 17, 1947

My predecessor, General Marshall, summed up the American record of World War II - the months of

tragedy and defeat after Pearl Harbor, our initial offenses, the final period when we controlled the skies and the sea and no army could successfully oppose us - he summed up our conversion of disaster into triumph when he said: “The vastly superior industrial establishment of the United States eventually overcame the initial advantage of the enemy...and we dared to mount operations all over the world with a strategic inferiority in number of troops...through superiority in mobility and firepower.”

Aware, as only a man in his position could be, that American victory was primarily the product of American battlefield spirit and courage; deeply conscious of the debt the free world owed the fighting men of the United Nations, General Marshall was still moved to pay this high tribute to American industry. While some of our Allies were compelled to throw up a wall of flesh and blood as their chief defense against the aggressors’ onslaught, we were able to use machines and technology to save lives. The miracle of American war production confounded our enemies and astounded our friends. It is a distinct honor for any soldier to appear before a group that represents so well and so comprehensively the management sector of this great industrial plant.

The Army is proud of its rapid mobilization for war, but industry had to expand in at least the same ratio, and under handicaps at least as baffling. The armed forces and governmental machinery absorbed from industry much of the best managerial ability and millions of skilled workers. Management was forced to deliver more and more with less and less - and did not fail to do so. Minds whetted to razor sharpness by the competitive struggles of peace found ways to slice through obstacles; eyes trained to anticipate sudden shifts in market requirements discovered shortcuts in war that saved precious days between the drawingboard and the battlefield. The American industrial fabric, ingenuity and skills, developed through the ceaseless interplay of the competitive forces in the free enterprise system, paid off a thousand times over in time gained and lives saved. Our clear-cut victory over the totalitarian nations is a ringing vindication of the American way of life; when the chips were down, democracy and free enterprise could not be matched by regimentation.

Present and future security demands now press us for solution. Just as victory could not have been won without your contribution, peaceful security cannot be maintained without your active cooperation as a member of the national team. Our strength for the enforcement of peace is not measured in population - there are nations that far exceed us in numbers. Nor does it spring from our wealth in natural resources - the undeveloped riches of others surpass what we have left after the lavish consumption of a century. But no nation, or entire continent for that matter, approaches the output of the American productive plant or the brains that guide and the skills that man it.

That was proved in 1917-1918 when Mr. Baruch and his associates directed the industrial establishment in World War I. Fortunately for the country that had to fight a second and greater World War a quarter-century later, the production lessons then learned were not entirely forgotten in the general neglect of military matters in the years that followed. The centralized control agencies for industrial mobilization, as finally evolved in World War II, took shape from those planned in the ‘30s by the Army-Navy Munitions Board under the tutelage and guidance of American industrial leaders. Despite the handicaps of fatuous complacency and short-sighted parsimony in the twenties and thirties, our planners evolved the concepts which, with necessary modifications, became the basis of our war production program in our hour of greatest need.

The foresighted patriots, both civilian and military, who worked on those plans between wars founded the Army Industrial College where many of our officers obtained their first concept of the magnitude and complexity of the problems of converting industrial potential into military power. In its progressive revisions, the industrial mobilization plan prepared by the Industrial College assisted by many of the nation’s production experts, forecast the shape of our later organizational requirements with remarkable accuracy.

The Army Industrial College stemmed from the Army’s awareness, after the experience of the first World War, that the Nation’s military establishment included merely a part of the comprehensive talents and techniques essential to defense and security. It provided a practical approach to increased coordination between the military and industrial members of the team.

Today a more extensive effort is required. The vital task of reviewing and analyzing the results of our production experience in World War II is already well begun. You have heard from members of the War Department staff something of our studies thus far and some of the conclusions drawn from them. You may be sure that those of us concerned with military planning will continuously re-examine and revise our estimates. Modern warfare is anything but static; it is dynamic to the Nth degree, and he who relies complacently upon the

weapons and methods of today may find himself suddenly overpowered by the super-weapons and bolder systems of tomorrow. Now while the memory is still fresh, we must project the lessons of experience into realms where only the boldness of the scientist can chart a reasonable course.

We depend for our military strength on a citizen army, and for our material power on a civilian economy. Both proved their worth in the decisive test. But the integration of our military power with our total national resources was not effected without strain, and not a little confusion. The whole complicated process by which the right weapons were delivered in ample time at the chosen place did not develop spontaneously at the rubbing of a magician's lamp. Considerable sweat went into the process - along with a liberal expenditure of midnight oil in Washington and Detroit, in Hanford, Oak Ridge and towns that had not existed in 1940.

The relentless pressure of war - the desperateness of our early position and our insistence on victory no less than total - compelled and enforced close cooperation between industry and the armed forces. None of us, whether we wore uniforms or business suits or overalls, was laggard in seeking and giving aid toward the common goal. Peacetime, however, and the return to normal activity involves divergence of interests and associations. The Army is no longer the major consumer of the tremendous production of industry, and the production lines that a few years ago were fabricating the enemies' destruction are now devoted to the enrichment of life. We cannot, however, permit a wall of preoccupation with the pursuits of a still unquiet peace to separate industry from the armed forces. Above all we cannot permit complacency or an "atomic bomb mentality" - a possible modern counterpart of the "Maginot Line mentality" - to lull us into another postwar apathy.

The muzzle velocity of war has increased in geometric progression from the musket to the rocket. The time interval between the initial assault and a crippled nation has been narrowed by every improvement in offensive weapons. An incontestable conclusion that emerges from World War II is that modern wars are fought with the concerted strength of whole nations, and that the integration of our national economy into an effective security machine must be accomplished - in thought and in plan - before an emergency occurs. The responsibility for achieving this purpose rests with all of us - in solving the problem your role is a vital one. The armed forces must bring forward the fruits of their own studies and experiences, they must act as recorders of the combined results achieved, they must advise our lawmakers and civilian officials of the changing requirements thus unfolded - but the whole task must be shared by all our productive facilities and all instrumentalities of government.

More than two-thirds of the research and development funds obligated by the Army during the current Fiscal Year were expended through civilian contracts. More than 80% of the dollar value of these contracts is with industrial establishments and the remainder is with educational institutions and foundations. In almost every case, pure research contracts were made in continuation of work placed with these industries and institutions by the Office of Scientific Research and Development. The War Department depends with confidence upon these industrial establishments and universities to get maximum results from the expenditure of these funds, to keep this country at least abreast of similar activity in every part of the world; and the War Department supports with its full strength the centralized Intelligence Agency which has as one of its functions the task of keeping us all informed of progress elsewhere.

Military planners must be quick and sure in selecting and applying correctly new principles, new discoveries and new inventions to military use. To make certain that our thinking does not become obsolescent we have set up a separate planning staff, completely divorced from current responsibilities and preoccupations. That staff will seek advice from one principal source, the scientists of America. Thus we hope that as we meet and solve the problems of today we shall be constantly alert to the possibilities of the laboratory to add to or even to revolutionize tactical power. In this way we strive to avoid a surprise beside which the results of the surprise at Pearl Harbor would pale into insignificance.

Because we feel the urgent necessity of assuring this country's safety against any conceivable aggression does not mean that we are pessimistic as to the future of world collaboration. To the contrary, the Army, along with all others who understand the basic futility and stupidity of war, believe that only through success in international cooperation is there any absolute security for us and for all nations. We believe that enlightened self-interest urges us forever to seek and support agreements whose universal acceptance will one day eliminate the need for armed forces. Attainment of no other goal would add so much to the tranquility and prosperity of

all mankind.

Until that goal is achieved we further believe that our country must remain strong, strong in its alertness to the realities of today, strong in all phases and elements of its great productive capacity, and strong in the certainty that it can rapidly transform its integrated moral, mental and material strength into a machine that can meet the requirements of modern conflict. With such a strength and such motives we will, while assuring our own safety, be best able to contribute to progress toward the certainty that world order and world cooperation shall supplant the conflicts and bloody wars that have for ages been the inescapable burden of mankind.

Today the mission of safeguarding the national security is more exacting and challenging than ever. We cannot do the job alone; we need the help of all the people, yours especially. Your experience, your potentialities, your constant support, your coordinated devotion, are all indispensable. And all of us can render this service to America in the firm conviction that by so doing we are advancing the day when the fruits of all men's efforts may be devoted exclusively to the betterment of man's lot.

• U.S. Conference of Mayors, Washington, DC, January 20, 1947

About a year ago - a year ago last June - I was ordered home suddenly for a visit to the States, and I was authorized to bring with me certain subordinates, including enlisted men. One of the men who rode with me in my plane was a paratrooper, and our first stop was at an airfield in the Azores. We had a very nice time with him and listened to his experiences on the way - everybody liked the fellow - and about fifteen or twenty minutes before landing we started to circle. He showed great excitement; he jumped up and he ran around to the various portholes and looked out, and then said he wished he could go up front and see this, and I said, "Of course you can go up front and see this," and then I said, "Wait a minute, why are you so excited? You have been up in an airplane before."

He said, "Sir, I have been up nineteen times, but I have never landed."

Now at various places in the world I have had to stand before audiences, but I certainly have never stood before a convocation of mayors, and I am just a little bit alarmed also to see that in many cases they have brought their charming families with them, and since I expect to say what I have to say extemporaneously, I hope my barracks room language does not creep in unfortunately. If so, my apologies in advance.

There is one individual here whom I must mention specifically before I go ahead with what I have to say. He is the Mayor of Saint Lo. The reason I want to mention him is this: Something over two years ago, we entered Normandy and through the vicissitudes of battle, it happened that Saint Lo was one town that was completely and utterly destroyed. There was nothing left, really, but dust. What I want to say in his presence is this: The one thing that inspired our forces, and particularly those who knew what was happening, was that never once was there a word of complaint from those people. Never once did they come and ask us to hold off in bombarding a village, to avoid anything that might bring victory over the Germans. Their fortitude and their courage in the face of a destructive force, the like of which most of us could not imagine, was something exemplary. I hope that when he goes back, he will assure his people that they will always hold a deep place in the admiration of all soldiers who had to participate in that great venture.

There are two or three reasons that I am particularly delighted to meet with a group of mayors and city officials throughout the country. The first of these is that you people represent the elected officials who are closest to our people, and the Army is of the people and belongs to them. It belongs to no brass hat or to no bureaucracy or to anything else. It belongs to the people of the United States, and in the ultimate its orders and its policies must spring from you. Therefore, if I am able, with you, to agree upon any element of policy and we see any common problem in a common way, we are that much to the good.

At the same time, you people have the same type of administrative and planning jobs that devolve upon the War Department. You have your day-by-day problems of balancing expenditures and income. You have the problem of planning for the future what you are going to do for the welfare and the benefit and prosperity of your people. That same thing applies to the Army, and from a group such as this, if I can induce you to take a personal and specific interest that I would like to see each of you take, I would expect and hope for suggestions and ideas of how we can better perform our duty, which is to serve the people and the Government of the

United States, and not to serve any particular group or to be self-centered in our own service to ourselves.

The present War Department problem divides itself very definitely into two phases. One we call the ad interim or transient state, and the other has to do with the long-term problem of assuring the safety of the United States against aggression.

This interim problem is not too difficult to define. Our Government, in consonance with others, undertook certain commitments in foreign fields. Those commitments placed certain specific duties upon the Army of the United States. I should like to make very clear that the Army has nothing whatsoever to do with the making of policy in this country, and it wants nothing to do with it, in spite of occasional inferences to the contrary in some columns. We are an executive and operating portion of the Government and we receive our orders, and insist upon receiving our orders, from the civil, and we will act in no other way.

However, as a personal conviction, I do not mind telling you this, that I believe the policy of our Government in maintaining occupation forces where they are now, in Germany, Japan, and Korea, primarily, is absolutely essential to the peace of the world. In any event, we have that job and we have to do it, and that one fact more than any other fixes the pattern and the size of our current Army.

Those jobs are, let's say, residual and remaining from the conflict just past. In other words, the purposes for which the United States went to war were not completely achieved when the last shot was fired in the Pacific. We are still trying to attain them, and that is the reason that those forces remain there, and they cannot be reduced. They have been voluntarily on the part of both General MacArthur and General McNarney reduced until, from my viewpoint, they are dangerously low, and they cannot go lower.

The one great question mark that sticks with us all in the solution of that problem is how to get a sufficient number of volunteer recruits. We want volunteers from every standpoint. First, a volunteer makes a better occupational soldier; secondly, ordinarily they are more mature; but thirdly, they are far less expensive. The Selective Service Act brings us a soldier with a total service of eighteen months, and in those eighteen months we must absorb a month and a half of furlough, so he is actually in the Army's hands sixteen and a half months, yet all the overhead of the training and the transporting, the indoctrination, everything else of that soldier, is exactly the same as if he were a three-year man, and yet because of the limitations of transportation systems, training systems, and so on, when we ship to faraway Japan, we get about six to seven months' useful service out of him. He is the most expensive soldier that the United States Army has ever used. So, again, we say we need volunteers. I do not know of anything to do about it here except to appeal to you all to act in your off time as recruiting sergeants for us, and for goodness sakes get us recruits to the Regular Army.

The long-term or postwar problem of the Army is not so easily defined except possibly in terms of its end objective, which is the security of the United States against condition. I assume that every single individual here feels those same impulses of irritation - worse than that, hatred - at the futility and stupidity of war, as do those people who have actually participated in it. There is nothing that seems to me to be such a great and at the same time such a useless burden on the backs of mankind as indulging periodically in the most silly activity of which the human race would be guilty. All of us must struggle toward the time when world order and world justice shall supplant world violence and injustice. There is, of course, a body already working to lay out the pattern as to how we shall do that. Our problem in security divides into two: How to make sure of our protection while that body is evolving and developing; and moreover, how may we use our strength, be it economic, industrial, military, or any other kind, to support that institution and so insure its ultimate success?

If I thought for one second there was no possible future for this country except to try to assure its security through the accumulation of force as represented in military units and formations, I certainly would not be guilty of recommending the most conservative and modest course that I do. I believe that we must have faith that United Nations and world order will finally prevail. If they do not, we are facing a very sorry future.

So, this problem for the future, then, become ones to decide a number of questions: the possible character of a future war (and we are talking now short of that period when United Nations does achieve success); what we need to do in the meantime to assure reasonable security - because I must make perfectly clear, ladies and gentlemen, there is no absolute security for any nation in arms alone. It just cannot be done. You may surround your house with all the policemen in your city, but that is not absolute security. The only way that will be achieved is when we remove from nations any reason for, or any desire to, attack.

We come, then, to the aphorism or the platitude: There is no positive and full security for any unless it is

achieved for all. But we are solving the problem short of that ideal situation.

One of the first things that is necessary for us is to continue, so far as the genius of our people is able to support, research and development. Warfare becomes more and more brutal, more and more devastating, and more and more total character. We must never be guilty of laggardness in this regard. Every, or almost every, cent that the War and Navy Departments get for the purposes of research and development, we put I the hands of civilians - civilian industry and universities primarily - and it is from them that we must get the very latest word and the very latest advice in this important direction.

This point gives me a chance to remark again that armed forces are not the total answer, even in the job of securing our country. The last war proved it was a cooperative effort. It is the morale of the people, the effort of the people, the products of our mines, our farms, our factories, our Government; everything must be integrated toward the one thing, and in this particular field of research and development it is almost exclusively civilian.

Another thing we must never forget is intelligence. There has fortunately been established at the seat of government and centering up in the State Department a central intelligence agency. Not only does the War Department support that agency with its full strength and purpose, but it hopes that you, understanding its need, will do the same.

I have often been asked if we foresee with this gradual development toward more destructive weapons, more mobile weapons, and so on, whether there will still remain any need for men, for manpower in the Armed Services, trained men in them. There are two or three things to observe in this connection. First, push-button war is not an actuality today,. Any great movement of that kind takes time before it spreads over the earth. The railroad today is a long, long way from its invention by Stephenson, I believe well over one hundred years ago, and the complete revolution of the world based on the railroad has probably not yet taken place because they are still lacking in great areas of the world.

In the same way, such things as atomic bombs, bacteriological warfare, and more and more deadly gases, and other things, are not complete; and particularly in the field of guided missiles, the perfection in range, destructiveness, accuracy, does not take place overnight. So that while people claim that armies are reactionary because they never think in the future, frequently they are not allowed to think further than the things they have at hand. There is no use thinking in terms of 2000 if you have nothing but the weapons of 1946. So, at the present, the job is to use what we have got, and we know that needed men.

But let’s go ahead one little step and say that you visualize the possibility of atomic bombs dropping on Chicago or Detroit. By the way, I must digress here a moment. Someone told me that to qualify for membership in this body, you have to have a population of your city of 25,000 people. That means that my town has to multiply itself five times before I can get a mayor in here. But suppose one of those bomb shots should drop on Abilene, Kansas; wherever it is going to drop, can you conceive of the value of a trained body around there, with a trained leader in the National Guard or the Organized Reserves, a man who knows what to do in the face of catastrophe to prevent the spread of hysteria and to control conflagration and that sort of thing?

Even on the basis of civil defense, you can see what that would be the value of a trained citizenry in that area at that time, because what would be your way of getting away from this thing? If we talk about guided missiles, there is no passive defense against them possible unless you burrow into the ground, and I believe that when you have to turn the skyscrapers upside down and put them below as far as they now go above, civilization has practically ruined itself anyway and there is no hope of talking about saving it.

If you had those people there, you would have the opportunity to do the one thing you could do, retaliate, and retaliation and trying to find the sources of those bombs and destroying them would be your real answer, and how are you going to do that unless you have a calm, ordered, disciplined country behind you, because no one can act sanely or think clearly in an atmosphere of hysteria and fear. It cannot be done in battle and it cannot be done any other time.

Taking a measurable future as we see it, I can see no possibility that you do not need men, and above all, that you do not need discipline, and I do not apologize for the word “discipline.” I mean discipline in the sense of the extraordinary teamwork that characterizes the successful football team, such as Notre Dame which was too good this year. That is the kind of discipline that is needed in battle, and this gives me probably an opportunity to digress again for just a moment.

We talk about democratizing the Army. Now, you do not mean just that, because the ultimate purpose of

the Army is to provide a body at a particular spot on the earth that can take an objective in the face of the most cruel kind of danger. In that situation you need an autocratic government that is as fierce and solid as any government this world has ever known. I should like to point out it is the men themselves who demand that kind of government in that platoon at that critical point. The men demand that that commander will see that everybody else in the platoon does his job, and that is morale, and that is the kind of commander they must have and it is the kind of government that must prevail at that moment.

What we mean by democratizing the Army is to produce that kind of discipline as its end product, but in such a way that we do not unnecessarily violate the concepts of free American life as we have known them and experienced them. With that purpose, I am in hearty accord, but don't talk to me about a democracy at the bottom of Saint Lo when I send a battalion up to capture it.

Just one point before I leave this question of training. As I consider what the American Army has been through in the last four or five years, I am moved to point out that training is as valuable to that individual as it is to the country as a whole. Although we may approach it from the standpoint of the good of the country, that man himself, when he is faced with one of these crises of which I have spoken, will be more grateful for the training he has received, and he will bitterly resent ever being there if he has not been properly trained for it.

If we contemplate the kind of warfare that we have just briefly indicated, the time element in any future war will become more important than ever before. Particularly the first few days of a war will assume an importance that has not so far been significant in our own particular case. In both our last two wars we had time to prepare, but the first six weeks in the next war might be critical and there wouldn't be that two and a half years or more before we attack across the Channel - the two and a half years available to us for the training after the outbreak of another war. Therefore, if you put the man in at the critical time, he is bound to be untrained unless you do some of it in advance.

One other subject before I quit in which you people may have some interest is that of unification. I have never held any brief for any particular form of integration of the Armed Forces, but on this point I have had definite and unalterable convictions. In the field there is no such thing as separate land, sea, and air warfare. It is all one. It is an integrated effort that, by being integrated, multiplies the power of its separate parts rather than merely adds them. Without that integration, without that single command in the field, success is not possible, or if possible, only at excessive and unnecessary cost.

I have approached this problem on the basis that from the time a boy contemplates going into one of the Armed Services, he should get in his head that he is serving the United States of America and he is not serving the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, or anything else. He is working for his country. I want this integration, which to my mind means the growth of friendship, starting at the time the boy is a youngster. I want it to go on up through the services so that we take every action and think every thought in the atmosphere that I have just indicated; and to my mind if we are going to do that, it compels and desires integrated action at the top. That is the only thing I think about integration here in Washington, because I must say not only do I know very, very little about some of those very high and hazy movements that I see going on about me, but certainly I am not going to be guilty of giving advice up there where it is not wanted.

Finally, as my last word on the subjects that I have rambled around to touch upon this noon, I do believe this sincerely. The United States must be strong at this period. Again, I do not mean solely in military power. Our example at home, our economic, our industrial, every other kind of example, is eagerly watched in all the capitals of the world. Our strength comes from being an example before the people of the world of how well democracy works, and in this whole thing the Armed Forces are but a part. But if we are strong in the rounded way that I speak of strength, then I believe we can really assist the United Nations to develop toward its goal, and if we are weak, we cannot, because that can develop only if there is cooperation, and I repeat what I have so often said before: Weakness, nakedness, poverty cannot cooperate with anything; it can only wait to see what someone else does. But strength can, with consideration and humanity, cooperate toward this great goal.

I understand, I realize, that there are among your body certain representatives from our great neighbors, Canada and Mexico. This gives me a great opportunity to say that in any future time when we might be the subject of aggression and attack, we would truly be partners because we could not escape it. We are one North American continent here among ourselves, and so I do not only think it is fitting that they should be here today; I am glad they are here because it gives me a chance to talk to them as I have talked to you, my fellow

countrymen. Thank you!

• The Bond Club, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, January 23, 1947

Mr. President, Gentlemen: During the war there were several occasions on which I had to come to this country, and it was my habit to pick up anyone whose orders or leave was bringing them this way, and to give them a ride. One day on a field in France up came a young paratrooper, a very interesting young fellow, and we had lots of fun talking together.

We made our fist landing at the Azores. Just a few minutes before landing this boy began to show great excitement. He ran to the windows, to the portals, and looked out, and finally expressed a desire to go up with the pilot and see this plane coming down. I told him that of course he could go up. Then it struck me as odd, and I said, “Wait a minute, lad. You’ve flown quite a bit. Why do you want to go up with the pilot? Why does the landing interest you so much?”

And he said, “General, I’ve been up nineteen times, but I’ve never landed.”

Well, now, here and there over the world I have faced audiences, but I must say that I have never before faced one that I understood had the general label of Investment Bankers. I can relate another story to show you just about the extent of my acquaintance with finance. I heard Carl Gray, an official on the railways in the West, tell a story about his father who at one time made a luncheon speech. At the end of the meeting (and by the way, there is no implication in this, Mr. Chairman) he was offered a check as a sort of fee for his effort. And of course he declined it.

The secretary stepped up and said, “Well, Mr. Gray, in that event, do you mind us putting it in our special fund?” And Mr. Gray said, “No, not at all. What is your special fund for?” And the secretary replied, “To get better luncheon speakers.”

I thought this was a very amusing story, and I told it to an Aide who didn’t laugh very much. He looked at me sort of disgusted, and then said to me, “Do you know what you did?” I said, “No.”

He said, “A certain official at an institution which you visited offered you a check, and you tried to turn it into the common fund. But you made the mistake of signing your name on the back of that check, so you’ve got to pay income taxes on some money you never saw.”

I think, therefore, that I can scarcely be classed as an expert on finance, so certainly the subject of my speech, in which I have been told I have a very wide latitude, will not be related to your daily business.

But since I have been offered a field that seems to be world-wide in its scope, I am going to assume for a second the prerogative so often exercised by a master of ceremonies. I want to tell you one little story about each of two men who happen to be here this evening, and who were closely associated with me in the war.

One of these men is here in the City and serving in the Army. He led a regiment across Utah Beach in the Normandy invasion so brilliantly, that his Corps Commander reported to me that “If you will give me this man for Division Commander, I would like to make him Division Commander immediately.” Before the war was over he was commanding a Corps of American troops in action. He never made a mistake in battle, and had the general reputation of being the greatest fighting leader of any regiment, division and corps that we produced. His name is General Van Fleet, and I would like to have him stand up for a moment.

When we were in the midst of the Battle of the Bulge, the Commander of the 101st Division was in Washington on a conference to determine what we were going to do about airborne troops. As quickly as he found out that I had sent his division up into the battle as part of the SHAEF reserve, he did what any really good soldier would do: he told the War Department to go to hell, jumped a plane and landed with the division quickly in France. That man, the hero of this dramatic incident, was engaged in one enterprise in this war which I consider the most daring single thing that was performed in the war.

When we were trying to get Italy to surrender, we wanted to drop an airborne division at Rome. We had to find out whether it was feasible to do it, and whether we could get the cooperation of that portion, at least, of the Italian Army that wanted to surrender. I sent this man into Rome when it was held by the Germans and the Italians. He went there, and the story of his escapades, riding in everything from hearses to blinded automobiles, is one that you would not believe if you read it in an E. Phillips Oppenheim. That man was

General Taylor, now Commandant of the West Point Military Academy, and almost your neighbor.

These two men are typical of the people the country sent over to war. From the grade of private to General, you had men who were determined to do their duty, and who did it in a way that excited the admiration of all the professional armies of Europe, and astounded them by reason of the native initiative and resourcefulness that seems to be a typically American trait.

Although, I repeat, I am not qualified to speak about financial matters, I am encouraged to stand here before this group because I have been assured this evening that a great number of you people have served in the Army, and that seems to me to give us a common bond. In any event, many of you have had sons or relatives or friends in the Army, and even if not, as ordinary Americans you have an interest in the problems of the future of this country, and in those problems the Army has a very important and a very significant part. It is about those things that I wish to speak to you for just a few minutes.

First of all, I want to make it perfectly clear that the Army is not a policy-making body of any kind. The Army is the insistent champion of the superiority of civil power. We get our orders from civil government, and we obey them. The policies that today keep great forces of the Army in Japan, Korea and Germany, in Austria and in Italy, are not of our making.

It matters not that I fervently believe that the occupation of those countries is the most significant thing for the future of peace in the world that we are now doing. I do believe that, but I say that that in itself is of no significance. I am simply the executive of the body that is detailed to carry it out, and carry it out we will as long as we have got the strength.

The necessity for that occupation fixes in large extent the size of our Army today, and we have calculated that size on the very lowest estimates that General MacArthur and General McNarney feel they can go along with. Incidentally, I should say that their estimates are far lower than I think I myself would make them. I think they are at the danger point.

In any event, that job fixes the size of the Army, and that is the size that is translated to the President, to the Budget Bureau, and to the Congress. The only great problem which we have in connection with the solution of this current problem, is really an aftermath of the war because we are still pursuing the purposes for which we went to war: that problem is men.

To date, the volunteer recruiting program has not been as successful as we would have hoped, and we have been forced to rely during this past year on Selective Service to provide the men for the additional numbers that we need. The sooner we can desert that system the better for all of us, not only because it is inconsistent with the traditions of this country for the raising of peacetime armies, but because (and this is financial) the Selective Service soldier is the most expensive soldier today that the Army has ever used.

His term of enlistment has been cut to eighteen months, of which period we have him sixteen and a half months, because we have to absorb a month and a half of furlough time. In that period of sixteen and a half months we have to receive him, process him, get him all healthy, transport him to Japan and get him back so that he is home at the end of the sixteen and a half months.

That results in this situation: with all the overhead that we absorb for that soldier, he delivers six to seven months of useful service. He is too expensive, and we would therefore like to have volunteers. For that reason, just as I do in the face of any audience that I have the pleasure of meeting with, I ask you please to join my recruiting sergeant’s staff and help me get some volunteers.

That, I repeat, is the major problem of this short-term or interim job that we have.

Viewing the long-term purposes of the Army, the job is not so easy to define unless we merely give the desired result, which is the security of this country. But in working toward a program, toward setting up machinery that will insure such security as this country is entitled to, there are a thousand problems to run into, some of them with many unknown factors.

Before tracing out a few of these problems I should like to say that the Army realizes that there is no absolute security to be obtained through arms. No amount of force in this world has ever produced absolute security. There can be security in the absolute sense for this country only if it is enjoyed by every nation in the world; in other words, the concept that the United Nations is so carefully and so laboriously tracing out must be successful if we are ever to enjoy absolute security.

So when you talk about arms, you are talking only relative security, immediate security. It can protect you

against the gravest consequences of a sudden attack from aggression, but it cannot in the long run give you that tranquility and serenity that is, after all, necessary if we are going to develop and evolve in the way that the resources and the genius of this country would allow did we have no threat of war.

The long-term problem is, again, divided into parts, but there is no sharp division between them. If we talk about such a thing as push-button warfare, certainly we are talking about something that is of the future, X years.

To show you what I mean in a certain sense, I believe it was Stevenson who invented the railway engine at the beginning of the Nineteenth Century. But think of the years that went by before railways were common throughout the world, and indeed there are even yet great areas where the greatest needs consist of railway communications, notably places like China.

So in spite of inventions that have been widely publicized, the application of those weapons to a general war is something that is still far in the future.

As you approach, then, the problem of providing security in the best possible way and at the least possible cost for this country, you start from what you have got, but you must put your minds ahead on something of the nature of what we might call the Super Blitz period, yet it is not here, and therefore it does not involve your day-by-day work, the preparation and teaching which must be largely based on what you have got.

To make sure that we do not become complacent and satisfied with what is rather than what shall be, we have set up in the War Department a special staff. We call it the Super Blitz Staff, and it is composed of some of our ablest young officers, men far younger than I am, whose minds still want to look forward instead of getting together with other old soldiers and reminiscing about the landing in Normandy. They will seek advice from one source only, the scientists of America.

Our planning staff for this young group is this young bunch of men who have been experienced in war, as far as the fighting is concerned, and the scientists who can keep these people informed all the way along as to what is on the horizon in the way of weapons, transport, and all of the other things that may change the face of war so materially.

Therefore, as we in our daily routine go ahead with our work we have at least some certainty (and I must say the scientists work well with that group) that we will not become complacent and reactionary.

This preparation and preparatory business costs a lot of money. Today our Army, as has always been the case, costs more per unit than any other army in the world. Our Army, generally speaking, is raised in competition with industry, and there is no other force where the pay for a private soldier all through the ranks, right to the top, is comparable to ours.

Similarly, every single piece of equipment we get is expensive. It might interest you to know that just pay alone is a tremendous factor, under today's conditions. To digress a moment - and this is very unusual - everybody in Washington agrees upon this one thing, and I mention it particularly for that reason, which is that there is not the slightest intimation from anyone that our Army today is too large. It is not. It has been cut to the bare bone. Yet that Army costs, for its present size, something like two and a half billion for pay per year. That is before you feed, clothe, house or transport it, or anything else.

In the field of research and development we cannot fall behind. Practically every cent we get in that field we place with the industries of the United States and with the universities of the United States. We do not attempt in the Army to pretend that we are scientists or that we can bring out and apply these great truths with science uncovers. That is the job of civilians.

In the same way, the developmental money or experimental money goes to the factories. They produce the pilot models. We get them, but all of that is done by civil life. All of our planning for industrial mobilization is done by civilians. There is a civilian head of it in the War Department, and his staff works with industry through various organizations throughout the United States.

What I am trying to get over to you is this: Today, just exactly as was the case during the war, even the military power of the United States does not come from the Army alone. It does not come from our ships and planes and tanks, it comes instead from an integrated effort of the American people.

The Army is a part of you. Even in war it is merely the cutting edge of a great machine that you devise, support and send to war. Its mainsprings and its sources of power come right from the farms and the minds and the genius of the American people. So it must be in peace.

Your concern in it, if nothing else, is a financial one. It is up to you to know how it should be composed, what are the policies it is following, whether it remains true to the traditions of the American concepts, whether it is too costly, whether there is duplication, whether you are getting from it the thing you are paying for.

That,. I assure you, is what the Army is trying to do. But if we are allowed to drift away from the American people, if we are allowed to get into some little corner of the Pentagon Building (really, we occupy it all!) and there devise our own schemes and develop our own ideas, with nothing coming from us but an estimate of the cost and an estimate of strength, in the long run you will not have what you want.

Your minds and your sons' minds must keep the whole idea fresh, in my opinion, until the day comes when we, in concert with all other nations - but not until then - can abandon the Army and put people like me out of a job.

Gentlemen, in a very hurried and sketchy way, that covers the general field that I thought we would speak to you about this evening.

• Notes for United Jewish Appeal, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, DC, February 23, 1947

Understanding that this meeting springs from the determination of American Jewry to rescue from despair your brethren in Europe, I have not come here merely to praise this manifestation of spiritual union based upon common blood or religion. Although the task you have undertaken is vast in terms of material values, even the greatness of your goal and the depth of compassion it evidences, do not stand as the most significant feature of your concerted effort. Its deepest implication is in its eloquent protest against man's inhumanity to man.

When you seek by material sacrifice to rescue the innocent victims of savagery, you give much more than the contents of your purse. You give a demonstration of men united in mercy toward the stricken, and example that invites the world to renew with increased zeal the struggle against injustice, persecution and slavery. Your success will add impetus to the moral regeneration needed to banish from the world these evils that have darkened the way to peace among men.

The spirit of charity, among the most sublime of human emotions, in itself stamps your project as one conceived in the noblest traditions of yours or any group. Here, indeed, is need for charity. Only one who has seen, as I have, the mental and physical effects of savagery, repression and bigotry upon the persecuted of Europe, can realize the full need for the material help and encouragement you propose to give. The terrors they have endured, the indescribable horrors they have survived, cry aloud to all men who retain within themselves any respect for decency, any belief in the human soul.

There is no word that can exaggerate the urgency. We must believe that man labors toward better things, that global action, creakingly and laboriously evolved by nations amidst human conflicts engendered by prejudice, ignorance, misunderstanding and distrust, will eventually eliminate recurrence of the tragedies you attempt to alleviate. But acute disaster cannot await the functioning of vast machinery that has not, as yet, wholly emerged from the design state. Charity can do much to fill the breach - it can bring some brightness to these survivors of cruelty. It can lift them somewhat above the level of mere existence, the limit that perforce controls governmental effort.

More than material aid is needed for these in Europe who have felt the lash of brutal tyrants. Long fettered in the deepest pit of despair, they now need warmth and encouragement from fellow humans that their confidence can be restored. You can enable them to march in confidence and in dignity toward that day when, in common with all others, the opportunities provided by the richness of the earth may be enjoyed also by them. Mutual confidence among groups, among classes and among nations is a primary need in the world today. Everything that promotes it has world value.

No matter how we may answer the question, "Am I my brother's keeper?", the implications of that question have such inescapable effects on the effort to produce world order that the example you provide may well bear fruit in the attack on world problems of unlimited scope. Possibly it may help us realize that there can be no security for one unless it is enjoyed by all; that though force can protect in emergency, only justice, fairness, consideration and cooperation can finally lead men to the dawn of eternal peace. Certainly your example should help us see that enlightened self-interest demands the elimination of the unfair practices against

large segments of mankind which, in the past, have so blackened the history of humanity.

Humanitarianism is a link that binds together all Americans. As great as is our love of freedom, equally great is the American feeling of compassion for those in distress. Whenever tragedy or disaster has struck in any corner of the world, the American people has promptly and generously extended its hand of mercy and help. Generosity has never impoverished the giver; it has enriched the lives of those who have practiced it. In this postwar world, with its bewilderment and fear, Americans can still be thankful that we are in a position to give rather than depend for our very existence upon the mercy of others. One of the privileges of this great democracy has been its opportunities for us to share with those less fortunate. And the bread we have cast upon the waters has been returned in blessings a hundredfold.

Every person everywhere who holds in his heart a respect for human values and who venerates right and justice will wish you well, and will draw from your success renewed inspiration in the fight to insure that the humblest and the weakest may forever stand in confidence and equality in the presence of the proudest and the strongest.

• Address at Civic Reception, Chamber of Commerce Dinner, St. Louis, Missouri, February 24, 1947

Through this historic city flowed the pioneer energy that expanded the nation beyond the plains and mountains to the Pacific. Our national history, short in years, rich in manifold development and growth, has been seventeen decades crammed with achievement. Men and women, inspired by faith in man's dignity, goaded by conviction in man's responsibility, labored that this land might be a better home for those who followed them. Because every American generation attacked its problems with fresh vigor, we have peopled a continent, subdued its prairies and wilderness, tamed its rivers and devoted its resources to the betterment of those who dwell in it. The concepts of government, designed by our forefathers to assure all men freedom, justice, and equality before the law, have been sustained and amplified in this land of vast resources so that the United States is today the world's most prominent citadel of human rights and the greatest provider of human opportunity.

From the days of the fur trade and the settlers' wagon trains, St. Louis has funneled and fed our epic westward growth. Throughout its colorful history, this city and the Army were in closest association. Here was Fort Bellefontaine, our first Army post west of the Mississippi. This was the operating base for the soldiers who explored the West and later harnessed its rivers. Here lived and served great military leaders; Grant in the dark days of Hardscrabble Farm; Lee as river engineer and cavalry commander at Jefferson Barracks. Not far away were born and reared two of our modern military great - Pershing and Bradley - and the Army's Commander-in-Chief, the President. To every soldier, St. Louis brings memories of those who served before him; to every American, St. Louis symbolizes the spirit and will that built a great nation.

Today, the future holds for us goals that exceed our past accomplishments and it imposes responsibilities weighty beyond those we have bourne. Twice in our generation we have had to defend our heritage by resort to arms. The time approaches, however, when resort to arms may leave the wilderness as the only conqueror. But the certainty is also here that if we can eliminate wars from the face of the earth, this country, and all the world, can reach new heights of prosperity and happiness, exceeding even the most sanguine dreams of our forbears. Between us and the attainment of all the hopes represented in a permanently peaceful world runs a tortuous and even dangerous path; its successful negotiation will demand all we have of faith in ourselves and in democracy; all the labor of our hearts and minds and bodies; all our moral and material strength. Should we falter in our forward march or shirk our duty, we jeopardize not only the world peace but our very existence.

A soldier's hopes for the dawn of eternal peace are possibly more vivid than those of men who have not lived through the nightmare of the battlefield. Moreover, the soldier, like all others, realizes that security, in the absolute sense, cannot be achieved by force. Its perfect state can never be attained by any nation until it is enjoyed by all, which will mean that armed forces, beyond policing elements, will be forever gone. But until a truly effective organization can be fully trusted, our own relative security must rest firmly in our own hands. There is no bright future for the slack or the fatuously complacent among nations. There is no security for those who shy at its burden. Security is the reason for the Army's existence.

In the early days of the West, the Army was a neighborly force that intimately served the people. It protected them daily, and assisted in many fields. Its strength and composition, based on the needs of the growing nation, were relatively easy to compute. On our coasts were a limited number of vital points exposed to destruction or capture, requiring a definite number of men and guns for their defense. Against Indian forays, a measurable number of posts and soldiers were needed. There was, then, no possibility of lightning attack that could obliterate a city, cripple an army or shatter a fleet.

It is still the same Army, a protective cloak for the people it serves, designed and tailored for their security requirements. But it grown increasingly difficult to state, at a given time, exactly what constitutes adequate defense. Every changing factor in the global situation - the mood of an international conference, the outcome of a test-tube experiment, the discovery of a mineral lode, even the abundance of an annual harvest - each of these has its impact on our security in a world where isolation is impossible. One example is at your very door. Today hunger stalks many sections of the earth, and when men are themselves starving and see before their eyes their families and loved ones wasting away, it is idle to talk of peace and freedom and the rule of right. No excess, no act that we normally class as crime, will balk man, either individually or collectively, from attempts to satisfy this basic need. Here, virtually at the confluence of the three great river valleys that produce a significant portion of the world's food, you are widely insulated by distance from direct contact with these hungry areas. Nevertheless there is a clear and inescapable relationship between the Missouri farm, world stability and your Army's responsibilities.

No sane American, aware of the world's need for our stabilizing influence, denies the essential role of armed strength for our own security and for the maintenance of peace. The important question is, how much, for likewise no denies the crying need for economy. Neither of these conflicting requirements can be ignored; in every military activity and project they must be considered together. Economy, insofar as it confines expenditures to essentials and requires thrifty and careful administration, is always necessary, whether we are concerned with the management of a household, or city or army. For example, a profusion of military posts, once necessary for the protection of pioneers, should now be consolidated in the interests of economical administration and professional efficiency. Every Army activity should be held under a critical eye to determine that satisfaction of national needs does not provide excuse for indulgence in careless spending. There is no risk or danger in such economy. Quite the contrary; but neither is there any economy in military nakedness. Time and again we have proved the staggering extravagance of penny-wise policies.

Strength, however, even military strength in its narrowest sense, does not spring solely from money invested in tanks and planes and ships. It comes from the integrated purposes, effort and resources of a whole nation. In war it was the unity of purpose that provided the nation's power to execute its aims; it was the cooperation of industry, government, and the armed services, of labor, capital and management, of scientists, farmers and fighters that produced the mighty instrument of victory. In peace, it is only as we achieve coordination between the professional duties of the armed services and the concerted brains and skills of science and all of industry, that we can be reasonably able to protect ourselves. Moreover, only through continuing public interest can we achieve effective defense at minimum expense. These things are your business as much as mine; all of us pay for them - and are protected by them!

By wise governmental policy we are definitely committed to the temporary control of the nations which brought on the recent cataclysm, eradicating for the foreseeable future, not only the capacity but the will for aggression. These are heavy commitments in terms of men and money and they have been carefully and economically calculated. Although successful accomplishment bears mightily on future world stability and therefore on our own long-term security, these tasks are essentially police in character and contribute only to a limited extent to the immediate protection of this country, rich and tempting target that it is.

For reasonable security we require air, ground and sea establishments, efficiently organized into a force capable of holding the key outer bases on the periphery of defense; ready at all times to intercept or set up immediate defense against air and surface attack; potentially powerful enough either to seize or to destroy the sources of attack. A necessary part of this force is a trained and strong National Guard and Reserve, annually re-vitalized by trained reinforcements. The functions of these components are increasingly important, as capabilities of weapons and possibilities of sudden destructive attack continue to mount.

Policies, under which we are at present operating, are not sufficiently broad and far-reaching to encompass

all the requirements of the nation's defense, and supplemental measures will soon be considered by the Congress. In such matters the professional soldier can advise but only the American people can decide how much they will pay for their safety. Too much would be wasteful extravagance; but in any future emergency too little would, almost certainly and finally, be too late.

We are all acutely conscious of the awesome developments in the field of military weapons. To a far larger degree than ever before, our security depends on the efforts of our scientists. We must, to the limit, assist and encourage them to lead the field in every technological phase of our defenses. Should there be another war, it may be won in the laboratory before the issues, that cause it, rise to the surface.

Our scientists already have astounded the world by their mastery of the universe's hidden power. However, I decry loose and sometimes gloating talk about the degree of security implicit in a weapon that might destroy millions overnight. Those who measure security solely in terms of offensive capacity distort its meaning and mislead those who pay them heed. No modern nation has ever equalled, prior to the outbreak of war, the crushing offensive power attained by the German war machine in 1939. No modern nation has been broken and smashed as was Germany six years later.

So in the long-term view, I do not stress alone the material aspects of our defense, the arms and the services that use them. They constitute an essential shield, our outer protection. In them we want efficiency and sufficiency - no more. But in themselves they are shells that require inner quality and spiritual strength if they are not to collapse under the pressure of war.

On the solid foundation of human rights established by our forefathers has been built a mighty structure which stands before the world as a stronghold of freedom and democracy. Its girders are the pioneer traits of initiative, resourcefulness, self-reliance and pride in achievement. These were the factors that made the trained American the formidable giant of the battlefield, who conquered the armies of Germany, Italy and Japan. Those traits distinguished also our men in mines, factories and farms as well as in planes, ships, foxholes and laboratories. In seeking to maintain a secure United States, the same qualities are the core of our future.

If our youth and the generations to come clearly understand the relationship between individual effort and common good; if they perceive that our privileges and advantages in this great country, won by the toil and sacrifice of generations before them, can be retained only by a comparable expenditure on their part; if they appreciate that a corollary to our premise of man's dignity is his individual responsibility to maintain it against any threat; then the future of our country is secure.

And in broader fields, a vibrant, purposeful American will be the greatest single factor in progress toward world order. Leadership for peace cannot be attained by armed strength alone, any more than it can merely by lofty words. But with a clear moral probity evident in all our international dealings, a unified, productive nation can demonstrate the manifest advantages of cooperation over coercion. If we will it, this land shall remain proof and example to all the world that men, of themselves, may build in concord a better dwelling place, whether it be city or continent or globe.

• Testimony before Senate Armed Services Committee on National Security Act of 1947, March 25, 1947

When I returned from Europe in November 1945, I appeared before a Committee of the Congress to express my convictions concerning appropriate over-all organization of the security forces of America. Those convictions were frankly and almost exclusively based on 32 years of field experience in the war, an experience that comprehended the employment of all branches of the armed services in island and in continental campaigns. As a result of that experience I came to the conclusion that the mere existence of unified command in the field - without slightest reference to the individual exercising such command - is a vital factor in speedy and decisive victory in war. I believed then, and now believe as firmly, that if we had attempted to fight the late war under the same theories and practices of command that applied in Europe in 1914-1918, attainment of victory might have been long delayed, with untold and wasteful losses in men and secondarily in money and resources, and at the worst could have lost us the war.

During those long months in Europe I, and my associates, came to understand that in a major conflict there was no such thing as a separate land, sea, or air war. Single purpose and direction and careful balancing of

forces were necessary. We therefore came to believe that in the broader field of preparation and production of forces, in planning and in control of operations, a closely knitted headquarters in Washington would add to national efficiency and economy.

All agreed that single command in the field was essential; for my part this incontestable truth applied equally to the Washington management from which the orders for the field commander must come.

Upon returning to America I found that the unanimity of agreement I had encountered on this point in Europe did not prevail here. Moreover, and most disappointingly, I found that the subject had become one of interservice argument. It appeared that all men wearing one color of uniform had one conviction while those wearing another color developed opinions to the exact contrary.

My next astonishing discovery was that these conflicting opinions had developed a controversy of which the intensity seemed to be out of proportion to anything warranted by mere difference in intellectual conclusion. Because of this I explored this subject to the limits of my ability. In every included problem within the over-all subject I found an amazing variety of opinion. Regardless of the unquestioned integrity of the principal figures involved, it appeared that earnest and disinterested conclusions were, when attempt was made to translate them into the field of practical agreement, frequently colored by fears, by prejudice, and in many instances by traditional jealousies. May I make clear that I do not exclude myself from this general observation, for it is certain that in such an argumentative atmosphere, human nature is often apt, in spite of good intent, to dominate cold logic.

Finally, I became convinced that it was a problem that could not be solved by the advance preparation of any complete blueprint intended to govern every phase of common effort and to establish the rules by which every service would operate in all its actions, functions, and responsibilities.

The statement of the President with respect to this Bill is that it is a legitimate and honest compromise between conflicting views. With this I am in complete agreement, and I have a very earnest and definite reason for supporting this compromise with all the strength at my command. In the vast human effort, good will is far more conducive to efficient operation than is any mere organizational detail. To secure the utmost in eventual effect the original plan should go no further than to establish basic principles and to prescribe the plan so far as applicable to the area of general agreement already attained. To attempt now to resolve every detail in which acute differences have been voiced would not only result in a poorly devised program, but would arouse resentments that would militate against efficiency.

I believe that the one great step provided for in this Bill, namely the naming of a single Secretary of National Defense, with very definite responsibilities and powers, does constitute the most feasible effective step by which there may eventually be realized, under his direction, and by concerted action among the services, the organization and the methods best adapted to meet the requirements of our national security.

This bill sets up the Air Force in its legitimate place and does something to recognize the paramount influence of air power upon modern warfare. But more important, it establishes a single civilian head who, while achieving for the moment a degree of operational and directional coordination, will very naturally and logically find himself compelled to recommend periodically to Congress, such budgetary and other measures as will provide the greatest possible amount of security for the United States with the least possible cost in men, money and materials. Only a man so situated as will be the Secretary set up by this Bill, can possibly bring to you the disinterested and completely detached studies and reports that will be necessary before duplication may be eliminated and with the assurance to you that our country's security has not been endangered.

Further, the broad powers of the Secretary will provide the one great element of a modern security structure which is markedly absent in our present organization. That is flexibility. In this day of scientific and technological war, it is of primary importance to balance the security forces against world conditions as they exist from year to year. The establishment of single responsibility and authority for submitting recommendations to the President and to Congress, and for carrying out the mandates of the Congress will constantly bring to our ever-changing problems, involving the three services, solutions applicable to the time and conditions. Without such single direction we tend to become compartmented into fixed forms and practices that always grow more rigid with time.

In summary, therefore: I emphatically support the principle of providing a single civilian head of the armed forces, one who may give his entire attention to this vital phase of the nation's affairs. I personally oppose any

attempt at this time to prepare a detailed legislative pattern for unification and I would so oppose it even if this Committee should suggest study of any particular plan that I might myself propose. I am convinced that progress in efficient coordination must be worked out on an evolutionary basis and I am equally convinced that if so worked out, all of us - those responsible in the air, sea and ground forces - will continue to reach into areas where great savings can be effected for the country and which will leave no sector uselessly exposed to the possibility of attack.

This Bill makes a great start; and its promise is all the more fruitful because the fact of current agreement among the services assures development in the spirit of single devotion to the national welfare. In peace, as in war, the spirit of teamwork, based on good-will, is the vital ingredient to any organization. Consequently, without reference to specific points covered in the provisions of the S-758, I urge its speedy enactment.

• Notes for address at National Press Club luncheon, Washington, DC, March 25, 1947

During the past five years I have met the press on many occasions - usually in difficult times, sometimes on historic occasions. I have always found it advantageous to speak openly and as fully as I could on the background, the immediate problem and the planned objective. Today I shall do the same discussing briefly the Army's problems during the past year.

During that period and continuing to this moment, there have been three major problems whose solution is not always clear. They are concerned with: (1) the maintenance of an army sufficiently effective to accomplish its current missions; (2) the job of occupation with all of its complications; and (3) the development of a long-range security program flexible enough to cope with any possible future demand.

The first problem, the maintenance of the Army, has been almost entirely a manpower problem although budgetary pressure is beginning to loom large. At the moment we are adequately manned, but the future procurement of manpower concerns us greatly. We want an army of volunteers. It is the cheapest system but, more important, it is the most American basis for a peacetime Army; one of the most important elements in personal liberty is the selection of pursuit. The increased advantage of a soldier's life is undoubtedly our most persuasive recruiting argument, but within the Army itself must be continued improvement of the profession's attractiveness stemming from increased esprit and personal, as opposed to monetary, rewards.

The second, the occupation of the territories of our defeated enemies, is a problem apart from the Army's normal mission. We didn't want it but it was assigned to the Army as the only agency in a position to conduct the overall program. It is a complex problem. The Army is in many ways dependent upon the agencies of other nations for the efficient execution of its mission which is further complicated by arbitrarily defined zone boundaries that divide economic and social entities. In the case of Germany, on which I find myself lately quoted, the thinking people of the world are intent on denying Germany the opportunity of ever again starting a world conflagration. In implementing this decision, it has been brought home that the level of German industrial production has a marked effect on the standard of living of all other peoples in Europe. It is necessary to find the very fine line between economic sufficiency and technological capacity for waging aggressive war. Our officials concerned with the problem are increasingly aware that it is impossible in this day and age to separate entirely peaceful production and war potential.

Occupation is further complicated by the fact that during the frantic demobilization of 1946 when replacements were urgently needed for dwindling occupation forces, we had to send over all available men without adequate screening. Many of them proved unfit for the job of occupation where each soldier must be able to operate without supervision and where his every action is interpreted as representative of his native country. But this is a complication under the Army's control and we are correcting it. Trainloads of inept personnel have been shipped out of Germany and Austria. In Venezia Giulia alone we weeded out almost a hundred officers and more than 1500 men in the first two months of this year.

The third - development of a long-range flexible security program - is as many-sided as the national economy itself. Security is a matter of enough mimeograph paper to keep the public press informed as well as a matter of developing guided missiles. One aspect is of paramount importance, however - unifications. Balance and integration are its goal.

Balance - to prevent one arm's aggrandizement at the expense of another and a consequent weakness in case of total war which cannot be neatly separated into air war, sea war or land war. Proportion of each element, necessary for maximum effectiveness, depends on situation - target, terrain, season, ultimate objective, etc.

Integration - three independent teams are inefficient because: (1) they will compete and duplicate each other in fund-raising and money spending; (2) they will be out of step regardless of liaison or coordination; (3) an individual arm is not normally realistic in appraising its own value when another arm had developed a defense for the first arm's technique; and (4) strategic concepts - what bases are necessary, what areas must be protected at all cost, what routes are essential to defense. All these are national business requiring central intelligence, joint evaluation and unified decision.

• Women's Peace Conference, Washington, DC, March 28, 1947

As I see it, they who work untiringly for peace, who are ready to spend their time and substance toward its attainment, who value its blessings as worthy of unfaltering effort are they who most sharply feel the waste and futility of war, having experienced in themselves or in their loved ones its penalties of death and suffering.

The women of the United States are, in a very real sense, veterans of war who appreciate in the fullest sense what peace can mean, realize how much it cost, know we must not relax until it is our assured possession. They may not have endured the horrors of the battlefield or the bombing raid - although even there they were represented by heroes of their own sex in uniform - but most of them bear the scars of war, none the less cruel because they are of the heart and spirit. Mothers and wives and sweethearts suffered separation, loneliness, the terrible uncertainty of distance, the dreadfulness of silence, ceaseless anxiety - demanding spiritual strength and a will to sacrifice that paralleled the demand of war on fighting men. The weariness and fear of the soldier was reflected in some woman's heart at home; his courage to rise above them borrowed its fiber and greatness from some woman's love.

With their warm humanity and sympathy, it is natural that women even more than men should abhor war. For this reason the more must they guard against panacea and over-simplification in seeking to ensure peace in this sorely troubled world. It is a world that still looks to the strong for leadership. We can lead toward peace only if we are strong.

The peace we fought for must be universal in its scope, embracing all nations - those of vast area and resources and manpower as well as those confined within narrow bounds, of little wealth and few in population - it must be founded on the dignity of man as a human being, possessed of inalienable rights, but unable to live of himself, dependent for the fullness of life on other men. Rights and obligations, universally recognized, are the essence of peace; and so to attain peace, there must be found a way to protect the rights and enforce the obligations. The search is not an idle chase of dream stuff. The way is as old as humanity; only its last extension into the international sphere need be found.

Within the family, it is part of our daily lives or the family as a social unit would long ago have perished. Within the community, it is woven into our fabric of living or no village of a thousand or city of a million would exist today. It has been incorporated into our national being so that in the United States all the diversity of the human race possessed the peace of individual freedom and cooperative unity. Among 140 million people, rights are protected and obligations are enforced by law equally and justly administered. It has been done among 140 million, it can be done among twice or twenty times that number. Progress toward such peace will be slow.

Still numbed by the blows of the war years, cowed by their terror, millions of people grope along concerned entirely with the difficult job of finding the day's bread. In this supine state they are likely victims of militant minorities who by glittering catchwords and piper's tunes would lead them into political corrals where individual liberty and all the other rights civilization has learned to cherish will end.

We seek only to provide these stunned peoples with a breathing space, a period in which the wounds of war may heal, and the atmosphere may be cleansed of terror, so that they may develop their own constitution and bill of rights. We hold that such political forms flourish amid good feeling and harmony and not under a storm of terror and bloodshed.

These peoples must be rescued from nihilistic dejection which has cast its shadow on so much of the earth. It is paradoxical that fear and hopelessness should grip millions of men in this age when science has opened new avenues toward the enjoyment by mankind of life full beyond previous conceptions.

Democracy is no negative force. It believes in the future and looks ahead with wholesome confidence. Our vigor and optimism, along with material assistance, must flow as a current through fields now barren and desolate. We must revive and nourish the hopes of millions for individual freedom and the material benefits that are now within the reach of mankind.

The security of the United States is the first essential to lasting peace; only if we are secure ourselves can we lead others to mutual security. I do not plead for a security establishment that is a cloak for a militaristic machine. Between the two, there is as much difference as between the armed man of a police force who protects a community and the armed man of a gang who attempts to despoil it. The militaristic machine is the armed gang grown to international size; the security establishment is the community police force amplified to fit a world in which all nations are next-door neighbors. Its maintenance, in the future when their confidence and strength is restored, cannot be the burden of only one of them; all must share proportionate to their ability, in its support. But today, with most of the world desperately engaged in a struggle for the fundamentals of life, there are few who can stand even the minimum cost in men and money. Either the United States maintains its own security establishment or the world will lose its last barrier against chaos.

That is not sabotage of the United Nations. We were among the first to support it and we shall not relax until it is a functioning organization. Rather, we seek to provide the weak among the United Nations assurance of breathing space in which to work for the security of all. Unless the United States, a citadel of democracy, a champion of the dignity and rights of man, a foe of all who attempt to build in the world successor tyrannies to the Axis powers; unless our nation is able to defend itself and its ideals against attack and to protect those who stand beside it, there is no hope for the United Nations.

An enterprise, reversing ancient concepts of the relationships between sovereign governments, giving right and justice supremacy over strength and power, cannot develop when no nation or organization is prepared to support right and justice or to raise its voice against strength and power unjustly used. We seek only security for our own way of life and opportunity for others freely to choose theirs. That objective threatens no one but the potential aggressor.

• Army Day Talk, Atlanta, Georgia, April 7, 1947

Before starting on the few thoughts I would like to leave with you this evening, I want to read a note. I read it primarily as a matter of self defense. “Sir, in Huntington, England, you promised champagne to the men of the 8th Infantry Regiment before the invasion of Berlin. Though I did not get to Berlin, I would enjoy as a souvenir a bottle of champagne with your autograph - Charles D. Brown, 4th Infantry Division and a former member of the 8th Infantry Regiment for 57 months, 1940 to 1945.” The reason I bring this up is that I did make this promise because we were going to capture a lot of champagne from the Germans who had stolen it from the French and, to the utmost of my limited ability, I made good on it. Every bottle of champagne and every bottle of brandy that we could capture was sent to the divisions that had conducted that battle and brought back that victory. But Brown, who does not say whether he was a corporal or a master sergeant, was wounded twice and was finally placed in one of your hospitals here and apparently did not participate in the champagne party we tried so hard to give to each of our divisions. That is my defense for this. He is going to get that bottle of champagne but I don’t want it to get around here that a poor soldier can send a bottle of champagne to every one who got across the Rhine. However, that bottle of champagne will be but a feeble expression of the admiration I hold for the men that brought back to America the certainty that in our time we could continue to live under our form of government. As I can see it, Army Day has been set aside so that we might pause to give some reflection to the reasons that have led American men onto battlefields since the days of Washington, why they have fought and what they have done for us. I can conceive of no greater tribute to any man, a tribute which it is my privilege to pay to every member of this great audience, “I have done my duty to my country in time of crisis.” That I conceive to be the proudest thing that any man can call to mind on his deathbed; that is

how seriously I believe we contemplate our own obligations to the form of government that gives us the privileges we so highly prize.

This is a troubled and near chaotic world and we, along with the rest of the world, are troubled, sometimes we are fearful. At such time we turn to the defenses our country has erected against the possibility of external aggression. In 1709 a sergeant of Marlboro's Army said:

> "God and soldiers we adore,
> When trouble threatens, not before;
> But the danger passed and all things righted,
> God is forgotten and the soldier slighted."

But the state of mind we are in today, that condition does not wholly apply; we are concerned with the soldier.

It is my first purpose to tell you something about your Army, its needs and what we are aiming at. Before I start, let me make it perfectly clear that there can be no absolute security for any nation in the world unless there is security for all, including our own nation. The best the Armed Forces can do is to give you relative security, often too temporary in its character. In all that we think, in all that we say, in all that we do, we must strive for that time when men of my profession are no longer necessary and you may follow your profession in peace and in complete tranquility of mind. We do know that until there is some strength given to an organization that is international in character, that can police the world, we must be ready to preserve those things which we hold most dear. The things that we derived from our copy books, the philosophy expressed in the sayings we have remembered from Patrick Henry, Benjamin Franklin, George Washington and the others. That is what the Army is engaged in today.

First of all the Army's problem is one of men; in the great crisis of the World War we knew we could not place our national fortune in the hands of an individual human. The majority had to rule and every man had to do his duty so we enacted the Selective Service law and every man called to the battlefield had no choice. That man was required to go and face the horrors that the most deadly enemies of mankind could devise but he saved for us the right to meet tonight, to say what we please without fear that we might be disagreeing with some expression of a higher official of the government and tomorrow morning we would face a firing squad. To make good that victory, our government has decided that certain countries must be occupied and we need men for this job which is a part of the war we have just fought. We can no longer be certain that the voluntary system of recruitment will produce men for that occupational job to support it through the necessary organizations of Air, Ground, Schools, and all the other things that go to make up an Army. But Selective Service conscription, as a practice, is so foreign to our concept as to how we should protect ourselves in peacetime that the Army found it necessary, this spring, to say, "We are ready to go on a volunteer system in order to do the job that you have given us to do." I should like to point out that the Army did not invent the Army of occupation; however, I believe in it thoroughly. I believe we must occupy these enemy countries and see if we cannot make them peaceable democracies rather than aggressive autocracies; nevertheless, that policy was made by the government and the Army is merely doing its job, nothing more. There is a fixed number of men needed to do that job and to go below that number is to invite disaster. It is not a job that can be done personally because the second you go below the number that the occupied populations recognize represents that power that they respect, you are inviting recalcitrants into rebellion that will cost many additional thousands of men and additional millions of money. We cannot take that chance. We must have men for that job. In the world today and particularly in the United States, where we do not attempt in time of peace to preserve the great Armies ready for an immediate striking in any direction, there is one thing in which we are particularly strong and which had particular significance in the world today; it is air power. The Air proved in the last war its dominant position in the world of warfare. The U.S. had the greatest production capacity of air equipment and air power in the world. We cannot afford to neglect this arm for it is not only one that is respected throughout the world but it is one that, in case of necessity, could strike with retaliatory swiftness anybody that might challenge our right to live as we see fit. To show the conviction of the War Department as to the predominant influence of air in our security in any future possibility of emergency, I might cite this simple fact. The budget sent by the President to Congress asked for $5,700,000,000 for next year's military expenditures and of this sum, $3,500,000,000 or almost two-thirds was for air power alone. The other one-third was for Ground Forces and

Service Forces that support them both and that regardless of the fact that it is always the ground soldier that has to win the final victory and take the losses. So when we add up our total requirements, we find the Army cannot meet its problems of these times with less than 1,070,000 soldiers. The America that we know has never in its lifetime been faced with the problem of raising a volunteer Army of 1,000,000 soldiers in time of peace. Professional soldiers are nothing but your paid hirelings. We do our best. We come to you with professional advice but your future demands, for it is necessary to occupy these countries, that we preserve an air power and that we preserve the service and training organizations back of it, and that we provide men. Your future demands that you give your attention to this problem. If I could make you see it as I see it, I am certain that every man here would make himself a member of my volunteer recruiting corps and would go out and get some three year enlistments for me because we must resort to some system of producing these men as the future of this country demands it.

Gentlemen, it would be a great mistake to think that the Army measures our strength, and I mean our defensive military strength, merely in terms of ships, planes and guns. We do not. Even in war the military forces are merely the cutting edge of a tremendous nation, the power of which comes from 140,000,000 wills all directed toward the same objective. The military power of this country means the coordination of your military or armed services with your industrial capacity, with your social and governmental organizations, with the coordination of everyone in the United States who has anything to do with production. The man on the farm, in the mine or factory, everyone must coordinate to that one purpose. That is what won the war and brought the men home. The man who was home selling Liberty Bonds, working with machines or tools, was in his own way as deserving of plaudits as any soldier on the battlefield even though he did not face the continuous danger of the soldiers who fought the battles of Normandy, the battle of the Bulge, Okinawa, or Iwo Jima.

Far more important to our country today than mere military defensive strength is our position before the world as an exponent of democracy. Ask yourself, “Why will the United States develop a will to fight?” It is because we believe our form of government, our way of living as humans has come under dire threat. We may take it in stride without pausing to think about it too much, the right to live peaceably, the right to petition, and the right of habeas corpus but when anybody challenges them they have got an aroused America and we are willing to fight. For then the system for which we fight is our system of government and it is obvious that the wider the system is practiced in the world the greater is our security. I believe, therefore, that we could state our policy from a security angle, and remember I definitely tried to stay within a soldier’s limits, I am talking nation and not national policy, but we could state our policy in this way. We are ready to help any nation in the world that asks our help that intends living its own life and wants particularly to practice a democratic system of government similar to our own. Under such a concept it seems to me we need not challenge anybody, we simply say we are ready to help those people that are our natural friends, our natural allies, because I thoroughly believe that no people in the world, and I refer to people in contradistinction to governments, who have to pay the price want to fight a war. We trust governments that have the power in the people; we do not trust governments that have the power centered in some soldier, some dictator or other type of allegory. Consequently, if we can accept the truth, it seems that they must follow, that our stature before the world must be one of the great influences in developing friends and by our stature I don’t mean merely the number of regiments you are authorized and are paying for, the number of battleships and cruisers sailing the sea or the number of planes in the air. I mean, do we have a healthy social order, are we economically sound? Our fight is fundamentally economical, can we settle our own problems peaceably within ourselves without weakening our national position? Why should Brazil, Chile, Argentina or any other nation want to follow our example if we ourselves lose sight, due to our own narrow selfishness, and destroy ourselves. I do not believe that if everyone of us, the merchants, bankers, lawyers, soldiers and laborers, approached our problems with the attitude, “What is good for my country?”, then we will be leaders before the world and that will win us friends and win others to our form of government and increase our own security. I maintain that if this is a country based upon the concepts of human dignity and individual rights there must go along with it hand in hand a sense of individual responsibility. You cannot say merely that to get a larger dividend from my stockholders I will raise the prices. You cannot say, “I have somebody else on the hip and can gouge him out for a higher wage, a higher price.” You must say, “I place my country before the world, trusting the other parties of our own economy to do the same.” Then we will arrive at an answer here at home that will be an example to the world.

There was note taken this evening of a little gesture of mine this afternoon. At the corner of one of your streets I saluted a Confederate flag. First of all, any soldier is proud to salute any banner that reminds him of the red badge of courage. It seems to me that now more than ever courage is the thing. We must seek that courage because courage is the enemy of selfishness, courage is the power to suppress your individual safety, your individual advantage in favor of the group. Courage is what these men who are honored guests here tonight, who are now members of two hospitals, have displayed on the battle fields. That same type of courage displayed constantly by everyone of us is all that this country needs to live safely and securely in this world no matter how chaotic it may appear at this moment. Thank you!

May I impose on you one minute to say how deeply proud I am that this Order should have been chosen to present to me and my wife such a delightful memento of this city. Whenever I am made the recipient of any present as a feature or a factor in the problems that I had during the World War, I have the very great burden to carry that there may be men sleeping under white crosses because some mistake of mine was responsible. There is no greater pacifist than a soldier that has been in the war. I can only say, if those who came back and the relatives of those who did not come back still see fit to present me with a memento then I have received all the honor that a friend of the American people could receive.

• Speech at Air University, Maxwell Field, Alabama, April 8, 1947

Gentlemen, I should say that this is probably one of the largest audiences I have met with in recent months and it isn't too flattering to recall to my own mind that of course you were ordered out. Nevertheless, I do have this distinction from some of your guest speakers - most of them have been invited for a particular purpose, and in this instance, I did at least half of the inviting because I wanted to come see you.

My convictions as to the worthwhile quality of our school system to the welfare of this United States are very deep and very profound. The military has always been accused of being narrow-minded, reactionary, stubborn, slow to change, bound by ritual, and the reason that it has always irritated us to hear these charges is because there has usually been an element of truth in the. One of the purposes of our schools is to keep minds flexible, to keep you thinking, not to cram you with fact, although I presume your faculty urges you that when you use your thinking capacity that you don't discard fact and that you don't merely roam off into the realm of fancy and of vision. If the school can keep us aware, first of all, of our position, our function, in our national life, that is one great accomplishment. That mission, or that function, as I see it, is merely to be the executive agency or the executive corps, in order to carry out a great mission laid upon us by the Government, the Government representing our people. We must keep abreast of every development that can promise any type of threat to this country, and when we say "this country" we must not narrow our view to thinking only in terms of territory, of lives, of property. We are thinking of a way of life. The only reason America will willingly go to war is when it sees upon the horizon some threat to its system of government that it recognizes as very real and very dangerous. As a matter of fact, it is my own belief that no people in the world where the power resides in the people will go to war except for some deep and compelling motive of that kind. Now if that is the reason America will fight and we are kept as paid servants of the Government, first to keep us out of war and second, to wage it successfully if we get in, then it is up to us to think of the welfare of that country, not only in terms of our own specific and particular function but in its overall welfare. I take the example of the budget. We look at the budget, the national budget, from our own viewpoint, and the estimating agencies operating very sincerely with every man putting his best brains on it in order to keep the cost down says we can use fourteen billion dollars this year. That budget as it finally gets before the Congress is something under six billion, but I feel that the real Army officer does not take a resentful attitude toward the government that found that to be necessary because that government is interested in the protection of our way of life just as much as we are. We are to protect it from outside threat but that way of life can be threatened from the inside through collapse of the economic system, through tremendous inflation of the currency, through industrial strife, through a number of things that can come about, let us say, merely from the unbalanced budget. So it becomes the soldier's job to pick up his burden, and he realized frequently that he sees this problem of possible outside threat much more clearly than does his civilian counterpart or his representatives in Washington and he is very much worried and

properly so because he gets no more money to do his job, but what I say is we must learn in these schools and we must carry in our brains and in our hearts the idea that whatever they can afford to give us we are going to do our best with it. There is no other criterion in my mind by which to measure an officer of the U.S. Army.

Another particular reason that I wanted to visit this school is because of the convictions that I formed in war about the nature and character of warfare of today and any that we would have to wage in the measurable future. I think that both the Air Forces and Ground Forces went to war with some very dangerous ideas. The Ground Forces were never ready to concede the tremendous effectiveness and power of the airplane, the airplane in all its different uses in war. The Air Forces, on the other side, probably influenced by Douhet and others of that school, did not want to admit too close a connection with the Ground Forces because you will recall in those days there was also a political fight. Too many of the Ground element of the Army could see no future existence for the Air Forces, although a few of us were wise enough to realize that if we could get rid of you, we would have some money for ourselves, but the Air did not want to admit that it had too important a function in direct connection with the Ground, for the very reason that that was likely to be used, that fact was likely to be used as an argument against their own proper organization, and I say proper organization not only as a conviction formed during this war but one that I held long before, with many others, although you might know we were not too vociferous, but when we came into the war and we saw what its character was we realized gradually and we came more and more to realize that the expression, “air support of the ground” is absolutely erroneous in its implications, because there is no separate Ground war, there is no separate Sea war, there is no separate Air war. The Armed Forces are merely set up to apply tactical power in every possible way it can be applied to bring about the readiness of your enemy to call it a day and surrender and give up to your will, and even this thing we call strategic air bombing, the air bombings turned toward Berlin or Posen or any other place, is more effective as its targets are integrated most carefully with the broader objectives of your Ground and Sea war. We learned that early in Europe and I am sure that General Spaatz or others who may have been here before you, and who were my trusty right and left arms during the war, have told you the same thing, so in schools such as this what I should like to see put over and kept in your minds is that you are a member of the fighting forces of the United States Army. Don’t ever allow yourselves to think of yourselves solely as air officers or officers of any other component or arm. The same applies to the National Guard and Reserve. It is unfortunate we have to have adjectives and other terms of differentiation among us. We all wear the uniform of the fighting services of the USA, all of our job is a completely integrated one, and we must remember it always. And in a larger sense we are only a very small part, and I mean all the fighting forces together, of the military might of America. You people more than most are aware of how much that might is centered back in the airplane factories, but the same thing goes throughout our country, into the mine, the farm, factories, everywhere, but more than that, the defense and strength of America lies in 140 million wills to do the same thing at the same time and that is what won the war. If we can pursue our own special studies, our technical studies, our tactical and strategical studies, our organization plans in that light, I am perfectly certain we will never go wrong. To show my full trust in the concept, I should like to point out this: every Ground soldier knows he cannot fight and win a battle without Air. Yet in the plan that is laid before Congress, the Ground portions of the Army insist on stripping itself of every last airplane. You will not even find that we have asked to preserve for ourselves any tactical reconnaissance unit. We insist the Air all go because when the Air is needed on a portion of the front, you need it all, you don’t need part of it, and if you people are not ready to come in, not with a stingy little bit of detachment to go over and see what the Third Division is doing, but with everything you’ve got when the other fellow calls, then you don’t deserve the status you have not the positions you occupy, but I have never found such an implication to exist anywhere and my reason for insisting, as I say, that you go is because when we want you back we want you all unified to come back and make it easy for us.

There are a few problems with which I now wrestle in Washington, and General Spaatz and some others are my partners, that I thought might be of some interest to you today. I am not going to mention budget and its terrific implications and difficulties but I am going to take up with you for a few minutes the personnel problem. As you know, we are desperately trying to switch from a system based upon pure seniority in the Army to one that is based almost exclusively upon merit, selection. No one will quarrel with the academic superiority of such a plan but what everybody worries about are the obvious dangers to such a system. For example, favoritism can creep in. Maybe we will encourage apple-polishing and boot-licking rather than a

straight-forward, stand-up conviction, initiative, and those qualities that we want so desperately to develop among all of our officers. With respect to that, and without going into the long system by which we hope to produce these qualities, I want to assure you that if it is humanly possible for us to keep out any temptation toward this, “Yes, yes, colonel,” keep that tendency out as a factor in bringing along the worthwhile officer to an earlier promotion than the other type, we will certainly do it. We will keep it out if it is humanly possible and I think it is. To show you how far we have gone, and this is a mere example, in changing our system so that one person’s whim, one person’s - let us say - favoritism, or personal friendships, will have nothing to do with it under the new plan. The Chief of Staff himself will have no voice in choosing the general officers of the Army. The most he would be able to do would be to cross out a man’s name as unsuited by reason of his own knowledge of that person, and then he could not select a successor. Every single one of these selections from the grade of first lieutenant and captain and on up will be made by duly considered legal boards, the Chief of Staff, the Secretary of War and President will have nothing to do with it. In trying to make that system workable we ran into some very great difficulties, and it will probably be a shock to some of you, particularly you older officers, to find out that our efficiency reports as they have existed are a curious mixture of value and of complete worthlessness. If the selective system were put into effect today and the wisest men in all the world had to go to our records to pick the proper men for promotion tomorrow, it could not be done. They could do it in about 12 or 2 years if you had enough wise officers. The record is there and if all of the information can be laboriously searched out it is there, so I see no chance of any man being unjustly or unfairly treated, but to get these records in such a character that we can deal with them more effectively in the future and preserve this system, there is an experimental form coming out this year and this meeting gives me the opportunity to ask each of you a special favor. To you it is going to look a bit cockeyed, this new form. You are not going to think too much of it, but I tell you earnestly that we cannot go on as we have. We must do something. This form has been built up by personnel managers of great industrial firms, we even called in a psychiatrist, and then we have tried to get the finest and best of our older soldiers both in the Air Forces and in the Ground to devise a form that will give the War Department the knowledge that will be of greatest fairness to each of you and in this connection and in pleading that you take that report and use it intelligently, remember you are not merely marking the man whose name is on that sheet because this whole system is under test and you are marking yourself because it is that system that will determine your year’s rating. I cannot tell you how great an importance I attach, not necessarily to this form but to the earnestness and seriousness of the test to which we apply it this year. I don’t mind telling you I am still a bit concerned about it myself. I am very concerned, so much so that we are labeling it, “Experimental Form, 1947.” It must be tested and it is only with the help of people in the field wherever they are that we can find out whether or not it works.

With respect to the matter of unification which I know that all of you are so interested, I can only say that a plan was finally agreed upon among the Naval, Air and Ground authorities, and that command was submitted to Congress. Each of the heads of those Services have gone down to the Congress and supported that plan. We do not know whether it is soon to be passed but we are assured of very earnest support of the plan. It does not follow possibly what people call my extreme views on the one hand, it does not follow or pay full attention to some of the objections that were voiced other places. It has been labeled by the President as a compromise, but all of us thoroughly believe it is a good start and will lead us toward greater unification. That is the kind of unification and development that we expect from this school and we expect from those graduates of these schools who go on to the National Defense College and the other two colleges in which all of us, Air, Ground and Navy, and in one of them the State Department, all get together.

With this rather rambling dissertation, I come back again to this one thing. You are now engaged in work that is as serious and important to the United States as any that you performed in war; and never was a time in view of all of its internal and external problems that the United States needed more that devotion, the intelligence, the complete, tireless effort of every man who is entitled to be called a servant of the United States Government.

It has been a very great privilege to be here.

• Notes for Address at The Wings Club, New York City, May 5, 1947

It is an honor for me to address the representatives of an industry all which, within a quarter-century, has developed from handcraft and fabric wings to the giant planes that now speed men and goods over the trade routes of the world. Never in so short a period has man made comparable conquest over his environment. Vision and magnificent faith in human capacity have mastered the ancient obstacles of time and space. But amazing though the scientific victories are, the real significance of the airplane is its effect on the life and thinking of man, who created it.

The peoples of the earth now dwell in startling proximity to each other. So far, however, it is a proximity only in hours of flight; they are not close in common ideals and mutual understanding. Technological advance has outdistanced - at least for the time being - the social progress that it induces or, more accurately, that it demands. Lag between material achievements and a just share in their benefits by the mass of men is a dangerous condition that can invite disaster. Starvation and overproduction, bloated wealth and extreme poverty on a national scale cannot co-exist, only hours apart, without developing pressures far more intense than those of other days when time and distance served as safety valves.

Before any people can be assured security to enjoy victory over our physical world, scientific developments must be matched by fundamental changes in human attitudes. What influence we of America have in this direction, what contribution we make, will vitally affect our future, linked as we are to the world community. The product of change may be evil, unless leadership that guides it is broad enough to comprehend the general welfare of all nations. The golden rule of human conduct applies with equal strength to nations and to the men that form them.

The social and economic patterns that have characterized states and nations for ages were evolved when men were dependent on trade winds and ocean currents, on rivers and valley routes for trade and intercourse. The ocean barriers and mountain walls that once separated them from competitive patterns have been hurdled and, despite arbitrary political barricades, all peoples now live in a small world.

There is no room for the old rivalries and prejudices, the greeds and hates that divided nations in the past. The international expression of those vices is war. And war has grown in evil as the world has shrunk in distance.

No longer is any spot immune from its ravages; no longer is any human being exempt from its penalties. The achievements of air transport have been accompanied by unlimited possibilities for mutual destruction. Their dreadful implications demand international effort as extensive and untiring as men can maintain. The future of civilization, so far as we can see, depends on the outcome of world cooperation. But evils, entrenched in the structure of human relations, cannot be eliminated except through the inspired and stubborn effort of free people everywhere. In the meantime - until mankind gains effective control of the causes that beget war - security against destruction must be a first concern of a prudent nation.

In the security field, as well as in the political and economic, the role of aviation must be taken into account in all future planning. In the second World War, the air arm earned a position of full parity with land and sea forces. We are presently seeking to establish this parity by legislation. No one can contest the validity of such purpose. The air today is as much a sphere of human activity - whether it be commercial, social or military - as the land and sea have been since the dawn of recorded history. (Concept of the Overlord plan.)

The so-called unification measure, however, goes beyond recognition that the Air Force has come of age; that fact is not made any stronger by a law; it is written so that all can read in the ruined production plants of Germany and Japan. But unification is intended to incorporate into the military establishment the lesson we learned in the combat theaters - there is no longer such a thing as separate land, sea and air war; it is all one war.

There were times, of course, when specific operations were confined to one force because of the particular target involved or the nature of the mission against it. But for every such operation, there were scores where air and ground forces of necessity joined and many where all three were grouped in a single concerted punch, packed with everything we had. We defeated our enemies because we achieved sea, air and land mastery over them. Had we lacked mastery in one of the three, victory over the Axis would not have been dated 1945.

The legislation, now pending, provides a responsible civilian head of the armed services who will be in a position to build efficiency and unity of purpose with maximum economy of effort and funds. Its aim is the

development of a modern security structure, retaining every element proved necessary to a balanced establishment. It assures the Air Force its legitimate status as a dominant agent in modern warfare; the only agent whose effectiveness is not restricted by geographical barriers or reduced by long delay between decision to act and action itself.

It has never been the way of this democracy during the years of peace to maintain great land forces capable of aggressive warfare. History proves, rather, that it has been our custom to let the military establishment lapse after war into something less than a minimum defensive force. It is only after we are threatened or actually struck that we adopt adequate measures for the generation of our full military power. Under these circumstances, the Air Force represents a modern striking weapon which will be immediately available to fend off an aggressor and, at the same time, to strike with retaliatory swiftness the initial blows at his source of power. Its very readiness is an insurance policy against attack.

The military aspect of aviation, however, is only one side of a vast subject. Fleets of aircraft from American production lines are today engaged on missions of peace; hurrying statesmen across half the earth, rushing medical aid to stricken areas, speeding a world's economic recovery, reducing to hours our measure of distance. Human contacts are thereby broadened - Europe and Asia, Africa, the Americas and Australia are now as close to each other as New York and Philadelphia in our forefathers' time. Inevitably, the plane becomes an instrument for the spreading of ideas, ideals and good will. At the same time it exhibits in tangible form the unprecedented technical progress achieved by our democracy.

Technical progress by itself may not win us new friends. There has been, for that matter, too much emphasis on the mere material productivity of our industrial techniques - the chrome plumbing, the automobiles, the radios, the automatic heating and air conditioning plants that are so common in this country and such priceless rarities to hundreds of millions beyond our shores. When we did not have them - and in my boyhood there was little of them on a Kansas farm - our belief in the value of democracy, our appreciation of its fruits, was no less than now. But when those material advantages are joined in the minds of men with the possession of personal liberty, then the American way becomes synonymous for them with physical and political freedom; independence from drudgery and disease, independence from the tyranny of other men. Our products, plus our leadership in things of the spirit, will win friends.

The memory of man is long and people, however backward in the techniques of mass production, know well that the deeper values of life still stand unchallenged. No scientific progress can replace the virtues of cooperation, charity, patience and understanding. Unless our planes carry to the peoples of other lands new inspiration, new guidance, new courage in the improvement of relations between men, we will fail a national responsibility. The problems brought to a head by the amazing development of air transport cannot be dodged by us who - more than any other people - made this the age of flight.

Extraordinary opportunity to measure up to our responsibility awaits our industrial system and, in particular, the men of aviation. No matter what the pessimists may say, there has never been a time in the world's history that so many men of so many nations of such diverse cultures and traditions have been willing to seek in conference a solution to international problems. The points of difference between us, fundamental though many of them still are and intense in pressure, have shrunk numerically under scrutiny by men made more world-conscious by the advance of science.

By applying your wealth of specialized knowledge to joining the nations even more closely, you men of aviation will render your world a service that cannot be measured in dollars. Your objective should be the attainment of such physical proximity among the peoples, such constant exchange of ideas and goods, that tomorrow's world will be as closely knit as today's metropolitan city. Your leadership in your field will stimulate leadership in other fields - the political, the medical, the social, in every area where men must have guidance and inspiration.

We cannot escape the responsibilities of leadership. To fulfill them, we must make clear that our interests are broad and sympathetic, that we are not worshippers of the machine obsessed with its inanimate products, but that we are a people who view with understanding and compassion the entire field of problems affecting mankind. Let men understand that we threaten no rash exploitation, that instead we offer the promise to plow into the land as much or more than we take from it - and we shall achieve international friendship as we have technical leadership. Our own national life will be the healthier, make no mistake about it; if we abide by the

principles of democracy in our relations with other people, we shall strengthen them at home; the wider their exercise, the more firm their base.

The American air industry is an American missionary throughout the earth. It spreads the truth of Americanism. Even in the remotest corner of the world this democracy symbolizes man's new mastery over the elemental powers of nature. We may be a transient burst of flame briefly lighting the horizon until all the lights of civilization are quenched in another war; or we may be an unwavering beacon that guides mankind toward truth and freedom, peace and security for all. We may exploit the present for what it is worth, ignoring the future; or we may build into the world's framework the basic American principles that time has proved fruitful in filling the wants of men.

I am confident that our leadership shall be strong and untiring in the cause of humanity; great challenges to our spirit have always been met by great response. We, who have searched the recesses of physical nature for the betterment of man and have triumphed over the seemingly impossible, will not be less diligent in searching the closer field of human relations for the attainment of man's first need - peace with his fellows. For ages he dreamed of the power of flight - and now he possesses it; for ages he has dreamed of a peaceful stable world - he can possess it. One is no more impossible than the other.

Cynicism and sneering sophistication are no answers to the problem. Likewise the Pollyanna is helpless to provide the sturdy leadership we need. But if we look the difficulties squarely in the face - if we rise, in the battle of peace, to the heights we achieved in war - then we, to our own self interest, yes, to our own salvation, can lead this weary world into an era of human tranquility and happiness!

• Notes for DAR Convention, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, DC, May 19, 1947

Man's social development has been influenced by the knowledge that for certain of his basic needs he must depend upon concerted action of a group. Among these needs has been that of establishing rules and laws to control relationships among individuals and measures to protect the whole against the threat from without. Thus have arisen organisms of collective political enterprise which have, so far, found their highest manifestation in what we call the nation.

This nation was recognized, at its birth, as a new and startling political development. It was no monarchy or oligarchy; it conformed to no familiar pattern. Its distinctive feature was government by consent of the governed, coupled with guarantees to every individual, great and small, rich and poor, of the maximum in personal liberty.

Carried across the ocean in the hearts of the original settlers, individual freedom on this continent was practiced in considerable measure long before the writing of our Constitution. It was in the air, the forests, the streams of the New World. It was understood then, as now, that privileges and rights of individuals can be exercised only so long as those individuals, by cooperative action, support and maintain the governmental mechanism which can protect each in those same rights and privileges, either from abuse or destruction. The problem was to combine individual freedom with a linking together of the people of the thirteen colonies by bonds strong enough to keep the young nation intact and to enable it to carry on necessary central functions, including the basic one of security.

The nation's founders made these two purposes their guiding star. The Articles of Confederation declared the union "perpetual;" and when these Articles were found to be an inadequate binder, the Constitution replaced them and set forth as its initial purpose "to form a more perfect union."

Insistence upon individual freedom springs from unshakable conviction in the dignity of man; a belief - a religious belief - that through the possession of a soul he is endowed with certain rights that are his not by sufferance of others, but by reason of his very existence.

Further, if the individual is to be truly free, he must be provided opportunity to gain his livelihood through means of his own choosing. The American plan, consequently, included as one of its essential parts a system of free enterprise. It was perfectly clear then, as now, that if title and control of all property should reside in a central government, the individuals required to cultivate, operate and manage these resources would necessarily respond only to the orders of the government. The founders understood that complete regimentation for

production inescapably involves regimentation of expression and action.

Finally, implicit in the American system is a faith that Americans, in the discharge of natural responsibilities and functions, will cooperate to preserve the individual freedoms they so highly prize. The obligations of the individual citizen to his central government are thus no less important in democracy than under dictatorship; the difference is that in democracy they are voluntarily undertaken - in the other case they are performed at the bayonet's point.

Thus American democracy stands upon three main pillars, the first of which is unshakable belief in the dignity of man; the second is a system of free enterprise; and the third is nation-wide cooperation in support of all functions that the central government must perform in the interests of all. Should any one of these three pillars be undermined at home or destroyed from without, the American system, as we know it, cannot exist.

Methods and means of applying principle change, else we stagnate in the pattern of older civilizations that have violated this rule. But the principles, the basic tenets, must stand always as our guide posts if we are to fulfill our duty to ourselves, out children and the world.

By reason both of self-interest and world peace, the United States has a vital role to fill in this troubled world. Supporting our ethical standards there must be a calm resolution and a healthy security. Only thus can we inspire, rather than hopelessly disappoint, those who seek assurance that we, the world's greatest stronghold of man's rights, will stand in the spirit of Valley Forge and Brandywine for the justice and rights that form the only secure foundation for peace. As freedom gains affection and respect throughout the world, as it wins staunch adherents in diverse nations, it increasingly insures itself, in every country, against destruction from any cause. This truth, well understood everywhere, comprehends both the reason for and the aim of our leadership. Peace is the goal - we must neither despair of its attainment nor dare we be impractically naive in this search. Work is indicated - tireless and effective work; and to work we must be strong!

The strength for this purpose is not found solely or even principally in regiments, fleets and air formations. Fundamentally that strength springs from the collective will of 140,000,000 people. Industrial efficiency and maximum productivity of our farms and factories are as important to world peace and, therefore, to our security as any amount of armed force. The watchword is cooperation - the team-play that spells America. This means that each of us has a responsibility in the promotion of world order; collectively we cannot promote cooperation abroad unless we, here at home, cooperate as individuals for the good of the entire country.

The security provided by armed forces is limited to protection from external attack by violence. They have no function in securing us from a more insidious form of attack. There are vicious cults that seek in termite fashion to destroy the foundations established by Magna Charta, the Declaration of Independence, the American Constitution. They recognize as our primary strength the unity of our people and so use every plausible argument to create division. Industrially, socially, politically, they seek to divide and confuse.

Knowing our love of individual freedom they make extravagant though false promises that they will give to each a better life of more liberty and greater happiness. The inevitable sword of dictatorship that is so clearly evident in every form of statism, they hope to hide from the unthinking by the density of their propaganda; and so they promote and incite human passions at home and preach defenselessness against any danger from without.

Yet it is clear that so long as they have no more than their own manufactured falsehoods as ammunition, they are bound to fail. Their real chance comes from failure on our part to live up, honestly and persistently, to the true principles on which this country was founded. If we insistently reject any doctrine that acknowledges disparity of right based upon class, race or creed; if we discharge our individual obligations to the state as freely as we enjoy the rights and privileges it accords us; if we train ourselves thoroughly to meet the requirements of any emergency; if we place the good of the country above opportunity for immediate gain; then we shall have the greatest amount of good for the greatest number among ourselves. And the enemies of our system, be they envious from without or the misguided and selfishly ambitious from within, will encounter only defeat in their effort.

You may say that here I have entered the field of morals; that I am blinding myself to human weaknesses and preaching a perfection unattainable in human relationships. Go with me for an instant to the battlefield: every soldier knows that in war the most important factor of all is morale, the spiritual quality of the men who fight. America has placed upon the battlefields of many conflicts men carrying within themselves such

convictions of duty, so inspired to perform that duty without regard to personal cost, that they have never yet emerged from war except with victory perched upon their standards.

If teaching, training and example can give millions of men the heart and will to face the indescribable terrors of battle, then America's schools, her churches, her statesmen, her leaders in every field, her patriotic institutions, such as this, can drive home the conviction that the welfare of each of us demands first of all and above all else, the welfare of our country. This is not to preach unselfishness, sacrifice and altruism on an idealistic moral or religious plane; it is a matter of plain self-interest - self-interest of the individual as well as of the nation and therefore of the world.

For one hundred and seventy years we have proved false the gloomy predictions of those who claimed that no people could combine the seemingly contradictory purposes of individual freedom and national effectiveness. Abiding steadfastly by the basic tenets of our system, we can continue to stand before the world as an exponent of democracy. Unified and productive within, our influence for good will be strong without. The alternative stands tragically clear - the deterioration of civilization in an atmosphere of hysterical fear if not of open conflict!

From the Constitution of the Daughters of the American Revolution I read these words: "To cherish, maintain and extend the institutions of American freedom, to foster true patriotism and love of country, and to aid in securing for mankind all the blessings of liberty."

So long as this membership lives in that high purpose and so long as it devotes its efforts to interpret that purpose faithfully before the world, it will be an effective implement toward democracy's unity and the worldwide extension of its humanitarian principles. It will remain worthy of the great American traditions that you have been organized to perpetuate.

• Address to graduating class, Army Information School, May 21, 1947

No investment by the American Government has returned such tremendous dividends as the amount of money spent on the Army school system during the years between the two world wars; and I assume that the same is true of the Navy. I intend to do everything in my power to support our Army school system, to expand it and to elevate it ever and ever to higher levels.

By providing common doctrine and understanding throughout the Army, the school system paid off abundantly in the test of war. We were able to use our troops with a flexibility that was almost impossible in any other Army. Fortunately, our teaching was not based upon some leader's personal ideas. An accepted doctrine pervading our Army made possible, even in the heat of battle, the sudden transfer of a corps from one Army to another, from one Army group to another, without the slightest break in the continuity of supply.

Even so, I am convinced that we approached Army schooling between the wars in too narrow a fashion. We were too much concerned with what each of us had to do to fit himself for a particular assignment. We were not sufficiently concerned with the broader problem of the Army's role in the civilization that we call America, and of the responsibilities that we of the military profession bear toward the people who pay us our wages. These subjects should be included in the curriculum of every Army school. They are brought into sharp focus at the Army Information School. I am so convinced of the importance of the Information and Education program and of Public Relations, that, if it can possibly be arranged, eventually even army graduates of the National War College will attend this school. For, unless we approach these subjects objectively and in an organized fashion, under leadership of a staff devoted to the study of every aspect of this subject, we are not going to get a common doctrine.

We of the Army have lagged in our awareness of public relations. This attitude perhaps dates from the era of the Indian Wars, when the Army was stationed in isolated outposts, and the military were a class unto themselves. I can still recall when I first heard the term "public relations officer." So far as I could see, the job generally consisted of scaring up a couple of photographers and perhaps inviting an editor to the post, in the hope that he would write a nice story.

Public relations requires first of all an understanding of our own jobs. It means informing and educating ourselves in the objectives of those jobs. As servants of the American people, we may then clearly explain to

them exactly what they are keeping us for. Too many people not only don't understand the problem of National Security; they don't even think about it, dismissing it with the view that "We hire a bunch of soldiers. That's their specialty. Let them do it."

Such a narrow viewpoint may well be fatal in a world where war has become global in character. Just as everybody is involved in total war, so everybody's contribution is necessary to winning the war. The miner underground, the farmer in the field, the worker in the factory - all are as essential, if war comes, as the military.

The American people constantly must be made aware of their share in the National Security. The ever-changing character of war, the responsibilities of the Army in maintaining the peace, the huge responsibility that confronts that military establishment in case that peace is lost - all these must be presented to the public. It is a job as wide as democracy, because it is democracy that we are trying to defend.

There are no limits to the task of educating ourselves to this responsibility. Every man who wears the uniform must realize why he is in the Army; that is not merely to get his monthly pay, but rather to serve the people of whom he is a part. The soldier's duty is not just to perform his job. He has got to hold always in mind, "Why am I doing this?" and "Why does the United States need me?" Any other type of soldier is a detriment to the Army.

Our responsibility is not limited to performance of duties given us by our superiors in the military hierarchy, or even given to us collectively by the President, our Commander in Chief. The law states that the Chief of Staff is the military adviser to the President and to the Secretary of War. In a certain sense, each member of the military establishment shares that responsibility with me. It is impossible for any few men, no matter what their qualifications, to circulate the information that is needed to enable our people to understand what they are up against in assuring the National Security. The powers of press, radio, and moving pictures, and of all the media that men use to communicate ideas from one central point to vast audiences, are well known. But I venture to suggest that the best way to advance Army public relations is by the way we ourselves live. Personal example is the kind of public relations we need.

If you are an instructor in a college, serving on a staff, or commanding your company, your platoon, or your squad in the field, and are doing your work seriously, that, to my mind, is public relations. When I speak of taking your job seriously, I should also warn you: Don't take yourselves too seriously. A balanced sense of humor that permits us to grin once in a while is better than a sorrowful visage every time we think of our Nation's possible problems.

Our staff in Washington is concerned with such matters as legislation, and getting the Congress to understand the problems involved in carrying on essential activities and in training our youth - as insurance if we have to fight a war. In the long run, none of these problems can be solved in Washington. The best that can be done is to give advice to relatively few individuals, all of whom derive their power from the people you meet and talk with every day.

Army schools have an influence far beyond the immediate understanding of those who are undergoing instruction. For at these schools is inculcated the doctrine that we of the military profession do not own the Army; rather, the people own the Army, and we are a part of the people. We are here to serve a Nation that represents the greatest human achievement in history. As long as we try to serve the Nation in this spirit, there will be no question of the effectiveness and efficiency of our public relations.

• Notes for Address at the Fire Underwriters, New York City, May 27, 1947

In our tightly knit economy, all professions and callings - no matter how widely separated they may be in purpose and technique - all have points of contact and areas of common interest. Banker or housewife, farmer, carpenter, soldier - no one of us can live and act without effect on all the others. Since a world grown small makes all men neighbors, the philosopher's maxim, "Nothing human is foreign to me," more than ever is embedded in fact. But for our citizens, this truth demands as its corollary – "Everything American vitally concerns every American."

Even actuarial tables - compiled over scores of years from hundreds of millions of individual experiences, the product of lengthy and abstruse calculations - even they directly affect the daily life of every man and

woman in this country. During the last war they played an important, though little known, part in the nation's victory effort. Their effect justifies me in seizing this particular moment to pay tribute to all of your Board who were closely connected with the War Damage Corporation. For more than five years, they served, without compensation, this United States agency which issued five million policies covering 140 billion dollars in liability. A wise and prudent national enterprise, designed to protect the country against financial disruption and to lessen the physical cost of war - should it strike within our shores - was buttressed by your patriotic service.

No matter how much wisdom may go into planning, whether it be an insurance program, an armed invasion of a continent, a campaign to reduce the inroads of disease, the measure of its success always will be the spirit and mettle of the individuals engaged in its execution. No matter how much treasure may support a project or how elaborate its organization or how detailed and farsighted its operational scheme, the human element is always the central one. A business, an industry, the nation itself, prospers and is strong only insofar as its men and women are determined to make it great and work together for that end.

Particularly in matters that concern the nation's welfare, the citizen, the community, the government, are jointly responsible: the individual American, because he is the source of all energy in a democracy; the community, because it is the most immediate agent of action; and the government, because only through it can there be effective coordination of all the skills and know ledges, the resources and capacities, that are demanded by an enterprise concerned with the welfare of 140 million human beings. But the root of success is still the contribution of the individual. National welfare - that is, general security from the four fundamental evils of human existence; fire, famine, pestilence and war - is the business of each citizen because it is he, ultimately, who suffers or profits. Because he has made it his business, we have attained measurable success over fire, famine and pestilence.

We have not achieved decisive supremacy over these dangers or complete independence from fear of them. No matter how much we may boast of our accomplishments in medicine, in economic productivity, in fire prevention and control, there is evidence always about us that we are still far from full success. Epidemics cut wide swaths of death; starvation or malnutrition become so serious that the future of a people is darkened; catastrophes reduce great structures to flaming ruin. But each eruption of a natural evil spurs us to new effort for its remedy, control and future prevention. Charity, impelling us to aid our stricken fellows at home and in distant lands, is joined with studious effort to unearth the causes of disaster and with national and international planning to prevent their recurrence.

We realize that calamity is a part of human life so long as men through carelessness, stupidity, ignorance or criminal intent breach the barriers against it, but we do not relax our effort to make its penalties less severe on the innocent. Although our tribute during the past twelve months to the god of fire cost hundreds of millions in dollars and more than 10,000 lives, we do not accept such losses as inevitable, if men are prudent and alert. Fire, famine, pestilence, consequently, have lost much of their ancient terror as the scourges of human existence. We recognize their remaining threat as largely the penalty of our indifference or neglect.

War, however, is not a natural evil; it is man-made. Combining all the horrors of the other three, its malevolence and diabolic savagery have been increased by man himself in the very years that he has learned control over the natural evils of life. As never before, the essence of war is fire, famine and pestilence. They contribute to its outbreak; they are among its weapons; they become its consequences. The tragedy of war is multiplied by acceptance of its inevitability, although since man is its origin - his carelessness, stupidity, or criminal intent the occasion of war - it should be subject to the same prevention and control as the evils that comprise it.

For men like myself whose professional concern is defense against war, there is obvious benefit in the study of endeavor directed toward the prevention of natural catastrophes. I do not suggest any mechanical parallel between fire prevention and war prevention, between a fire department and a war department, although effectiveness of both depends on immediacy of action with trained men and proper equipment. But there is a parallel in the development of methods and attitudes that have removed fire as a deadly menace to civilized life and in what must be done if we are ever to be liberated from dread of war and its consequences.

In the former it has been and in the latter is must be a process of education and research, understanding causes and blocking their outbreak, of improving methods and devising safeguards. Above all these is the task of developing in the individual an awareness of his personal responsibility, so that the efforts of many may not

be nullified by the fault of a few.

Citizen, community and nation joined to help defeat the menace of fire. To win security against it in the crowded city, the individual early joined his fellows in the volunteer fire departments; he entered into associations for relief from loss of injury; he sought out better devices to prevent or to extinguish; he designed legislation to curb carelessness or selfishness that might endanger property and lives; he engaged in an untiring campaign, that still continues, to teach the cause and prevention of fires. To observe fire codes, individuals surrender their right to build as they choose; communities join with other communities to learn more about prevention and control; government cooperates through its manifold facilities; the nation's attention, by such measures as the President's conference, is focused on the evil. It is a mighty effort involving all our citizens, requiring the expenditure of immense sums of money and covering every area of our social and economic life. And no one questions the value of the effort or balks at its cost. Fire, all men realize, must be controlled if the economic structure we have built is to be free from the threat of recurrent destruction.

There is here the shadowy outline, at least, of a pattern of effort against war! For too many generations, too much of the world has taken it for granted that war is a normal part of human life, whose penalties can be lessened, not by rooting out the cause of war, but only by maintaining so large and powerful a war machine that defeat would be impossible - the equivalent, say, of maintaining fire departments on every street corner while building cities of tinder and tissue.

As I see it, we need an organized effort, embracing every phase of society, whose goal will be the development of individual, community and national attitudes that will remove war from the category of the inevitable into its proper position as an evil subject to prevention, or at least control. Understanding by the citizen of the causes of war; acceptance by him of his responsibility to correct them so far as he can; vigilance of the community against apathy or defects that might weaken control of war; readiness of the nation to act as a single force should war strike - these four are basic attitudes or postures whose attainment will end the weakness that provokes attack and the indifference of the individual that permits the chance of war to become fact of war.

War is no longer the concern of the soldier alone; in its commencement, its waging and its settlement, he is only one of many. Although the outcome of battle is dependent on his action, his strength for victory is the product of the entire nation behind him. The economist, industrialist, scientist, the farmer, worker and teacher are necessary to the waging of war. Likewise they are likely targets of enemy action in war. In the same way it is the business of all to contribute to the prevention of war. Security against war is a function of citizenship.

From kindergarten to the nation's highest councils, war should be considered, as it is in fact, an evil whose outbreak is the result of human errors, human ignorance, human greed. Seen in its proper focus, as the product of man himself, its causes known and its development predictable, we can build within this nation a security establishment that, because it comprises all our capacity will be a powerful curb against the eruption of war and an effective force for its extinguishment should it break loose.

Of necessity, it would be a very involved process; the prevention of war is a far more complicated matter than fire prevention. It must be a long term effort; traditional attitudes toward war, developed over centuries, cannot be corrected or displaced within a generation. It may be, at the start, a one-sided endeavor, we cannot expect others to abandon deep-seated prejudices merely on our counsel. Discouragement is inevitable whenever humane leadership encounters a resentment and opposition that appear wholly without reason. But even such discouragement must never be permitted to develop into desertion of the cause. The difficulties are of little moment if each step toward their solution is an increase in our security against another war that, if permitted to develop unrestrained, may destroy civilization.

To teach our children so that they may be well informed citizens of their country and their world; to train our young men that they may be able defenders of the peace; to integrate our economy so that all our resources may be mustered to meet the disaster of war - all that is nothing more or less than the duplication in another and larger sphere of the effort by which we have liberated the communities of this country from the constant menace of destruction by fire.

In the effort toward international safeguards, we shall not work alone. Nations now are seeking, at the highest level, to develop cooperation and arbitration as a barrier against war. There is no people that does not hope for their success in this attempt. If we lead the way in showing how this international endeavor may be

reinforced and supported all the way back to the individual citizen, we shall not lack for followers. Regardless of his race, politics or creed, the common man, when given a worthy goal and guidance toward it, does not rest until it has been attained.

In a world of interdependent nations, where men comprehend the causes of war and understand their mutual responsibility to control them, war may happen - but it will cease to be an institution, a characteristic of human society.

The stake in the campaign is not property and dollars, no matter how wasteful war is of these commodities. It is not merely famine and pestilence for a given proportion of the earth's population. It is rather, the way of life to which we are devoted; it is civilization as we know it. Even more, it is rapidly becoming humanity's existence. The earth may become a flowering garden or a sterile desert - and we may make the difference.

• Notes for West Point Address, June 3, 1947

It is difficult for you, on this long-awaited day, to understand the eagerness with which you will look forward in later years to every return to this spot. For the former cadet, each visit here holds inspiration and renewal of faith in the things by which he lives and in the service to which he is dedicated.

That self-dedication is the preservation of the free system established by the American Constitution. Through your solemn oath to support and defend Constitution, you become one with the living and dead who have given the best within them that this nation, free and secure, might become for all men a champion of right and a leader in the ways of peace. While all Americans seek this common goal, you, as soldiers, pursue a special path toward it.

Your training has held before you the lodestars of your predecessors - loyalty and service to the nation. But you are still individuals, each of you the product of his own family, his own blood lines, his own state and community. Each of you has strengths and capacities, peculiar to himself, shared with no one else, which augment the composite strength of the Army.

Obligation to yourself and to your nation demands that your talents be developed to the full. For in the blending of diverse qualities, in the combining of many human virtues, in the fusing of many wills, is the true source of America's broad achievements, military no less than civil.

Chosen to devote your lives in the military service of the nation, you help man the fortress for which freedom still finds need. This, your immediate mission, is one upon which the very existence of our nation may depend - the fortress must be strong; its garrison the embodiment of military effectiveness. But this service does not imply subscription to the rule of might. War is mankind's most tragic and stupid folly; to seek or advise its deliberate provocation is a black crime against all men. Though you follow the trade of the warrior, you do so in the spirit of Washington - not of Genghis Khan. For Americans, only threat to our way of life justifies resort to conflict; but once engaged in such defense, the country will look to you for the skill, the heart and the brain to lead her surely to victory.

As a professional soldier you do not inherit a greater share than your citizen brothers of the courage, endurance and fortitude that millions of Americans have so generously displayed on many stricken fields. But you are set apart professionally that you may better fit yourself for a particular and exacting role in preserving our American heritage of human dignity and justice for all. To measure up to that responsibility, no field of knowledge nor enterprise within our economy is alien to your interest. The arts and sciences, as well as the professionalism of arms, are bulwarks of security. And greatest of all is the spirit - the will for freedom and justice - that binds together Americans of every age and provides the mainspring for your own life work.

The high resolve of our nation's founders to promote peace, tranquility and prosperity is a guide for relations with other peoples as well as among ourselves. National security - your special and pressing obligation - can never be achieved, in the absolute sense, unless all other peoples feel equally sage. Relative security, only, is possible through strength of arms. The true soldier of America, therefore, is a leader for world cooperation, knowing that to serve best the security of his country he must work for the cause of peace. Here is lasting challenge to your breadth of understanding no less than to continuous professional development. For the man who forfeits material gain thus to serve, the wisdom of his decision will be confirmed by every visit to this

shrine of duty and devotion.

Significant it is that this peace-loving nation, which, during most of its history has neglected other aspects of its security, has nevertheless maintained here on the Hudson River the world's foremost cadet school. The reason is that the mission of West Point from the beginning has had the breadth of national service and not the narrowness of selfish ambition or sterile, detached militarism. While unchanging in its granite exterior and steadfast in its emphasis on character, West Point has adapted itself constantly to the march of time. For more than 140 years, its graduates, coming from the cities, villages and farms of America, have been tempered for professional leadership of free men. They have understood that American citizens cannot be competently led - in peace or in war - except by men who carry in their hearts that same devotion to American ideals for which every true citizen is ready to sacrifice. So long as West Point's graduates continue one in spirit with the men the lead, that long shall this school live in the proud boast that it serves America faithfully and well.

The inspiration you will find on revisiting this place is even more stirring than that of a son returning home. The pulse quickens to the feeling that here is enshrined something of the selflessness of all the men who have fought and died for our country. Their spirit charges that our own work be no less devoted. It fires our purpose that this nation shall ever remain secure as it steadfastly pursues its far-reaching efforts toward man's betterment.

• Notes for D-Day Address, Kansas City, Missouri, June 6, 1947

As we return their colors to the units of the 35th Division, who bore them so courageously on European battlefields, as we salute the states from which they came, our thoughts go out to the great force that - three years ago today - stormed the shores of Normandy. Before them was a test of soul and fiber that only war imposes on men. For, despite, its waste and slaughter, war requires a boundless outpouring of man's best qualities.

In all history, few legions have realized as fully as the Allied D-Day force how much depended on their success - perhaps none has ever borne such an awareness of the dangers it faced. Through months of anxious tension its men were burdened with glooms predictions that German strength would repulse the assault and choke the Channel with the flower of British and American manhood. Day and night they lived face-to-face with the terrors ahead - treacherous tides, mines and dragonsteeth, a wall of thumping, blasting shell from unseen batteries. But their faith in themselves and the firmness of their convictions steadied them; they knew the job must be done and each gave heart to his fellows as soldiers do.

Boarding a myriad of landing craft, they massed to form a mighty concentration of military power. Cruisers, cutters, ships ad boats blanketed the turbulent waters while overhead the sky was filled with fighters and bombers, transports and gliders - all moving to the grand assault that carried the hopes and fears of men the world over.

To the individual soldier, crouched amid the chaos of Omaha, or climbing from the wreckage of a glider inland, it was all up to him. It was his heart, his spirit, his sense of duty, his gallantry before God and himself that carried the force onward beyond the shell-pocked coastal dunes.

Alone in the rage of battle, he could hear no leader's command or comrade's voice. The years of effort, the months of feverish preparation, the lives already sacrificed, the great cause itself - all could be hopelessly lost if he did not find within himself the strength and the will to drive to victory.

His immortal courage, his selflessness and his flaming zeal set the example for all who were to form the great force that swept through Western Europe. It hammered the Nazi hordes back through France; it breached their inner defenses; and, in less than eleven months from the day of landing, joined triumphantly with the Russian Armies on the Elbe. The most formidable single force of land, sea and air yet seen on this earth, it included the greatest body of uniformed Americans ever assembled. They carried on in the flaming spirit of the D-Day soldier. St. Lo, Nijmegen, Huertgen, Monschau and a thousand other scenes of their gallantry will be recorded as timeless tributes to the courage and tenacity of the American soldier.

Because he had the heart to face fire-spouting pillboxes, the world has new hope for a better future.

On this day, three years ago I issued an order of the day to the great force of freemen that carried the battle

to the German war machine; on this anniversary I thank all of you who fought so valiantly for the common cause and all who at home, and elsewhere, labored for success.

Into this conflict were concentrated all out technical knowledge, all our mastery of the material world, all our wealth of human spirit and the will to win. Not we alone but our forefathers before us - men and women of the Revolution, of the westward expansion, pioneers on all our frontiers - contributed, each his share, to this perilous and mighty venture. The soldier who fought his way from the beach, across France, through Germany, was heir, with his Pacific comrades, to generations of Americans before him.

Because they had been fearless to defend the right as they saw it and dared to face the challenges of their day, he possessed a spiritual strength and traditions of valor that armed him beyond the weapons he carried. The crushing impact of the assault against the Axis fortress was heavy with the weight of all American history.

By it we proved not merely the richness of our material resources, nor our technical genius in the transport and maintenance of millions across disputed oceans - but the deeper qualities of a great people. There was nothing half-hearted in our effort. Though our cities and homes were still intact and our continental frontier in no immediate danger, we struck with all we had on behalf of those less fortunate and to perpetuate the system we call American. Pride in this record, however, must be tempered by realization of our own prior fault in permitting conspiracy against the world's peace to become menace to the world's freedom.

World War II and the price we paid for it was the penalty for years of indifference when this nation stripped itself of strength necessary to security and to leadership for peace. Because we did not sustain the peace, we drifted into danger and freedom was jeopardized. D-Day, a magnificent proof of the best in the American tradition, was an appalling penalty for failure to live up to our responsibilities. The first of these responsibilities is to depend upon ourselves for the preservation of America's free system - as long as there exists any slightest danger to it.

From our nation's beginning, despite vast distances and weeks of time that separated us from the rest of the world, the United States has been a world factor. We came to be recognized, wherever men gathered in council, as a people devoted to peace and stout in defense of justice. For our part, however, we failed to recognize that the impact of national policies and social philosophies becomes so intensified in a shrinking world, as to require continuing and cooperative effort by the nations to prevent world discord. The eruption of Axis aggression brought that fact home. It is the hope of all men who cherish peace that we shall not nullify it by return to international apathy. On the anniversary of D-Day, their hope burns strongest.

Utter defeat of the Axis was worthy of our supreme effort. But that effort will attain fruition only as we progress to a more distant goal - the lasting security of our nation and humankind against the terror of war. That farthest goal gives complete validity to the price we paid for combat victory. Until universal security is attained and firmly grasped, our task is unfinished.

In this enterprise, national leadership cannot be shuffled off at the conclusion of one phase. The responsibility of leadership continues so long as the need for it exists and the strength remains to supply it. Such responsibility is not subject to mathematical demonstration. In our case, arguments both for and against an action or policy, not immediately concerned with our internal affairs, are advanced by loyal Americans. But there is one stark fact in the world today, subject to no argument, requiring no lengthy proof; it is this - without the United States, civilization, as we know it, will perish. Without American aid, guidance and leadership there is immediate danger of social, political and economic chaos among hundreds of millions. Human misery, begotten of hunger and want, multiplied by hopelessness, sharpened by fomenters of unrest, cannot long continue on so vast a scale without collapse of the civilized structure in critical areas. We alone cannot accomplish the world's salvation. We face, moreover, the fact that at least one of the powerful nations does not see eye to eye with us on measures for the stability peace demands. But another's indifference - or even hostility - must not deflect us from the course we deem right.

We do not dictate to any nation what it does internally but we intend to continue the firm champion of those who seek to lead their own lives in peace with world neighbors. They need our help. And in helping those who seek to live in freedom we are helping ourselves. We are rich in foodstuffs; one day distant by plane are millions who starve. We are wealthy in finance; nations, sound at the core, are periled by bankruptcy. We are possessed of economic skill and industrial know-how; whole continents await development. Above all we have proved that men of all races and all philosophies can live together, respecting each other's rights to freedom and

peace and a decent life; hundreds of millions need guidance in that way.

Of all this, there is widespread consciousness in the United States; and there is, too, the will to take action - a will manifested by innumerable individual acts of charity, by great drives for the relief of distress, by government policy itself. The work of the 35th Division Association toward rebuilding St. Lo is a case in point - a substantial recognition of American responsibility beyond our shores and a magnificent gesture that renews warborn ties with an ancient French town, whose people sacrificed their homes and all possessions to the victory.

We put everything we had into the military conquest of the Axis and its degraded philosophy of domination by force. So far as can be achieved by arms, we accomplished our purpose. The men of D-Day in Normandy, the men who throughout the world fearlessly drove ahead where the fighting line and the dying line were indistinguishable - all of them, backed by an inspired nation, did their part. That their sacrifice not become waste, the task must be carried on to conclusion. Food and material aid, economic guidance and leadership for peace, strength to enforce the peace and the wisdom to join closely with all those who seek more secure peace - if the United States gives these to the world in the measure that we alone can afford, D-Day will have its perfect fulfillment.

• Notes for July 4 Address, Vicksburg, Mississippi, July 4, 1947

Ladies and gentlemen, I am signally honored by your invitation to meet with you of Vicksburg on the anniversary of the American Declaration of Independence and on a day of such significance in the history of your state and city.

On July 4, 1863, the sun of the Confederacy passed its zenith. That day, the gallant hosts of Lee started wearily back to Virginia, their ordeal at Gettysburg behind them, and only their courage to sustain them through almost two years more of bitter fighting before they came at last to Appomattox. On that same day the epic of Vicksburg reached its end, but not until there had been given to the world, on the ground on which we stand, imperishable proof of American's stubborn will to sacrifice and endure and to die for the right, as they see the right.

For all who fought under the Stars and Bars, the 87th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence was a dark and bitter day. But their bitterness would have been lessened, their gloom would have been lightened, could they have looked forward through the years to the sequel of their struggle as clearly as we can now look back. Scarcely could any of them have hoped that the sons and daughters of a reunited nation would gather at the places immortalized by their valor, to commemorate the sacrifices they so freely made for the cause in which they believed.

Few could have foreseen that America's fighting men of a later day would be sustained in battles against tyranny by the memory of men, in the Gray as in the Blue, who counted not the cost when all by which they lived was at stake. And still fewer could have realized that the very conflict they waged would remove forever from our national life problems that appeared unsolvable and would result eventually in a firmer union, one against the hordes of the Kaiser, the Mikado and the Fuehrer would later dash themselves and their false ambitions to destruction.

United ourselves, we now seek to unite a world lately released from the agony of global war and still divided by economic, social, and ideological differences. We see that unless the United States helps plan and build a world structure for peace, humanity may suffer the Golgotha of a third world war. The problems ahead are many; their solutions obscure. But because the human feature is a projection of the past and present, we can profit from the study of the accomplishments, the failures, the lives of our forefathers.

For us who live more than eighty years later, the Confederacy's fall and its causes reveal a truth that is valid today. The Southern cause was sinewed by potent elements of victory - courage, will to win, a stubborn endurance, and magnificent armies whose superb leadership and heroic performance have never been surpassed. But though the South had all these, it was blockaded, isolated, cut off from intercourse with the rest of the world by an ironclad net around its coast. Wealth of spirit and the skill and stamina of its armies were outweighed by a fact that must - and especially by us today - be accepted as an axiom of world relations. It is:

A nation's success in war and in peace demands participation in the community of nations. Commerce and communication with others, the exchange of goods and of knowledge, the play and interplay of human activity - such international partnership is required for national vitality and strength. Just as the Confederacy could not stand alone, there is today no people so rich in resources, so stout in action, that they can live alone and by themselves achieve richness of human life. More than this; no nation can, in the absolute sense, attain by itself even physical security.

Present facts, however, and the possibility of insane attack on those who work for peace cannot be ignored. We do not dare, now, to neglect the relative security that resides in strength - military, moral, and economic strength. Until all others are ready, with us, to substitute the council table for the battlefield, we must parallel and support our efforts toward world stability with a unified purpose to guard ourselves well and to maintain an effective strength that compels respect for our peaceful intent.

But this cannot be our final goal. Fear of war and its consequences impedes spiritual and material progress and at the least, compels vast diversions of our toil and sweat to unproductive processes. Though a people, accepting barren existence, should devote all their substance to maintenance of arms, they would finally reach, in their fearful and sullen isolation, a point in deterioration where bankruptcy within or attack from without would mean collapse.

Either the nations work together for the common good or one by one they will perish; slowly in withering decay; or quickly under the impact of total war, as is more likely the way of the future. Industrial development and atomic science have left no limits to global conflict, either in scope or destructive result. Many, nevertheless, disparage world unity as visionary and impractical because national loyalties tend to stifle international action. But in the reunion of our states that had been divided by internal conflict, deepened by a bloody civil war, a problem comparable in intensity and kind was surmounted.

In the generations following that decisive struggle, service to the nation demanded no lessening of loyalty to the state. The Mississippian of today is just as proud of his heritage, is rightly as devoted to the welfare of his state as any of the men who defended the redoubts of Vicksburg. It is clear to him today that the well-being and full security of the state can be achieved only within the larger concept of national interest which comprehends at the same time the welfare of all of the states and all of their citizens.

In an interdependent world, the ultimate good of any part can be attained only with full regard to its relationship with the whole. Americans we proudly are - never will we turn by a hairbreadth from our devotion and duty to country - but we must realize that self-interest and our own country's good demand that our words and deed reflect the understanding that there can be no prosperous America in a starving world - there can be no real safety if others are ready, in savage envy and hatred, to pounce upon us at the first propitious opportunity.

We must admit that international machinery with the strength and status required to adjudicate dispute and back up decision is still in the future. But even if distant, effective world cooperation is still the logical goal ahead. It is the only goal that will permit men to live side by side and prosper on this earth once more. Security and justice for all nations, with each given the opportunity for a reasonable livelihood, is an aim dictated by common decency. It is dictated also by valid concern for our own peace. Conflict between nations in the world of today quickly overflows borders to every nook and cranny of the world and involves hapless millions who know nothing of the war's causes.

Leadership toward the goal of international cooperation is partly a matter of convincing others that their self-interest points in that direction. Tangible proofs are being offered to the world of the sincerity of our own convictions. After fighting a war, with stupendous cost in lives and treasure, we are still extending ourselves to feed, clothe and minister to the wants of many peoples. We are moved by charity and by the knowledge that starvation and misery are sterile ground for the seeds of cooperation. However, this can be emergency action only - no country can permanently carry others on its back. Millions are still in want and will not reach full sufficiency until they are able, with such help as can be given, to solve their own great problems. Basic to that solution is their freedom from fear of domination.

Another element in our leadership for peace is our successful demonstration of the cooperative method. If we believe that the American system, extended to world-wide practice, would be the salvation of us all, then it is incumbent upon us all to make the system work at home. Cooperation means to work for the good of all. If we - each of us - is concerned with promoting cooperation in the world, then we will measure every

contemplated action in terms of the national well-being, rather than by narrow and selfish interest. Industrially, economically, socially and politically we must cooperate for the good of America.

In striving for world action, we cannot blueprint the future just as we cannot predict the factors it will introduce. Even a plan for the present will rise or fall on the willingness of the nations involved to make it work. Our own heavy responsibility lies in our position as the most powerful and prosperous of those nations that with us uphold the dignity of the individual and the freedom of men in the exercise of fundamental rights.

Our course through these critical years must embrace wisdom and charity. A prosperous peace, which fosters the development of human betterment, is the only wise peace. Wisdom in the face of opposition requires fairness, patience, and a visible competence to defend ourselves. And regardless of the drains upon our patience, the irritations aroused by accusations directed at our honesty of purpose - even at our acts of charity - we will never falter if we recall the alternative to world order. We must abide by the words of one whose spiritual greatness is the common heritage of North and South – "With charity toward all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on... to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Thus guided ourselves, we shall more surely lead others to a better future. From war's havoc, death and destruction, some permanent good to humanity shall be reaped. Just as Vicksburg was a crucible where differences were fired and joined into a strong and inseparable national unity, so the last war, which ended with an inferno of destruction, can be the start of a world union for peace.

As a soldier I salute the memory of all who fell, during our years of internal conflict, battling for what they believed to be right. Whatever their uniform, they contributed to the America whose strength and unity gives hope to the world. Even for Pemberton's army the siege of Vicksburg was a failure only in fleeting sense. Long since it has become a symbol of American endurance, a bright chapter in a volume of glorious traditions. More than this, in terms of history, it was a memorable part of a great transformation that has brought America to a destiny of opportunity and responsibility that involves all - everywhere - who seek to live in peace, respectful of their neighbors' rights as they are jealous of their own.

• Talk to 925th Engineer Aviation Group, Fort Richardson, Alaska, July 30, 1947

Primarily, men, I am here to see you and to learn something about what you are doing. You know more about it than I do. Even the brass hats can learn something. I came up here to learn something about your problems. Before I start, I want to tell you one thing - the importance of your job in the world. We thought we went to war to gain a permanent peace and that was the aim and hope of America; and we have seen in these uneasy and chaotic times a situation which keeps all people upset. In such a world, America represents the most powerful and has to look to its own defenses. Because war has become so all-inclusive in its scope, so terribly destructive in its character, we must look to our own outpost, and this is one of the most important.

I want to say a word or two about the technical service groups. I should say that the Aviation Engineers, along with the Combat Engineers, were among the most important people we had in the European War. The Aviation Engineers carried out mines, and dug roads. The Aviation Engineers made an airfield on the Island of Gocia in 13 days. They were a significant part in the capture of Sicily. And for you Negro troops - Port Battalions volunteered to work 24 hours in the Port of Cherbourg. Every soldier on the front line has to have many soldiers to support him. When we were short of men in the Bulge, we got, from service troops, 15,000 volunteers for the front lines - among them 2,400 Negro troops. The Air Force had 10,000 go into the Infantry.

I am learning something about your particular problems. I know that many non-commissioned officers are having trouble getting housing for their families - you haven't paved streets, sufficient recreational facilities. We will see what we can do to make Congress and the people in Washington understand these things, understand the importance of your job, make them understand something about the difficulties of living up here. Maybe we can get something done.

I think the greatest citizen of America today is the soldier in uniform. Our country is the most important single thing in the world today. It is only under some such system that the United States uses that men can decide whether they want to go into the Army - they can decide everything for themselves.

I want to thank each of you individually and collectively for helping to make this country a safer place in which to live.

• Talk to officers of Fort Richardson, Alaska, July 30, 1947

I am very fortunate that General Craig should ask you to meet here - it gives me a chance to speak to you all at one time - something I would like to do individually.

Much has been happening since the war stopped in the Pacific that is important to all of us, and I think it is a good thing once in a while to stop and ask ourselves what we are doing and have to do.

When the shooting stopped you will remember that our government felt there would be established a world order that would eliminate future wars. We held out the olive branch and have had it struck aside. We are coming closer to that time when it appears that we must accept the fact that there are two worlds. In those circumstances it becomes ever more necessary to look to our own and take care of ourselves. It brings to mind the important job given to any officer who is wearing the uniform of his country's fighting forces. Since war is growing deadlier, more devastating - since it is becoming more and more possible to strike sudden, almost paralyzing blows - we must so plan that our country cannot become the victim of assault such as Poland, France and many others did. It is my belief that no man has a right to accept a commission in the fighting forces of the United States unless he has a deep-seated, earnest conviction in the importance of the work that organization must do. If he does not believe in that, he had better go some place else. From bootblack to being bank president, there are many places where he will be happier. You should know more about such things than the average.

Many of you are separated from your families - you have personal problems that we understand and are trying to do something about. All of this means again that you must be almost a crusader in your assertion that this is one of the most important activities the United States is carrying on. Your position in that Army, whether you are a technician in your own profession or whether an officer of general administration, is that you are a leader. It is necessary to exercise leadership if you are to do your job in this great organization. Leadership is merely the influencing of others to do something that is necessary. If you are a leader, your first job is to convince men that they are doing something important. Unless you do that, you have no army - no other type of fighting or service organization. You must leave that with them and in front of them. If men become imbued with the importance of their work, they can and will ignore the ordinary irritations and frustrations that make life almost objectionable. Particularly the handling of young 17- and 18-year old boys - to inculcate a sense of the importance of the work he is doing - not by words, but by showing him every day what that means to the entire structure.

To speak for a second more on specific things. One and the greatest is unification. The actual separation of the Army Air Forces and the Army is merely in recognition of this fact: The Air, as a technical organization, has certain problems completely separated from the Ground Army - personnel problems - the pay scale is on a different basis - and the promotion system. We believe that the Air should have that opportunity to expand its own possibilities. I want to point this out - that unless the stated object of the leaders have been accomplished, it will be a mistake.

The Army Air Forces had to be organized under one commander. When you need air, you need it all. You can't parcel it off and use it effectively. It must be under one commander. But unless you officers, particularly you Air officers, unless you get your shoulder to the wheel to prove that you are operating better than ever before, then the thing will be a mistake. I believe it will grow into a more effective Air-Ground team. It is very important that we do not take legal separation as some reason for expressing resentment. We are closer now than ever before and must continue to grow closer and closer together, realizing that the other man is going to do his job.

When I was going to school I found that one of the things the Commander always did was to go around and visit everybody - this was to inspire his troops. For many years I have been going around to see troops - but with me it works in the opposite direction. Every time I can see soldiers like yourselves - see you people in the field - I want to assure you I can go back to my job and do the best I can.

• **Talk in Hanger #1, Fort Richardson, Alaska, July 30, 1947**

I remember when I was a relatively young man in the service - about your average ages. If there was one thing we dreaded, it was the “brass.” They made us shine up everything, put on our best clothes and go on parade. I know from your viewpoint a formation such as this is a considerable bore, but from my viewpoint, it’s a different story. I like to go out and see soldiers and observe what they are doing. I can’t come to every mess hall, barracks, or day room to say hello to each of you individually. I can see a good portion of the post by getting together this way. So, please accept my apologies.

One of the first things I want to say is to express my appreciation for the fine way you are doing your job - one of the most important things you could do for your country. In these troubled times the United States needs to look carefully to its outposts - every one of them - and none is more important than this one, Alaska.

There is no better citizen in the United States today than the man doing his duty in the Army and that goes for one doing KP to one sitting at a nice polished desk like mine – it’s a very nice one, too.

I have seen the American soldier in every country in the world - in every kind of job - both in war and peace. He was never doing a more important job than the American soldier today. Our insurance for peace and our own future prosperity for our country is in our hands. If we stand before the world as a people ready to insure our own safety, other nations will respect us. If we become weak and afraid of our position, we will not be respected, but on the contrary, sooner or later, they will take advantage of us and that leads to disastrous trouble. You men, as much as any others, help to preserve peace and keep our country a place where all of us like to live.

I would like to see you have better roads, better barracks, better recreational facilities and things of that kind. I can try to learn about them while up here and when I go back, what I can do will be done. You can understand that in a democracy such as ours, just because one man wants something, that doesn’t make it come true. I must persuade a lot of people including the Congress. If I can get you finer barracks, living conditions, recreational facilities, I will try to do it.

I would like to have each of you men understand that he is an important part in this fine organization - the United States Army. You are not just a serial number, another statistic or another number on the rolls. You are individuals and there is a place in the Army for everyone from me to the lowest recruit. Learn your finest capabilities and develop them so you will become a more important member of the finest organization on this earth. I thank you for what you have been doing. I have been all around the post today and have been more than pleased to meet the smiles and warm welcome everywhere. Thank you - good luck - and so long.

• **Press conference of July 30, 1947** (included in Pre-presidential press conferences data base)

• **Farmers’ and Farm Women’s Convention Raleigh, North Carolina, August 28, 1947**

Throughout our national life the American soldier has existed solely to protect the freedoms won in our Revolutionary War and embodied in the American Constitution. Consequently, I feel special distinction in this invitation to speak in the state whose citizens anticipated the Declaration of Independence by proclaiming their own liberty at the Mecklenburg Convention. It is, moreover, an unusual honor for a professional soldier to have the privilege of speaking to men and women whose livelihood - tillage of the land - is the most foreign to war, the most peaceful and fundamental of man’s pursuits.

You of North Carolina look back a long avenue of years from that day in 1585 when the first English settlement of the New World wilderness was made within your borders. Now the goods and products of North Carolina enrich the world’s living and North Carolinians serve their country around the globe. Your generations have built a record of great men and women and of great deeds.

The men of Mecklenburg and the Revolution have had worthy successors. In the latest war against tyranny,

your sons and daughters served with me from the first landings in North Africa to the collapse of the Nazi war machine. In the Pacific they fought on Bataan and Corregidor and on the long perilous road back. They served in the North Carolina tradition - proud of their state, devoted to the nation.

That same spirit has characterized the North Carolinian, Kenneth Royall, in my close association with him in the War Department. As a citizen and soldier in two World Wars, he has worked long and effectively for his country. At the close of the second World War he had clearly earned return to peaceful life among his friends, but he accepted, in the national interest, appointment as Under Secretary of War. Good citizen and good soldier, he had neither shirked the job not faltered in its execution. His appointment as Secretary of War was concrete recognition of his splendid performance.

He has played a prominent part in the demobilization of global forces and the reconversion of the national economy from war to peace. These were visible and critical sequels of the second World War. But there remain other demands that war brought into sharper focus - the continued maintenance of our own security in a troubled world, with ramifications into every phase of our foreign problem and into every nook and cranny of our national life.

Today, the American farm has an importance that reaches far beyond our own borders. We must help to feed and clothe a hungry world. This we do, not to foster dependency or to strengthen any enemy of peace, but in the knowledge that there can be no end to chaos and political strife until millions now destitute can gain the strength and means to win their own livelihood. The man who tills the soil - in spite of trouble, toil and vexation - must have an incomparable sense of achievement in bringing in a crop today. He is contributing, as no one else can, to a better world where hunger is appeased and men can think objectively of cooperation and a practical program for peace.

The farmer knows nature’s abundance, the richness she pours from the earth to satisfy the needs of humanity. But he also knows that her rewards go out to those who work. There are no lotus eaters among successful farmers. The harvest forthcoming from any planting can be measured largely by the care, toil and sweat that goes into it. And even full ingredients of these cannot insure against the ravages of storm, flood or drought.

In the waging of war and the construction of peace, as in tilling the earth, we get out only as much as we put in, and opposition is always present with the threat of defeat of all our effort. War is of its very nature wasteful - in money, in resources, in lives. Fully conscious of this, we nevertheless spent scores of billions in the recent war against totalitarianism and assumed a staggering debt. We expended our resources lavishly and, without thought of profit from conquest, we drained our nation of its manhood to build an invincible fighting force. Because we put in so much, so freely, the outcome of a magnificent human effort was, in equal measure, magnificent.

It was not mere combat victory, although that alone seemed a very distant prize in the dark days of 1942. Nor was it the surrender of our enemies and the elimination of direct threat against our national life. The true significance of the Axis defeat, measured in terms of generations, is in the opportunity it provides for the development of international understanding and organization. This goal, announced with high hope even while the guns were sounding, today stands more distantly remote upon the horizon than it did two years ago when the last of our enemies surrendered. But the goal itself must remain forever in our view - to allow it to disappear completely will be to resign ourselves to a prospect more grim and bleak than any other civilization has faced.

Meanwhile we have, at the very least, a space in which to foster and nourish such solidarity among those who stand for peace that their aggregate strength will make militaristic aggression a profitless gamble. By eliminating from the unjust use of force any chance of its success, we shall be far on the road toward liberation of the world from the tragedy of another total war.

Basic to the success of any program among nations is the military, economic and moral strength of those who support it. Even the most righteous endeavor requires of its participants the ability to accomplish their end.

Moral strength cannot be measured by the size of wealth of a nation; the weakest may exceed the most powerful in greatness of spiritual fibre. Even in its economic contribution, the least nation may be as important as the strongest because of unique material resources and the skill and initiative of its citizens. But in all these elements - the moral, economic and military - the United States, by common consent, must meet the demands of leadership toward world order. It is a difficult role to fill - particularly when noble purpose is subjected to

ridicule and sacrifice earns only vilification. But, for our own future, if for no other reason, we must not forsake humanity's cause. Even by partial and temporary isolation from the concert of democratic nations, we would fatally weaken the hopes of those who seek to build a permanent peace, and condemn ourselves to a future of fear and uncertainty.

Military strength, compounded of trained men, modern weapons - and, even more important, agricultural, industrial and scientific resources, when maintained by the United States is a bulwark of peace. Democracy cannot secretly promote an aggressive war, because of the transparency of democratic methods. But American strength serves notice to all that this nation, openly and earnestly striving to eliminate the need for maintaining armed forces, is yet determined that peaceful intent shall neither invite another to invade our rights or homes, nor be interpreted as the cringing fear of the hopelessly defenseless. This strength must be genuine, not mere reflection of wishful thinking or of pride in past exploits. I believe no citizen of the United States can have a more serious or more personal responsibility than to do his full share to see that America's peaceful program is backed by every kind of strength needed for its success. The Army, Navy and Air Forces can be maintained at required strength only if all our citizens make this matter their own business. Economic strength, agricultural and industrial productivity, all important to us in stabilizing world conditions, are definitely and specifically in the hands of all. Moral and political leadership depends for its success on the solid backing of all of us.

Military security in this age, to be more than imaginary, will not be cheap. We are determined that it shall cost no more than is absolutely necessary. But to a rich nation, object of the jealousy and hate of those who would tear the world down to their level, security is worth exactly what is put into it. There is no bargain counter substitute. If we lack any of the essential integrants, we fail those among whom the flame of freedom still burns, however feebly, and our voice will rebound from stopped ears and closed minds. Yet we realize that strength will provide only a relative degree of security as we seek to eliminate war from human relations and supplant the rule of force with the rule of justice.

The ultimate goal remains a world in which the nations recognize their dependence on each other. In this small world, that daily grows smaller, none can stand alone; none can be threatened by starvation, by bankruptcy, by fear of a neighbor's designs, without creating in the world beyond its borders perturbation about the future, uncertainty about the present. The world is one in physical fact and none can deny that it will be a better, richer, more peaceful world when it becomes one in cooperative effort.

Success may require many generations; set-backs will be numerous and discouraging. But by every mile that we extend the frontiers of mutual understanding, by every nation that we add to the roll of those who would live at peace with their neighbors, by so much we come closer to the ultimate goal.

The soil for sowing is a world population that dreads war. Twice within our own lifetime war has scourged the ancient seat of our Western civilization. Outside this hemisphere, hardly an area of the world escaped its horror in the second world conflict. Even those who had most barbarously attacked their neighbors, themselves finally suffered the utmost in physical punishment.

The seed for planting is the concept that man is born to possess the earth and enjoy its fruits in amity with his fellows for the betterment of himself and his neighbor. The law of the cave and the jungle - that man lives for himself alone - must be replaced by the true law that holds the common good to be greater than the will of a few.

Give the seed and fertile soil for its germination and growth, the harvest depends on our will to cultivate in every necessary way the field of human relations; upon our resolution to be quick with aid to those who are willing to help themselves, and upon our unswerving support of justice. Already through our government has been voiced the American people's determination to extend all possible aid to those who need help in restoring their national economy in order that they may be better able to help construct a world of peace. And the Congress, by its decisions during the last session, has assured the weak among nations that the United States will retain a respectable strength to buttress international justice.

These essential steps we have taken are preliminary to the time when the majority of nations is freed from the constant menace of collapse within or aggression without. Only then can we work together with single heart toward the goal of universal peace. Until permanent peace is assured, a strong, healthy, united America is the fundamental prerequisite to its attainment.

Every man and woman, regardless of station or of calling, has a part to play. The strength and health of the

United States is compounded of many virtues. Measures to raise the health and educational standards of the individual are as important as the efficiency of the Armed Forces. Increased productivity of our farms has as much bearing upon our leadership toward peace as does the wisest counsel of our statesmen. Industrial cooperation - a maximum flow of products from our vast manufacturing processes - is as necessary to progress along the road we travel as any number of regiments and battleships. Every American has now a single standard for his own self-government. It is simple stated, “In what I am about to do, am I best serving the interests of this great nation, which protects me in the right and privilege of making this individual decision?” When the answer becomes universally “Yes” - then indeed we shall live in prosperity and in that state of tranquility sought by the founding fathers.

• **American Legion convention, New York City, August 29, 1947**

Fellow veterans, in all likelihood, this is my final appearance before the American Legion as Chief of Staff. It is, consequently, something of an official farewell. But whatever may befall in the future, nothing can take from us the comradeship of service. We have lived together through events and circumstances, packed with drama and human experience. For my part, nothing will inspire me more in later days than the memory of men to whom I bade Godspeed on more than one perilous venture; nothing can equal my sense of obligation to the gallant millions who manned the mightiest military machine of all time. Through you, to all American veterans, I express my personal thanks and appreciation. Service with you is, and always will be, my highest personal honor.

This meeting brings to me another valued opportunity to submit to you earnest views on matters affecting our nation’s security. At the appropriate time, I shall pass on to my successor my convictions as to what must be done within the Army to serve the nation. But the overall security of the United States requires the direct and personal concern of those - not in uniform - who weigh defense measures realistically and will strive for their accomplishment.

Our nation is faced today with problems, present and future, which equal in scope and significance any it has hitherto met in 171 years of existence. Because we are close to them, it is difficult to recognize their historical import. But grave as they are, almost beyond precedent, and they deal - as did our great crises of the past - with the freedom of man. What America does today, what America plans for tomorrow, can decide the sort of world the generations after s will possess - whether it shall be governed by justice or enslaved by force.

We have lately emerged from a war into which we threw - without stint or hesitation - life, treasure and resources so that we might subdue the forces of aggression and make this earth a happier, safer place. Military victory won, we have contributed freely to the rehabilitation of stricken areas, with no regard for profit, save that which would accrue to all humanity from a stable peace. Mindful that world chaos is the enemy of our security, we have held out the hand of friendship to all, refraining from interference in the internal affairs of others. We have sought for all peoples the opportunity of choosing freely their form of government. Our plan has not been to make then wards of American charity - but to give them a chance to work for their own living and salvation. Thereby we have accomplished much for humanity and for strengthening the practice of freedom elsewhere; had it not been for the policy of our government and the generosity of American men and women during the past two years, the world today would be in hopeless plight.

Nevertheless, we find ourselves blamed, castigated, excoriated by some for any and all our efforts toward peace. In our own country, the shortsighted cry “internationalism,” implying a lack of patriotism in those who struggle to maintain world conditions essential to the preservation of our own freedoms. Are we expected to sit idly by, doing nothing, while hunger and hopelessness inexorably push the shadow of enslavement ever and ever closer to our own shores? From without, false propaganda brands democracy a menace to progress. The exercise of the freedoms for which we fought in solemn pact is blocked in critical areas by forceful imposition of minority dictatorial control.

In the face of such discouragement, and under the burdens that destiny has placed upon our shoulders, it grows difficult to hold the course set by our conscience. But the world is in a fluid, turbulent period and unless we continue to do our utmost to make it a better place to live, the problem will likely be how to preserve it as a

place in which we can live!

We have been witnessing a vast transfer of sovereignty from the few to the many. Three monstrous dictatorships have been overthrown and we are hopeful that in the lands of their origin the roots of democracy will take firm hold. Elsewhere, peoples who have lived in subordinate status for generations are receiving independent statehood. But, against this, nations which were free and independent members of the prewar European family are now caught in a stifling web of circumstances, crushing independent thought and action - national or individual.

Our government, acutely aware of the significance of these contradictory currents, has announced its support of the first trend and its opposition to the second. The alternatives are sharply defined; the friends of freedom everywhere must stand staunchly in its support or its foes will eliminate freedom from the earth. For the United States there can be only one choice!

Among the nations devoted to justice and freedom, destiny endows our own with the ability and capacity to assume leadership. We have the will; we have the means. Well knowing this, an enemy of freedom would, in future war, fix upon us as his first and principal target. Thus on our security depends the existence and growth of a free world.

The reverse of this statement is equally true. I firmly believe that the only prescription for absolute security for any nation, including our own, is international understanding and cooperation. A shining example is the international boundary between us and our neighbors, north and south. No other borders, however they may bristle with works of steel, or how heavily supported with planes and guns, boasts the strength of our northern and southern frontiers, along which no soldier, sailor or airman has a defensive function. These common boundaries are maintained, on both sides, by friendship - they are truly safe! Their existence inspires us to continue to work for peaceful cooperation among all nations, expending ourselves to the utmost in the effort, using all the resources of our minds and skills and talents, exercising the limit of patience in negotiation without the least compromise of principle. We are now so engaged within the United Nations, the best available implement for developing appropriate agreements and procedures.

But we must face the hard fact that, during the two years since hostilities ended, the cooperative spirit has lost ground. The world comprises two great camps, grouped on the one side around dictatorships which subject the individual to absolute control and, on the other, democracy which provides him a free and unlimited horizon. In my view, conflicting political theories can exist peacefully in the same world provided there is no deliberate effort on the part of either to engage in unjust coercion or unwarranted interference against the other. But as long as deliberate aggression against the rights of free men and the existence of free government may be a part of the international picture, we must be prepared for whatever this may finally mean to us.

To work for peace and eventual disarmament, but at the same time to look well to our own security in a troubled world, is thus a central problem of the day. I ask you to remember, in what I have to say about relative, as opposed to absolute security, that I am discussing issues forced upon us by the slowness of progress toward our desired objective - the substitution of the council table for the battlefield. Another thing - I do not want to be understood as seeing a global war as an immediate threat. It is fully as important to prevent blind fear and hysteria from influencing us as it is to look facts soberly in the face and thus develop logical conclusions from the survey. No great nation is today in position deliberately to provoke a long and exhausting conflict with any hope of gain. But time, foresight and concerted effort are all necessary in order to possess, at any given time, a respectable defensive posture. Consequently, the subject assumes for us a critical urgency as long as the will for permanent peace has not been universally demonstrated.

Moreover, the senseless storm of war has more than once begun its destructive course in spite of, rather than because of, deliberate intent. Any such explosion, now or in the future, must not find us unprepared. And finally - the weight of our peaceful counsel will most certainly be measured, in today’s circumstances, as much by the world’s respect for our actual and potential strength as by our own sincerity.

We must so gird ourselves that a predatory aggressor will be aware of the risks he runs and will realize, should he provoke war, it will likely be fought over his territory. This means that we must be ready, not only to endure and survive the first hard blows of an enemy, but to recover immediately, to strike back, to hit harder than he does - to win. All must know that we have this capacity.

The American process of government - everything for which our people have fought and will if necessary

fight again - gives a potential enemy, through the transparency of our processes, great advantages. It gives him full notice of our defensive intentions and the assurance that we will not - that we cannot - secretly plot an aggressive war. The bulk of his intelligence information is available in the public press and in the open debates and decisions of the United States Government. There is no way except through genuine preparedness by which we can convince a possible aggressor that he can choose war only at the cost of his own exhaustion or destruction. Bluff on our part is impossible; preparedness must be actual.

For the United States this means many things. It means the determination of all of our people to work together in meeting any real threat as it begins unmistakably to develop. It means unity of purpose in all issues that affect the national interest; it means an adequate force to execute the people's will; it means money to support the necessary defensive system.

By creation of a single national military establishment we have taken a major step toward the sort of preparedness we need. This unification of the armed forces, an historic development in our security pattern, provides flexibility to meet changing conditions of warfare. It establishes a National Security Council above the level of the armed services to coordinate our military and foreign policy. This has always been an urgent need. The law has set up, on the same level, a National Resources Board to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial and civilian mobilization. The National Military Establishment makes possible the organization of a comprehensive civil defense, something that assumes greater importance, day by day, as time brings nearer the possibility of quick, destructive blows against our cities and production centers.

A satisfactory security program means also the efficient functioning of adequate intelligence and research organizations. It means completely equipped air, ground and sea elements to move out at once and fight from protected bases. It means sufficient other troops to train and supply the necessary replacements and reinforcements. It means that we shall have already bought time in the way of standby plants, stock piles of critical materials, as well as by perfecting plans to supply and equip the forces, and to sustain civil economy.

Still lacking is legislation that will assure us a reservoir of trained manpower, available to fill up the National Guard and Reserve with trained men and, in a national emergency, to back up the professional elements of the armed forces and to support civil defense. Universal Military Training, as proposed by the President, endorsed by the veterans of the United States and by a majority of the American people, is the least burdensome and the most equitable solution yet suggested. This issue must be decided by our citizens and their Congress with full view and appreciation of valid arguments pro and con. No good purpose, however, is served by the blatant echoing of such catch phrases as "Mass Army," suggesting the phalanx of Alexander and the formations of Frederick of Prussia. Wars have become total, not only in the means of waging, but in all-inclusiveness of target. Discipline and training - wide-spread discipline and training - will be necessary from the outset of any new world tragedy. Time demands that these soldierly virtues be instilled before, not after, the first blow is struck.

The history of warfare is a constant evolution, with changing weapons and tactics. We are living in a period when the trend moves forward at accelerated pace. No man can picture accurately, today, the face or appearance of a possible war in 1967. The outlines, the possibilities, the definite requirements of the present that stand forth with reasonable clarity, take on with increasing haziness the further we attempt to project them against the future. We must avoid stagnation, rigid dogma, complacency; until the need for armaments shall pass, we must be certain that ours are suited to the possibility of their day.

We must constantly maintain the nucleus and the pattern of the air-naval-ground-industrial-scientific machine needed in emergency. Else we shall dwell in fear, and forfeit our influence toward a peaceful future. I urge your special concern for air power. Our geographic position makes air power a primary factor in our defense and the best weapon for quick retaliation. It is still relatively new - its potential grows daily. We have a national genius for flying, for maintenance and for production. Our welfare demands that we neglect no part of these essentials to air efficiency.

There was little worry in the world about aggression from any quarter in that summer two short years ago when American military strength towered over Europe and the Orient. One heard more about ideals then and the rights of nations and less about power politics and ideological strife. Ideals will have a better chance to flourish again when we have supported our current forces with a rounded program of defense that will demonstrate to all the world the seriousness of our concern and the intensity of our purpose. An adequate

security program will mean continued sacrifice, but this nation must be guided not by what it wants to provide, but by what it must provide.

If we are to achieve the safety reflected in this program - a program carefully trimmed to the impelling factors of our time - the support of every citizen is required. You, who have seen war, who know its destructiveness, its demands upon human endurance and fortitude, its insatiable consumption of material supplies, and above all, its cruel obliteration of the weak and the defenseless; you have a special responsibility to communicate your knowledge to all other citizens.

Through the wisdom of Congress and the President, and the response of our citizens, a substantial start has already been made, aside from unification, to promote the national security. For the Army, a wise reform has been accomplished by recent legislation that requires the advancement of both officers and enlisted men by merit. Modest but effective initial steps have been taken in research and intelligence.

A continuing concern, from which none of us can escape, is the maintenance of Army-Navy-Air Force manpower. Congress has done much to keep the professional forces at the levels demanded by present world conditions. But it is up to Americans, individually and collectively, to see that these forces are successfully maintained on a volunteer basis; the effort needs the support of our great veterans' organizations. Stability in the occupied territories, vital to peace as well as our own safety, leaves us no room for complacency in dealing with the manpower problem. Every American, aware of the significance of world events today, should be a recruiting agent for our armed forces.

But I repeat that armed defense, however elaborate, is at best only a partial insurance against war. All of us firmly believe that humanity wants peace and if given full voice the majority will demand peace. This is the inspiration for our support of majority rule within the nations and among the nations. We deplore the conditions that demand maintenance of military force, but what choice is there for us today?

Through unity of action we can be a veritable colossus in support of peace. No one can defeat us unless we first defeat ourselves. Every one of us must be guided by this truth. Our competitive system is an essential feature of democracy, but the practice of competition given no man, no group, the right to act, for selfish and immediate gain, against the interests of the nation. Each of us must realize that whatever might weaken the whole will in the long term, defeat each part - no matter what the glitter of the immediate promise. Banker and borrower, industrialist and worker, political and farmer, civilian and soldier, must each keep his eyes upon the major good. All must acknowledge that in every problem where is involved the welfare of America there can be one answer only. That answer must be given, not merely by emotional response to a patriotic hymn. It must be lived, every day, in the work-a-day actions and reactions of a hundred and forty million people. If we fail in this, there will be no real security for the United States, because eventually we could be so weakened by domestic strife that conquest from without would be little more than a formality.

Within the workings of a free economy persons of similar interests organize for strength. But in matters of life and death importance to the system that gives us the right to organize as we please, there can be no "pressure group" struggle. All must work together - or eventually we will work under the whip!

You are soon going back to your homes. The thought I leave with you is this. The American system rests upon the rights and dignity of the individual. The success of that system depends upon the assumption by each of personal, individual responsibility for the safety and welfare of the whole. No government official, no soldier, be he brass hat or PFC, no other person can assume your responsibilities - else democracy will cease to exist. They are yours, to meet or to neglect! In the one direction lies first our immediate and future safety. Beyond that are all our aspirations, our hopes for ourselves and our children. In the other direction lies the destruction of all we hold dear!

A pre-revolutionary patriot stirred his comrades with the cry, "Give me liberty or give me death!" There need not be a future Patrick Henry. Liberty is ours - now! All we need do is sustain it; all we need do is to be steadfast in our stand - ready to work and strive for our convictions! A united and determined American citizenry is, under God, the mightiest force the earth has seen. It can protect itself and lead the world to respect for right and justice - and to peace.

• Labor Day Address, Minnesota State Fair, St. Paul, Minnesota, September 1, 1947

I do not believe that any simple American could find words to express his overwhelming sense of humility and of pride that he must feel when receiving this kind of a welcome from such a great concourse of his fellow citizens.

I believe that everyone who was closely engaged in the last war had one thing brought home to him more definitely than any other single truth. It was this - In America we have a democracy for which our forefathers have slaved, fought and died. It is ours to possess and to enjoy and to defend so that we may pass on to our children as valuable a heritage as we have received.

This is the first State Fair it has been my privilege to attend and my friends here in the Twin Cities have assured me that my education started in the correct way because they say I have attended the greatest of all Fairs first. I can well believe it.

In the halls and buildings of this great Fair are represented the things America needs. I don't mean merely the champion hogs, cattle, sheep, vegetables, and everything you produce, but I am sure that when we think of those things we find also that there was a system to allow you to produce them.

No one in America is told that he must raise meat and grain, that he must turn them over to the government, and they in turn will tell him what he will get for them. We have a system of life that is more responsible for our happiness and human contentment than is the regeneration of the resources which God has given us to enjoy. Now today each of us must move around the world to see that that system is not damaged.

Our system is the envy and the target of hatred of all dictators. They have so indicated. If, therefore, any trouble that we may expect in the international world is one of envy, or if we want to use a ten dollar word, ideology, then it is up to us to see that our ideology is not only healthy and strong at home, but is practiced throughout the earth's surface where we can give to those people its true value in the world today.

They are anxious to see us lead them into the same kind of responsibility and the same kind of democratic practice that we here enjoy, but they in many instances are desperately hungry and so this truth is obvious - the Minnesota State Fair today has an importance that not only reaches the borders of this state, but the borders of our own country, as well as other countries, and directly affects the chances we have to pass our system, secure and safe, on to our children and grandchildren. There is no use talking ideals and principles to a man who sees his children starving in front of his eyes. Your appreciation must be manifest and there is no maximum production on your farm that must ever satisfy you.

The world needs food and it must have food, and so our government has determined to help those that want to live in the same concept by which we live. Not merely because it is an altruism, but because of self-interest, we must see that our system has a chance to grow and prosper in other areas of the globe, and then if this eternal conflict ever by any chance breaks out again on the battlefield, the greatest portion of this earth's surface will be on our side.

Today is Labor Day. Democracy has given dignity to labor. It has given the laborer the right to engage in the profession he likes and has given him the products of it, and he can take the knowledge of his brains and hands and pass it on to his family. Without that right, no democracy can exist.

And so since all of us should be laborers because only labor has made this country great and all of us should be generators of our system, I leave only this one thought with you today - let us conduct our nation and hold up the warning to the rest of the world that we will continue to be the noblest, the freest, and happiest persons on the face of the globe.

A final word to the veterans of World War II - my special greetings to you, my special feelings of appreciation and of gratitude for what you have done for this great democracy. As long as America has the power, the strength, and the unity that we had in world War II, no one will dare attack us, and if they do they will be destroyed.

Thank you very much.

• Address to American Meat Institute, Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, September 4, 1947

In spite of the very glowing introductory remarks just made by your chairman, I am certain that many

among you must be wondering why a simple soldier should be invited to appear upon the program of the American Meat Institute, particularly after the chairman said earlier in the evening he was beginning a program of entertainment.

Now, I can give you one or two reasons. First, he wanted to make sure that part of the program that was not entertainment was reasonably short and I am going to make mine short because I happen to know about a half hour of entertainment, real entertainment, that your people are going to enjoy. At the risk of being considered a ballyhoo man for the organization that is putting it on, I must tell you that the program that you will see shortly put on by Life, “The New America,” is one of the grandest things for any one who bears in his heart a deep love for this country, and I congratulate you all on the opportunity you have of witnessing it this evening.

The second thing is this: Although I am sure it is not well known to most of you, I at one time probably could have applied for membership in this organization. I was not only a chairman of the board of a packing company, I was the whole board, and I am sure that many businessmen here would envy that very enjoyable position.

It came about in this way: Every soldier at war, every person that is denied his ordinary and normal contacts with his homeland builds one in his own mind, the particular thing that he wants most. He has his own dreams of what he is going to do when he goes home.

The thing that he misses most usually has something to do with food and the thing I missed most was the bones that you packers wouldn’t put into meat that you sent abroad.

I got so eternally tired of just good solid meats with no bones at all, no bones for good vegetable soup, that I decided to do something and sometime late in the European campaign someone sent me, at my personal headquarters, a cow. Sometime in the winter along about the time of the Battle of the Bulge the cow gave us a little bull calf and instantly a meat packing organization was organized in competition with the nefarious practice of the meat organizations of the United States and no member has seen that bull calf, but at eight weeks he was properly packed, cut up. They could do anything they wanted with all the meat, but anything that had a bone in it belonged to me. So my ambition was realized. The company was dissolved. There was nothing left on the books, and everything was cleaned out. So I could have applied for membership.

But if my connection with the members of this Institute rested on a mere accident like that, it would still probably be a rather odd and curious instance that I should have the presumption to appear before you for a short period even.

There is a very deep connection, however, between us. I am a representative of one of the three great fighting services that is maintained by the United States to insure that all here at home leading tranquil lives may pursue their several businesses in peace and security.

Now, first of all, those organizations are made up of you. They are Americans. They are young friends, brothers and sons of you. The organization is maintained by you through your representative and is paid by you and simply for the reason that it is a creature of your creation, you should have a very continuing and vital interest not only in the efficiency, but in the business-like conduct to make certain that it is not wasting and spending your money uselessly and is actually delivering for you what you think you are paying for. But our relationship I submit is even deeper than that. No security of the conventional type, the kind of which we usually think of as planes and ships and guns can possibly insure your security and tranquility in this troubled world of today.

Even if the military strength of the nation is represented in its economic and its moral, and about all its purpose - its unity of purpose as well as in the organizations that are paid for that specific purpose - your day by day actions, as they reflect a concern for the welfare of the whole in the certain knowledge that no part of this country can long prosper if the whole itself should be weakened or defeated; insofar as you are doing that, you are doing your part for the security and tranquility of this country today. Nothing is more important to the peace of the world, which is one of the functions for which the Army, the Navy, and the Air Forces are maintained, than its food.

It is useless to talk of principles to a man who sees his children starving in front of his face. Now, anybody will realize if we look into the long-term future, America cannot carry on her back, even in the question of feeding the hungry peoples of the world, the whole world - we are not an Atlas, and we can’t do it. But if we are going to establish conditions in this country that make possible first, a certainty that we can pursue the system

that has served us so well through this past 171 years, and that we can eventually cease pouring into such negative and sterile organizations as the Navy, the Army, and the Air Forces so much of our national income, then we must make sure that the conditions are such that an ideal of that kind can finally be achieved. That was the purpose, the basic purpose aligning behind the organization of the United Nations, and we have seen that purpose recede in the past few years. It is disappointing, and it is discouraging. But, when you think of the alternative to success, the eventual alternative to success, I am certain that there is no man who bears in his heart a love for his country or any concern for his own welfare and physical safety, who will neglect the task.

Any war of the future, and I am not limiting myself to an observation, but a remote future when this so-called push-button warfare may finally be a realization, any warfare of the future is so likely to weaken, if not destroy the organisms of civilization, almost, by which we have lived. That life as we have known it will no longer be possible and the sacrifices particularly of the English-speaking races back to 1215 will all have been in vain.

There has never been a time in history when the world and our country was facing graver problems than it is today.

Now, this one world idea that was at least briefly described in the charter of the United Nations, as I say, has disappeared or not disappeared. It has receded.

I say again, we must always keep it though in our view, and what do we have instead? We have on the one side, a group of peoples that are organized around a principle of dictatorship. The rule of the few over the many, and of the other side, we have a government that recognizes the dignity, the liberties and the rights of the human with government set up to serve him.

Success in that type of government depends upon one thing. The cooperation in all those group purposes and group efforts that the individual may not do for himself and cannot do. Among them security is one.

Your Army today is serving in many laces in the world. Among their important jobs is that of occupation of conquered territories. Our government has decided that job is one necessary to the peace of the world and I think that the reflection at home will assure you that is so.

If you will visualize for one second what happened in Japan, Germany and the occupied portions of Austria and Hungary, if you would visualize that, you would know. And I believe, unless we achieve the stability and security in those sections that will allow secure sections to more or less surround them, then this portion of the world that is organized around the freedom of man is going to become weaker and weaker.

As the ever-broadening borders of the areas governed by dictatorship press closer and closer upon us, finally there comes a place where a government, a nation organized as ours, cannot exist. We are not self-sufficient. There are vast quantities of such critical things as rubber, and many others, and possibly oil, that we must obtain from abroad. But, let us take the extreme case and assume that all the world except ourselves were organized under the dictatorship principles. How would we get those things? Therefore, how could we exist?

What I am getting at is this: In supporting these nations that do want to live their own lives, that have some concept of life under a Bill of Rights, the dignity of humans, in supporting them we are not merely optimistic, we are working for ourselves.

For the moment, the critical thing is food and clothing. Merely to get them to that state of mind where they can think about the problems, the next step then is to get them so organized and to coalesce in their regions so that they can help themselves to the utmost and such help as we need give, be only that which is the net deficit, not the sum total that each may have.

But, I say again that in doing it, we are working for ourselves, just as well as working for humanity. So let us not hug to our breasts that comforting feeling that every time we sacrifice something to rescue or to help other nations live the kind of life that we are living, we are being completely charitable and they should emulate us. We are involved along with all the others.

I do not see how we can look at these problems and look on the black side all the time and have no idea of anything else. I know of nothing more certain to defeat an army than black pessimism. If you are sure you cannot win a battle, you will never do it.

This battle, in my opinion can be won and one of the things that encourages me the most is this: Everywhere you travel in this country, you are running into, today, a wider and a deeper and a more serious concern in this country and a greater realization that the freedoms by which we live individually, impose upon

each of us an individual responsibility to sustain them. They did not believe that in the careless days of ‘23 and ‘24 and I believe the early ‘30s, when college presidents were asking their boys to sign up because they would never serve in the armed forces of the United States, no matter what the cases were. Now, the United States is too aroused. Their concern is too deep. Those days will never come again.

I want to repeat one statement. I believe, if democracy had to be defined in one word, that word would have to be cooperation, because, if we are not forced by our government to perform our group responsibilities, it means we must do them willingly. I say that the future of the world and certainly of our own country and the great freedoms by which we have lived rests upon the extent of our cooperation and its effectiveness in solving these problems. Therefore, I do not believe in such words as isolation and internationalism, because I believe they are meaningless if you carry them down.

Our concern for this world and the parts of the world that we can reach is primarily because we ourselves want to be safe. The more people that practice democracy in this world, the more places where power resides in the many, not in the few, that much we can be certain that we will not be attacked, that we can live in peace with those people, and if that coalition can be built so strong, so healthy, so virile that everybody throughout the world realizes that we are earnest and serious about this thing, then no one will ever dare attack us. We will be truly safe. And finally, they will recognize the wisdom of the old saying, “If you can’t beat them, join them.”

And gentlemen, when that time comes, people who wish to attack us will be out of a job and you people will be saved a lot of money at the very least and above all things, you will live in a state of peace and tranquility. I say again, it can be done and all we need to do will be to get together and do it.

• Air Force Association, Columbus, Ohio, September 15, 1947

This first meeting of the Air Force Association marks a development important both to American security of the present and to world peace of the future. The creation of the United States Air Force as an independent entity recognizes the special capabilities of air power; the creation of this association recognizes aviation problems that require specialized - and organized - civilian assistance toward their solution. In this group we have a wealth of military and civilian talent that will devote itself to our defense needs, even as it keeps always in view the potential usefulness of the airplane in bringing the world closer together in purpose as well as in time.

Your membership involves research, design and production men of genius, men who in war turned out quality airplanes at a rate so great that we could beat down, simultaneously, two powerful enemy air forces. As a soldier whose wartime plans and decisions were rooted in the conviction that America could and would supply her fighting men with the most and the best in airplanes, I deem it a rare privilege to express, through this body, my admiration and gratitude to every man who had a hand in producing the air mastery upon which all successful battle action depends.

Over this continent and, indeed, the globe, you have established routes of air travel in a vast network. On those routes fly the best and the safest planes, the products of skill and vision. The American air industry, acknowledged leader of the world, is one of the nation’s greatest assets.

Among your members are also proved masters of the application of air power; men who wrote a new military language. Their imagination and energy made of the skies broad avenues to victory in war. Many of them have been with American aviation since its pioneer infancy; all of them had faith in its future even in those bleak days when American air power was so slight and puny that it provoked derision among our enemies.

The United States Air Force is a young organization. From the beginning, it has been young in spirit and outlook, manned by doers and zealots, impatient of frill and dogma, who measured traditions by their contribution to the present and rejected those that no longer earned their way.

Such flouting of the accepted perturbed many who feared change of any sort. There was criticism of the airman’s enthusiasm and even more of his informality. But those who saw the Air Force in action, adding a smashing punch to ground attack or in mass formation, wing to wing, driving steadily ahead to target areas despite murderous flak and fighter assault - they knew that air enthusiasm was warranted and that Air Force

discipline stood well the shock of mortal combat.

Because the men of American aviation, civilian and military, set air supremacy as their goal, the United States possesses a commanding lead in its ability to produce and perform. For our own security, we either maintain that position or we relapse into a potential target of serial destruction. The machine that has given man speed beyond all previous imagination, that has made him almost independent of geography, provides him also a vehicle for the transport of unlimited destruction. Against such threat, our first defense is air defense. But no real security resides in a second-best Air Force. Either ours shall be equal to any test a possible aggressor might impose or, under attack, it will quickly cease to be.

Such air power, at the command of America, is no threat to any nation or to world peace. When power is combined with a political philosophy of aggression and human enslavement men are fearful; but men take heart when power backs up a social philosophy rooted in respect for human dignity and international peace. In all the free world, men would breathe more easily, work more earnestly in the present, plan more confidently for the future, if they were assured that the United States would continue first in the air, as strong and staunch in the maintenance of a just peace as it was mighty and forceful in the pursuit of unconditional victory. American strength in the air will promote respect and caution among those who are not influenced by the rightness of a course; it will dispel fear and doubt among those who are loyal to the principles of justice for all nations, great and small; it will not breed war.

Today American air power is assurance against the terror that another Luftwaffe - whatever its name or flag - would strike in men□s hearts. If we are prudent and foresighted, and design our forces to match our world position, no possible aggressor can repeat the Nazi strategy of fear.

Beyond an Air Force in being, equipped and manned for possible emergency, we must also have the producing plant to maintain it at the required level in numbers and design. We need research facilities to keep it technically proficient. We must possess bases essential to its operation as well as an intelligence organization to alert it to every pertinent development in the world. How this shall be done demands of Americans unstinted application of their organizational, financial and scientific genius. In particular, we must find ways of assuring the aircraft industry a continued healthy life because our international position in the immediate future may well be measured by its existence and productive capacity. And by constant progress in our air industry we can enrich human living.

The late war caught aviation early in its development. Because of its speed, range and novel strategic capabilities, the airplane matured under great pressure during the years of conflict. It proved itself an unrivaled agent for the destruction of man□s works and civilization, and is now known from Berlin to Hiroshima as a dread vehicle of terror. Yet to be demonstrated is that its contribution to peaceful civilization will at least compensate for the terror it can add to life on this earth.

Until such time as the piracy of international aggression is eliminated from human relations or subjected to international control, those who work for aviation□s exploitation in human service must dedicate themselves also to combat its use for man’s enslavement or a nation’s destruction. Peace alone can permit the full development of aviation as humanity’s servant. To be durable, however, peace must be founded on the satisfaction of basic human needs.

Today, the world community is not producing enough. This condition stems partly from the devastation of a global war that sapped the energies and resources of the combatant nations. But the fact remains that want will continue in many heavily populated regions where land and resources are inadequate to meet minimum local requirements. At the same time, vast areas - off the old trade routes and distant from the population centers - are contributing little of their rich potential to humanity’s sustenance. Given the opportunity, we in the Air Age can tap for mankind new springs of wealth which to this time have seemed inaccessible.

Economic development in the past has depended upon favorable tides and coastal conditions and upon ports for shipping, elaborate rail and inland road nets, requiring many years to build and tremendous capitalization. Time and money, however, are today at a premium multiplied by exhausted economies. The need of rebuilding and rehabilitating once productive areas must be the world’s first concern.

But as science progressively develops aviation, reducing hazards and operating costs, rich natural resources, now isolated by forbidding coasts and mountain barriers, may be exploited through air transport for the betterment of humanity. There is room in the world for all the men who inhabit it and its natural wealth is

enough to sustain them. In the plane we now have the means and the instrument by which we can open vast areas hitherto locked against man by nature; we have a carrier of goods for men that recognizes no barrier too wide or too high for its wealth-bearing mission.

It is for mankind to decide whether air power shall advance civilization or destroy it; whether aviation shall serve man or enslave him. There are places in the world today where human beings cringe in terror at the roar of a plane overhead. They remember one use man has made of air power. Their terror may be reflected some future day on the faces of people in all nations, including our own, unless mankind seeks earnestly and finds the formula for universal peace and justice.

The search will not be easy; cooperation among the nations may on occasion be scant and grudged. For many, hunger and famine may continue to be more pressing threats than war itself. Old hates, fanned into new flame, may at times block advance. Political upheavals, civil strife, economic discontent in critical areas may delay progress. But despite obstacles and discouragement, the search must go on, for man is now armed with such frightful power to destroy himself that the alternative to peace among the nations is the collapse of civilization.

In the formula for universal peace and justice, there is one essential ingredient which we of the United States can supply - a steady resolution to devote ourselves untiringly to the pursuit of yet greater human mastery of the air. Thereby we shall be better able to work for the protection of man's rights, for the increase of wealth and its better distribution, for the service of man and his peaceful living.

For the present, however, the security of this free land is the pivot of humanity's future. I would stress one priority element we must have if that security is to be complete - teamwork. Neither air power nor sea power nor land power alone, nor any one of them preeminent in a lopsided combination, can constitute for the United States a reasonable defense. Each of the services has its own peculiar sphere in which its unique effectiveness must be recognized. Each complements the others and the weakening of one or its subordination as a mere auxiliary lessens the effectiveness of all. Only by the fullness of teamwork within a balanced military establishment can national security be attained.

As an independent organization, the Air Force is now able to direct its planning and administration toward the maintenance of maximum combat efficiency. But as one of three independent partners in the military security establishment, its attitude toward the common defense must continue to be characterized by the team spirit that recognizes cooperation as the key to success.

Teamwork, of course, must extend beyond the professional components of the armed forces. America's security potential is a complex as wide and varied as the national economy. The air industry is a part of that complex. Just as the security and progress of our country is directly dependent upon the vigor and health of air production and operation, so does air success depend upon the welfare of the whole nation. Inter-dependence among us is so basic and all-inclusive, that in its recognition we find the meaning and the foundation stone of democracy.

Our responsibilities to the group - to the nation - of which we are a part are not here discharged under tyrannical order. We are free - but if in the exercise of individual freedom we forget or neglect our fundamental obligations to the whole, then, in the long run, none can prosper, none can be safe. Miner, banker, manufacturer, farmer, mechanic, lawyer - all - all must, in the pursuit of that health, happiness and prosperity to which each is entitled, be guided by the over-riding truth that immediate gain is permanent gain only if it does no violence to the good of the whole.

The nation's security is bound up in its economic strength; but its economic strength cannot long endure unless all our people feel confident and secure against threat of aggression. Teamwork, cooperatively accomplished, won the military victory of World War II. It is the key to winning the peace.

Within your membership you possess the knowledge, the skill, the imagination and the initiative to make of the airways wider avenues and of the plane a more efficient instrument for man's use. With these attributes come an imposing challenge and a weighty responsibility. The challenge - to maintain American air strength, both civil and military, first and preeminent in the world. The responsibility - to demonstrate to the outside world air achievement dedicated to the enrichment of mankind. Your acceptance of the challenge and responsibility will be an index to America's future and the world's peace.

• Convocation, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia, September 23, 1947

Since time immemorial, and on every continent, the mountains have been a home of liberty. Among them men sought refuge from despotism and pursued a way of life whose spiritual core was individual freedom. Mountaineers have ever been valiant defenders of liberty; history is studded with their exploits in many lands under many flags. West Virginians for more than two centuries have enriched the mountain traditions.

In the Second World War the youth of this state served the nation in every theater of combat - served valorously, as the Japanese and Germans can best testify. As Chief of Staff of the United States Army, I pay tribute to those, living and dead, who far from home in strange countries of mountain, plain or jungle were urged on to great achievement by the spiritual heritage of the West Virginia mountains. I pay tribute also to the men and women of this industrial state, who made it a giant in production for victory. The sturdy West Virginians who tunneled the earth for its minerals, tilled its surface for food, manned the machines of shop and factory, were worthy partners of their sons and brothers who faced the enemy at the front. In our generation, you of this state have proved yourselves the spiritual heirs of the pioneers who saw in the valleys of this region paths to a more secure freedom and in its mountains a refuge for the oppressed.

The world and its mountain barriers have shrunk greatly since their day. Life has grown fuller but, at the same time, vastly more complicated. In this land we have come far from the time when, on the strength of a man's own shoulders, on his physical courage, on his willingness to break the ground and labor from sunrise to sunset, depended his family's bread and their freedom from fear. The time is long past when the American family could be sufficient to itself - growing its own food, weaving its own clothing, building its own shelter. A good existence that was once the simple problem of a piece of land and the will to work is now the most complicated problem of human living. Mutual interdependence of 143 million Americans has denied to every family and every community the ability to live to itself alone, and still meet its own requirements in material goods, in social freedoms and in day-to-day security.

If this interdependence ended with national boundaries, the problems presented would be sufficiently complicated. But its complexities extend into the remote corners of the earth. Hostility in one sector, bedlam in another, starvation in others - all are of immediate concern to us. We need the products of other peoples for, even in this nation, favored as it is by bountiful resources, we have shortages critical to modern industrial life. We need world markets to dispose of our surpluses and to maintain a sound and prosperous economy. We need friends both great and small, for the contest between governmental concepts is dividing the world into two camps and the freedom we cherish exists in only one of them. The friends of democracy, in all the world, must be as tightly bound together in basic purpose to preserve it as its enemies may become aggressive in their efforts to destroy it.

The will to be free has not proved adequate defense of liberty in the past, nor will it in the future when machines and appalling weapons can prevail over the spirit of man. More than desire is required of those who would continue to enjoy the priceless privileges won for us over the ages.

For survival - to put the matter at its bluntest - military strength is a basic essential. Until the possibility of armed aggression is rooted out of international relations, the unarmed, the weak, the helpless of today may well be the doomed or the enslaved of tomorrow. Our richness, our dedication to freedom, our pivotal position will mark us the primary target should ever again a man or group of men stake out a path to world conquest. But if we are prudently ready to meet this threat, we can prevent aggression - for no one would deliberately provoke a war unless there were reasonable chance of winning it. Nurnberg, at least, has guaranteed that.

Here I must observe that military strength is not compounded merely of guns, tanks, planes, ships and trained men to man them. All these are necessary in reasonable and balanced numbers, but they are powerless unless geared to an enlightened and effective industrial machine, a sound economy, a sturdy national morale.

But with all these things, our inner and greater strength is in our way of life, and in our understanding of the relationships between its privileges and the responsibilities of each of us to discharge his individual duties toward it. Essentially, it is a political system that recognizes the equality of humans before the law. Democracy makes no distinction between the great and the small; between the rich and the poor. It rests upon three great foundation stones. On these, one is an abiding faith in the dignity of the individual, in the eternal value of the

human soul. Democracy recognizes the right of each man to think, to act, to worship and to speak according to his own convictions and his own conscience. The single restriction is that he must not trespass on similar rights of others.

The second foundation stone is a system of free enterprise - the right of man to earn for himself and his family, in any legal manner of his own choosing, a decent living by the sweat of his own brow and the toil of his own hands. But this economic liberty must comprehend, and operate within, the bounds of the group welfare. Neither ownership of wealth nor control of labor, nor any combination of the two endows a man or a group of men with the right to relentless furtherance of personal gain at the expense of public good. Free enterprise gives no man license either to exploit his fellows or to alienate them from the national family. To reduce this argument to the single point of self-interest, no brilliant-hued gain of the present can be permanently sustained unless it works also to the good of the whole nation. Should greed for power succeed in defying this principle for an indefinite period, the system of free enterprise must finally disappear, and democracy will be a forgotten issue. This truth is inexorable - it must guide us all in every act of our daily lives.

The third stone is the readiness of the individual to discharge the obligations of citizenship, both in compensation for and in defense of his rights and privileges under the system. There can be no durable strength in the group without unity of purpose in fundamental issues, universality of cooperation and willing subordination of selfish ends to the common good. Among these fundamental group functions is that of providing for defense against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Any man who hopes to continue in the enjoyment of democracy's opportunities, must be vigilant in watching for threat against it, and eager to leap into the breach whenever such threat may develop, from whatever source. America has today as sharp a need for her minutemen as she did in 1775.

Human dignity, economic freedom, individual responsibility - these are the characteristics that distinguish democracy from all other governmental forms devised by man. This democratic system - this capitalistic system - has given to our people the highest standard of living ever known and has made of this nation a world force for justice and peace. Should ever we permit aggression from without to reach us in overwhelming force, all this will be lost. If we ourselves should seriously tamper with its foundations in ill-conceived experiment, or weaken any one of them under transient pressure, we shall jeopardize the one way of life that has proved able to combine the maximum of human liberty with the maximum of common good.

A characteristic of democracy is that all its processes are exposed for the world to see. For it, sudden and predatory aggression is impossible - its intent is always open and therefore peaceful. Moreover, it seeks no power to interfere with other people, with other systems. If any say - as has been said - that they cannot live side by side in this world with democracy, then the conclusion must be based upon their own conviction of the inferiority of their own system. Democracy's goal in this world, as it is at home, is peace - peace based on justice, on right, on human understanding - on cooperation! Democracy's flaws are human flaws. Democracy's strength is human strength. To function properly it must be guided by the people; to make it live, every citizen must ass strength and nourishment to its fibre; to sustain its progress ever forward, it must be attuned to the times and adapted to expanding human needs. Above all it must have leaders - men and women - whose talents and skills, sharpened by training, shall be devoted to its service.

Education in all its aspects, in the humanities, in the sciences, in the professions and technical crafts, is a potent instrument of democracy. It is a most heartening development in postwar life that millions of men who staked their lives in the nation's defense have returned to our schools to broaden and better fit themselves for worthy roles in the service of peace.

This University typifies the unique, indigenous school structure that has grown up throughout the length and breadth of America. Our great universities and colleges, while carrying on the heritage of the arts and sciences - the lore of the centuries - are not merely monuments to abstract thought and lofty theories; they are practical, down-to-earth extensions of local scenes, closely related to local problems and requirements.

Your schools of Mines, Agriculture and Engineering are handmaidens of West Virginia's rich coal and mineral veins, its fertile valleys and tremendous power resources. The classroom, lecture hall and laboratory participate directly in the more effective use of natural wealth. Here education improves and develops the home community as well as the individuals it trains. Rooted in the culture and lessons of the past, growing with the present, the university is poised for the future.

But beyond fitting the student for productive life in a chosen vocation lies the first and fundamental purpose of education. This is to broaden understanding of basic principles and their application to daily life, to develop comprehension of how principles influence human conduct and how they produce or require specific action. Understanding of the true relationship between a democratic state and each of its citizens is more important than knowledge of the calculus. The accumulation of factual knowledge without grasp of the relationship between facts, or of the reason for their being facts, is a distortion of education. In the modern complexity of human existence there is ever-increasing need for active and trained intelligence, sound judgment, appreciation of human values.

The chief dangers to our leadership for justice and peace are: misunderstanding and ignorance of the nation's destiny; of the citizen's responsibility in its fulfillment; of the relationship between the health and security of America and decent living standards wherever people strive to practice similar systems. Consequently, the American schools - and particularly the universities - have a vital mission to develop in the individual American an appreciation of his country's role in the world, a role that must be assumed and played for our own welfare.

Above all, the schools - devotedly and with all the skill at their command - must clarify why the future of democratic civilization demands that this country be at once the chief protector and the leading exponent of human freedom. The most important fact to humankind today is this: on American conduct, at home and abroad, depends the future course of the world - whether the freedom and dignity of the individual shall continue its inspiration, or the enslavement of the individual to the state shall be its end. Unless we clearly understand the reasons behind this fact and all its implications, our decisions will be short-circuited by transient considerations, or, at least, impaired by hesitancy and doubt.

It must be granted that the complexity of international relations, compounded of commercial, economic, military and social problems, makes it impossible for the individual fully to understand or decide every matter affecting the national interest. Even a corpus of specialists, whose schooling and experience uniquely fit them to deal with such problems, may sometimes fail to develop the most applicable decision. But in the support of human freedom and its extension wherever possible in the world, the individual American citizen can be an active and effective agent simply by his daily life and conduct.

If we demonstrate in this country the real worth of democracy, free men everywhere will recognize its advantages and rally to our standard. If we continue to strengthen and perfect our own democratic institutions, the peoples of the world will hope to follow our lead. Nothing succeeds like success; no nation or people is so blind to self-interest as willingly to follow a hard and profitless path when a richer, better one is at hand. If we make democracy more productive of real achievement, beneficial in every way to those who support it, we shall make it more persuasive to those now blind to its worth.

That we shall put all our zeal of mind and body into the maintenance and development of our way of life is beyond doubt. This heritage built by generations of Americans in the fearlessness of their spirit, shall not be lessened by us who profit from our fathers' greatness.

Given a knowledge of democracy's inspiring past, an understanding of its guiding tenets, a comprehension of its vast destiny, a conviction of its individual obligations, we shall be successful in surmounting problems present and future, we shall increase and enrich the heritage we have received. America will be strong in a strength beyond that of military machines or aggressive tyrannies. America will be productive in food and in wealth beyond that of controlled economies or regimented industries.

On battlefields of every continent, the trained American proved the most formidable soldier of history. Initiative, resourcefulness, alertness, courage and stamina have not, in the average of their sum, been so fully demonstrated by others. In the battles of peace, these qualities are ever in demand. America needs them now - possibly as never before.

Facing us all is a challenge - each to do his part in the struggle to establish world-wide justice and cooperation. To attain this goal, still far off upon the horizon - we must be strong - strong in purpose, strong in our moral integrity, strong in our economic health, strong in understanding, strong in the physical attributes necessary to our preservation. You who are now undergoing training in this great University are entering upon your active careers at a time that history will call one of the great crossroads of civilization. Upon you, and thousands of others like you, now living in this greatest of all countries will finally depend the course that is

taken. If you apply to the problem the qualities of the American soldier of Bataan, of Tunis, of Okinawa and of Normandy, you will, like them, endure discouragement almost to heartbreak; but, like them, you will win through. You will write a page in our national history to which future generations of free men will turn with pride, with veneration. Those generations will say, “They were Americans.”

• Address to Forum, Manchester, New Hampshire, October 16, 1947

In New Hampshire where history reaches back over three centuries, it is fitting to take stock of what was done by the builders of this nation that we, their heirs, should possess greatness among the nations. Our domestic and world position is no less the product of our forefathers’ principles and vision than of our own achievement in these late, eventful decades.

In the Era of Exploration beginning in the fifteenth century, the Western World broke its Atlantic bonds and sought riches across the seas and lands for settlement. During that period men of every European nation came to this hemisphere. They raised flags of great kingdoms and seapowers - England and Spain, France, Holland, Sweden and Portugal. They built empires in the New World that dwarfed in size the mother countries.

On this continent, the Spaniards staked claims from Florida to California, and established communities that today, four centuries later, are Spanish in name and flavor. The French penetrated the heart of the continent, advanced their flag from the mouth of the St. Lawrence to the mouth of the Mississippi. From Quebec to New Orleans a thousand towns and rivers commemorate the intrepid, far-ranging voyageurs. But overshadowing all others in its influence on the future of the new continent was the settlement least likely to succeed, if climate or natural wealth were to augur success.

New England - its coasts rockbound and its interior rockribbed - became the home of men and women more concerned with establishing a way of life than in winning wealth and empire for a distant sovereign. That way of life, emphasizing the dignity of the individual, the integrity of the family, and cooperative effort for the betterment of all, has become the pattern of existence for this nation and a model inspiring imitation by peoples who were old when New England was unbroken wilderness.

Inevitably the question arises: Why has this little corner of America had so profound an effect on history and man’s living?

The settlers of New England had no monopoly of courage, of the adventurous spirit, or of willingness to endure hardship. Those traits were the possession, too, of the men who paid allegiance to the French and Spanish kings. DeSoto and Coronado, LaSalle and Marquette and Champlain are memorable names in American history. But the settlers along America’s eastern seaboard, and especially the townsmen and farmers of this section, possessed in unique fashion independence of opinion and the determined will to express it, because they judged action by its rightness rather than by the authority decreeing it, because they made the individual an active participant in his own government, they developed a sense of citizenship unparalleled in political history.

When New Englanders joined the Western emigration and moved beyond the mountains to develop new territories, they carried with them - more important than their skills and tools - that constructive spirit of free citizenship.

The town meeting of New England has its lineal descendant in every group of American citizens who gather to exchange opinions without fear of police spy, of government informer, or of denunciation to an arbitrary judge. Because we can meet in forums such as this to hear men of every background and philosophy express their views, we in this country are not chained to dogmatic solutions or to state propaganda, nor does the house on the hill dictate what they must think who live on side street or city alley. Because we are free, around this cracker barrel or in the town hall, to speak our minds on any topic that concerns us, we Americans are able to maintain the impetus of forward progress and to blaze new paths in achievement.

Freedom of speech is more than a visible mark of democracy. It is the vital principle of democracy’s effectiveness in meeting the issues of daily life. Every proposed policy provokes conflicting and even diametrically opposed attitudes. Such division of opinion and its public expression, challenging every point of suggested policy, analyzing every partisan argument, is the supreme test of valid thought and the proper basis

for majority decision. The essential corollary to this process is that majority decision having been achieved, it shall govern all, subject always to strict observance of the individual rights that apply as much to any minority as to the majority. Only through such process can government sensitively reflect and act according to the considered will of the people; only so can popular unity - the political opposite of state regimentation - be achieved.

Thus has developed a political system whose hardihood is measured by the faith in it of its own members. It is significant that, true to our principles, we permit full circulation in our press and radio of what other peoples say about us. However critical or intemperate they may be, such views are presented factually and exactly to the American public. This willingness to give ear even to the most defamatory opinions, though they mock and ridicule our most generous aims, is proof of our boundless confidence in the free system. By the same token, the inference cannot be escaped that any state that suppresses all criticism and finds it necessary for its own interests to screen and twist the news from abroad, must fear enlightenment of its own citizens.

The doctrine of human dignity and human liberty is still a missionary movement - one that by its nature can seek converts only by persuasion and example. Democracy cannot and does not impose its doctrines by force; else it would cease to be democracy. But, we are far from the day when freedom is enjoyed by all men. Moreover, we are far from the day when freedom may be permanently enjoyed by any unless they are ceaselessly vigilant in its support. There are still natural forces in the world as well as political philosophies that combat freedom and threaten its extinction. Physical hunger, economic ruin, social hopelessness can throttle freedom; while it seems to be a characteristic of dictatorial statism that its devotees cannot feel secure in their position unless they crush individual liberty wherever it may be practiced.

We recognize that to gain freedom from hunger men may sacrifice freedom of speech, of franchise - all the spiritual freedoms. Reason, logic and ideals lose their hold on men and women whose children are the prey of hunger and disease; whose homes are cold and miserable; whose existence is at the drab level of a crust-and-scrap diet. Under such tragic pressures, normal human beings are ready victims for any lie or false promise of a better tomorrow even at the price of surrendering their independence as individual human beings. While democracy holds for all men a valid promise of prosperity and happiness, its existence, nevertheless, demands tolerable living conditions. Consequently, the American people have given much and are prepared to give further of their substance that independent and peace-loving countries may be fed and enabled to rebuild their tottering economies. Charity impels us to that course and self-interest demands it; the more widely national independence and individual liberty encompass the earth, the more secure are we in their possession.

By every mile that freedom’s territory is restricted, by every family lost to its foes, the future of freedom and its exercise, even in this country, is menaced. Plainly, those who espouse the cause of human freedom must be resolute in maintaining what they hold - or eventually be overrun. If the supporters of the democratic way of life too often retreat, abandoning those who seek to be free with them, the time could come when the democratic systems, outnumbered and outpowered, would be faced by the alternatives of surrender or destruction.

That time will never arrive if we, the American people, measure up to our responsibility in the world. Measure up we must, for the leadership won by generations of American effort cannot now be defaulted. We must understand the fundamentals at issue; agree on the basic outline of solution and resolutely set ourselves to meet every requirement thus imposed upon us. More than any other nation it has been ours that made democracy and enduring, productive system of government. More than any other nation we have benefited from its application to daily life and it is we who are best able to support its friends. To dissipate the strength demanded of leadership for democratic progress is to betray our history and our destiny.

The first strength required is moral - a national integrity that will be recognized and respected universally. In the uneasy status of today’s world, that strength requires, also, the maintenance of balanced military forces in the visible posture of a nation prepared to defend itself against attack, able to enforce a peace bought at tragic cost. An adequate military establishment for America is not only insurance for our own safety; it is a source of hope and confidence to weaker friends who would otherwise despair. Strength also requires the maintenance of a healthy economy, the bulwark of our international position. Industrial strife and selfish greed, when they sap our material welfare at home, can ultimately end our world leadership. Indeed, in the present needs of today’s world, productivity - in food, clothing, useful machines, everything needed for the sustenance of man - is as

much a factor in our security as is any amount of armed force.

National productivity, military strength, a wise and widely understood foreign policy based on justice - all are vital to our world position and must be considered together. Unless we are economically prosperous, we cannot afford the military establishment prudence demands; unless our foreign policy has the support of the nation, military power will avail us nothing; unless the military establishment is adequate, our rich economy and our foreign policy might provoke attack.

Every American is affected by two pressing needs in the free world today. The first is: Food and material aid for once prosperous peoples that they might survive to rebuild their stricken economies. The second is: Such armed power that those who respect only force will stop short of international aggression.

The longing of the world is for peace and for the opportunity to develop its riches in the betterment of humanity. To the utmost, all of us must work for the fulfillment of that longing, strengthening within the community of nations every barrier against the unjust use of arbitrary force for the settlement of international disputes. Such effort is in the American tradition.

Our government is so shaped that we will never take the initiative in a war of aggression. History shows that we have been quick to repudiate armed force and have demonstrated our willingness to abandon arms forever. Today our military establishment is designed for our security needs. As we deplore the employment of force between nations, so we will not maintain one soldier, sailor or airman other than in our own necessary defense.

But we are faced with such conditions and problems that only be strength in all the forms I have mentioned, can we progress steadily toward permanent peace. Certainly it is your concern as much as mine that the United States military establishment be adequate to foster attainment of this goal. Almost half a million of your fellow Americans in khaki are now serving you abroad to stabilize conditions and to permit our statesmen opportunity to root out the causes of war. They are serving your interests and they merit your support.

Only a few of you here can join the Armed Forces. But all of you can be recruiting agents for them. All of us can to some extent participate in the building of the civilian components of our military establishment. All of us can help feed the hungry. All of us, by a little extra effort, can increase the national productive output on which everything else depends. Each of us can play a part; and the sum of our contributions will be greater assurance of freedom for all men. That, after all, is the best hope for enduring peace.

This is not to minimize the enormity of the tasks or the discouragements along the way. Even granting that others who fail to see eye-to-eye with us on basic issues may still be honest according to their own lights, it is bewildering, not to say frustrating, to see every effort toward reducing world chaos and human misery, blocked by calculated obstruction. Even so, because the alternative to success is of such somber nature, we must continue with infinite patience toward the goal of broader understanding among men and their nations.

The spirit of freedom, tolerance and cooperation, that had its most powerful impulse in this region, must be spread throughout the world if humanity is to be saved from self-destruction. The choice is clearly drawn between a hate-ridden, strife-ridden world in which all men live in dread awaiting the final disaster of another war; and a neighborly - or at least a logical - world in which all men may live in peace, free to enjoy its blessings and riches.

• Talk at Chapel, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kansas, October 24, 1947

In the second World War, Americans proved that justice, rooted in God-given precepts and faith in the right, provide men inspiration denied to the evil and the seekers of false power. This chapel of meditation where they who come may gain renewed spiritual strength will symbolize the supremacy of truth and conscience over falsehood and despotism.

Commemorating the war service of Kansas State graduates and students, it is a tribute appropriate to men whose victory was won by spiritual greatness as much as by weapons and combat skill. Those who have returned to their homes and are now engaged in the tasks of peaceful life will be quick to appreciate that here, though we build of stone and wood, there shall rise a living memorial of our country’s ordeal by battle.

And for the fallen - those who cannot come again to this campus - this place of prayer and peace will be a

uniquely fitting remembrance. Once bound together by a common allegiance, they are now more closely joined in the noblest unity of all - common fellowship in the hearts of all they served.

Here in this chapel we who survive them can in some measure attain a like unity of spirit. For in the edifice you build, there will be no barriers of sect. Within it, all men will be joined in their common hunger for enlightenment, their common need for spiritual strength, their common dependence on God.

We live at a time when all the ancient divisions among men seem to have been resolved into a single fundamental division. On one side are those who reject the dignity of the human being, subordinating him to the state and making those who control it absolute masters of human destiny. On the other side are those who believe in the dignity of the individual human being, whose rights, freedom, protection and betterment constitute the basic purpose of the state and all society.

America is dedicated to this freedom and dignity of man. From our War of Independence to the latest conflict that engulfed the world, we have repeatedly staked our existence to that purpose. But a future challenge may be armed beyond our present strength to contest. The talents with which we are endowed - all our wealth of human and physical resources - these must be husbanded and increased else we may be found derelict in our stewardship.

Above all, we must grow in strength of the spirit, deepening within ourselves the knowledge that only in sacrifice is greatness won, strengthening within ourselves the will to be ready for personal sacrifice whenever it is required in the cause of human betterment or the defense of this country, stronghold of human freedom.

A sober humility befits America today. And in this chapel of meditation we can learn it, growing strong in spirit, becoming more worthy of those whose sacrifice this edifice will commemorate.

• Address at stadium, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kansas, October 25, 1947

This for me, is a true homecoming - to this college, with which my brother is so closely associated, and to this state where I spent my youth. Wherever I have gone since leaving Kansas, I have carried with me inspiration from its people and from the brave spirit they have demonstrated on this soil.

Admitted to the Union in the year that marked the outbreak of our tragic fratricidal struggle, Kansas had already manifested its staying power; it had endured, through pain and anguish, the border conflict foreshadowing the war that was to cleanse the New World of human slavery. In every succeeding national crisis, our Kansas forebears have provided new proof of men’s ability to rise above disaster. They have bequeathed a rich heritage from which all of us may draw vigor and spiritual strength as we, in our time, strive to fulfill America’s continuing purpose.

Plainly stated, that purpose is to preserve and develop this country as the abode of free men, endowed with equal rights before the law, each assured the opportunity to seek his own betterment in any calling of his own choosing.

Never before have the vigilance, devotion and understanding of its citizens been more vital to democracy’s preservation. We cannot isolate ourselves from the outer world which today is faced with ominous problems. The late war, rather that clearing the atmosphere, has left it heavy with storm clouds that threaten new suffering to civilization. The way to durable peace is blocked by the ruin of shattered economies, by appalling human misery and by ideological strife that seems at times beyond composition. Unchecked, these foster anarchy, the fertile breeding ground for a malignant despotism which may end all freedom and destroy every democracy.

Despair will not be our portion if we retain the spiritual fibre of the men and women who settled Kansas. Local their problems were and possibly of only passing interest to the outside world. But could any division be deeper than that which set American against American in the territorial days of this state? Could any physical problem be greater than the restoration of a land wasted by locust and by drought? Could any future look blacker than that of a farmer who, with his family, faced the winter empty-handed after months of futile toil?

Unless we emulate the courage, tenacity and strength so abundantly and often demonstrated here in Kansas, our future is grim indeed. Complacency, greed, inertia, weakness, hysterical fear - any of these could destroy us; together they would surely do so. Moreover, unless we are impelled by the neighborly spirit that moves men to share their lot, however meager, with those in need, we shall not salvage our civilization from the ruin of

war.

To meet the challenge of our day ably and well, each of us must know how he fits into the great complex we call America; how America fits into and affects, as it is affected by, others of the family of nations. Each of us must come to realize that his own efforts are significant to the whole process, and his ambition should be to increase his capacity for rendering beneficial service to the whole.

The matter is far more complex than is the winning of a battle, although there are elements of similarity between the struggle we face and military conflict. Veterans among you know that teamwork is a fundamental to success in war. Each must do his part and he must be confident that all others will do theirs. That also is true today! Only the wholehearted teamwork of the American people can defeat the starvation, chaos and hopelessness that threaten millions of our fellow beings.

But before the soldier enters battle he is carefully trained in the techniques and skills applicable to the task allotted him by his commander. Beyond this the combat force receives, before the day of conflict, plans and orders that assign the specific task each element is to accomplish. The mission of the whole army, of each of its units and, finally, of each of its men is carefully outlined. Thus the solidarity of the team is assured, and the authority of the commander sets the whole in motion and directs its work until victory is attained.

These methods do not apply to a democracy at peace. To use them would be to destroy the free system we have practiced here since the days of the colonists. Our individual responsibilities and obligations cannot be ordered and enforced by central authority; they must be understood, assumed and carried out by ourselves. Civilians, members of a free economy, cannot be independent citizens and at the same time accept dictation for every individual step and action.

If any mission of our educational structure transcends all others, it is to impress on us the relationship between possession of individual right and discharge of individual responsibility; to point out potential dangers to our way of life whether their source is external hostility or internal ignorance and indifference; to develop in us a comprehension of human and national needs and to suggest cooperative methods for meeting them. For what could it profit us to train the best doctors, the best engineers, or to have the largest houses and the finest automobiles, if freedom should ever be lost to a dictator’s power? The whole concept of our system, the meaning of America, would be gone if human conscience should ever be replaced by the decree of government, of if the unity of a free people be replaced by regimentation and police compulsion.

Another matter we must see clearly is the relationship between the preservation of our democratic system and the continued exercise of freedom in other countries. From our viewpoint, there is no reason why two different systems of government cannot live together peacefully. But it is idle to believe that any nation, however powerful, could long exist free in a world otherwise completely dominated by aggressive dictatorship. Opportunities for trade would disappear and even such a country as ours, under the impelling need for critical materials we lack, would finally be forced to return to a pastoral existence or to accept domination from without. This fact is one source of our tremendous concern for the people of other nations who desire to retain freedom and independence. Self-interest demands a course of action to which we are impelled also by every instinct of humanitarianism and decency. But since the riches of no nation are inexhaustible, the help we give must eventually contemplate a mutual strengthening of economic structures to the benefit of giver and receiver, as well as the preservation of decent political concepts.

Our country’s leaders have announced our readiness to assist all who desire to live in freedom’s concepts. Underlying this policy is a tenet of the American faith - that free men, even when their fortunes are lowest, when the elements of nature have turned against them, where there seems no hope for their future prosperity, free men in such plight are never politically or spiritually bankrupt. Given a helping hand, given encouragement and protection against further evil, they will rebuild better than before. Time and again we in this nation have proved the truth of this conviction when disaster, natural or economic, spelled ruin for millions. We believe it can be proved among peoples who are bound to us by the ties of common destiny. Failure to move forward in this faith is to surrender that which we have no right to surrender - the courage of our ancestors and the freedom of our children.

But even when we, whether students in school or living in the afternoon of our lives, have gained comprehension of these issues and understanding of our basic responsibilities, there remain additional factors in this problem of sustaining our freedom and independence.

A fundamental longing of our world today is assurance of peace. There must be lifted from the minds and hearts of men the gnawing fear of another world cataclysm, whose disastrous effects would dwarf any that civilization has yet endured. Among sane men, was is justifiable only as the last and final resort in defense of principle more dear than life itself. Nevertheless, we dwell today in a world where force and the threat of its employment make most difficult, and even impossible in certain areas, the realization of our dream of peace among men.

We, consequently, must have the strength to convince the world that no outside force shall ever conquer this great stronghold of democracy. Our strength cannot be measured exclusively in such simple terms as ships and planes and guns. It comprises, first, the moral probity of the nation. Our purposes must be so just and fair and so clearly evident to all that we ourselves gain spiritual strength in their support and others see us as a helping friend - never a menacing enemy.

We must be economically strong. The productivity of our nation is important not only to meet the immediate problems of combatting famine and bankruptcy, it is of special significance in the problems of maintaining a security structure that others will respect and fear to challenge. Our grain and produce, our manufactured goods, that are the most effective weapons in today's battle to establish stability in the world, have also a primary function in maintaining for ourselves an adequate defensive shield.

We need unity for the effective execution of national policy determined by majority decision. The democratic process assures ample room for discussion and argument as to means and methods. But basic policy, once established by the majority must be earnestly supported by all.

Finally, we need military strength - a strength adequate only to our security and defensive needs. Possessed by the United States, such strength is feared by no one because it is clear that democracy can never undertake a sudden and surprise aggression against any other country. Our methods are open, our decisions and the processes of arriving at them are known to all the world. Surprise attack - the key to successful aggressive war - is impossible for a democracy.

What we must do now is soberly and seriously prepare to meet our obligations in the world. Our weaker friends expect us to remain defensively strong, and if we fail in this, others who have not repudiated the doctrine of rule by force, will be contemptuous of our position. Each of us, recognizing that the enjoyment of individual privilege imposes an equal responsibility for defending the nation that provides such privilege, must take this problem to his own heart. Should the world ever again be plunged into war, only those who have met this responsibility and prepared themselves to meet war's exacting requirements can perform their duty effectively in defense of themselves and their nation.

At this critical crossroads of history, the free world depends on America to lead the way. Misunderstanding or ignorance of the nation's destiny and the citizen's responsibility in its fulfillment are definite dangers to success. Our schools foster science and the arts; they increase our productivity and give to us greater capacity to enjoy and profit from the thinkers and artists of the ages; they increase our earning power and give to us a constantly improving standard of daily life. But underlying all else, our schools must construct a foundation of understanding on which we may base wise individual and national decisions. Unless we have such understanding, our decisions will be shortcircuited by transient considerations or, at least, impaired by hesitancy and doubt.

In our possession today are all the attributes the world recognizes as strength. Aware of this material power that has no precedent, we nevertheless conduct ourselves with the humility of a God-fearing people, seeking to gain for others similar security and abundance. Given wisdom, firmness, patience and tolerance we can present, in sharp, bold focus, our answer to man's fundamental need - a way of life that assures the individual, without prejudice or hurt to his fellows, the present maximum of human good and the opportunity to build for the future.

Within that way of life, Kansans have written - so that all may read - an epic of endeavor and achievement in the spiritual and physical spheres of human activity. The slogan, "First in Freedom, First in Wheat," is the story of Kansas in six words. In both wheat and freedom Kansans are rich; for both, much of the world is hungry. We cannot export from this country parcels of freedom; but we can demonstrate its worth and productivity and we can sustain those who defend freedom. We cannot export enough wheat to feed all the world; but we can so apportion our supply among ourselves and the hungry that this shall not be a winter of starvation. And we can preach to the world the spirit of Kansas - that freedom, valiantly sustained, shall

triumph; that out of our present despair, neighborly help can lead to future richness and peace.

• Will Rogers Memorial unveiling, Fort Worth, Texas, November 4, 1947

We are gathered here out of affection and respect for Will Rogers, a great American.

His career and his place in the American defy exact classification. He was member of no particular profession; he was not identified with the trades or sciences - he did not seek political preference nor was he, in any formal sense, constructor, teacher, preacher, lawyer, farmer or soldier. Yet, an adventurer at heart, he seemed something of each; a smiling wanderer through city, farm and village. He possessed a keen insight into the things that concerned, amused or distressed his fellows, and was gifted with an uncanny ability to relate these things to the fundamental business of making a living, of maintaining freedom, of pursuing happiness. He gave to the millions who regarded philosophy as something of interest only to the cloistered professor, a better balanced understanding of their place in modern society. His favorite tool was the witty barb - but though sharp, to puncture pomposity, it was never poisoned, to leave a lasting wound. He climbed to fame on the lazy twirls of a cowpuncher's rope - and he used his fame to teach while he entertained; to goad each of us to think about the heritage we possess - of our opportunities, our rights, our responsibilities.

Within the year I have seen the lonely cairn that marks the spot, on the bleak borders of our northernmost frontier, where he met his end. There, with his gallant companion, Wiley Post, he had gone, following still his bent of probing into things outside the limit of everyday conscious knowledge. Just what he sought, I do not know - but fitting it seemed to me that his passing should remind us, as had, in life, his pungent words that there still exists a need to seek, to search, to know.

To class Will Rogers with the acknowledged philosophers of the ages would be as false as to relate him in Thespian art to Booth, Marlowe, Jefferson or Sothern. He, himself, would have ridiculed any such attempt. He was observer rather than profound thinker; entertainer rather than interpretative actor. But though he belonged to neither of those fields, he invaded both and in doing so gave to his contemporaries thought for everyday consumption; bits to spur our minds even as we smiled at the package in which we received the gift.

He knew those the world called great but stood in awe of no man. Purists, grammarians, even scholars and statesmen may have at times deplored his flagrant disregard of the particular dogmas each of them held dear. But the only Americans who failed to gain some inspiration, some mental quickening, some quiet chuckle from Will Rogers were those few totally devoid of a sense of humor and completely blind to the foibles that a mental mirror always shows. With these he was not concerned - but to the millions he brought fun and stimulus, and so he deserved what he gained, a big place in our hearts, a secure niche in our admiration.

He was a common man with uncommon qualities, and common men never failed to appreciate what he had to give. Into one sentence, under the glint of a wisecrack, he could pack a century and a half of history and salt it down with an ageless truth. He once observed that "The United States never lost a war or won a conference," doubtless to remind his fellow citizens that while a united America can develop irresistible power in defense of principle, rightness of principle cannot of itself assure success over human selfishness.

Most interesting it is to speculate on what he would have had to say about things that trouble us today. What wisecrack would he have shot at us on a dozen differences in the United Nations; what kind of needling would he have used to awaken us to the relationships between maintenance of our liberties and a decent life for others that desire also to remain free; what quip would he have employed to shame us into greater saving of food for the needy; what shaft would he have launched to inspire us to greater cooperation at home? Could his wit, his insight, his homely phraseology make us better see that democracy has entered its decade of greatest crisis? Could he have helped us see that personal ambitions and desires must now take second place to national need and solidarity? Could he have made us see the inescapable truth that sheer national interest demands of us a unity of effort that must extend far beyond our national borders? Could he have made us more vigilant in the preservation of freedom, defending it from all enemies, foreign and domestic? Could he have helped strip from our eyes the scales of misunderstanding, prejudice, ignorance, fear - and so help us each to see clearly our duties to our country and ourselves, and tirelessly to struggle toward their performance?

What he would and could have done, none of us can know; none of us is a Will Rogers! But certain it is

that he would have tried - he would have brought to us such understanding as was granted to him. He would have done it for his love of America, his devotion to human freedom, his concern for his fellow citizens, his faith in humanity. And even more certain it is that he would have brought smiles to our faces - for he did not believe that to be earnest is to weep, that recognition and performance of duty are possible only to a doleful face. We would have squirmed under the spurs he may possibly have applied to our complacency but we would have warmed to his infectious grin, and tried the harder to meet the requirements of our day.

He has gone - the problems remain, and he would be the first to remind us that thus it has always been. A loved one goes - even leaders that may temporarily seem to acquire the quality of indispensability - but life continues to encounter the storms that loved ones or leaders shared with us or pointed the way to avoidance. Ours alone is the responsibility of meeting the issues of our time, but the memory of those we have lost brings inspiration to the daily task.

It is fitting that we should try to communicate to others still to come, something of this inspiration born of affection, faith and admiration. A pictorial likeness, a statue, can help to do so for it will endure long after we, gathered here today, have joined the one it commemorates. And in the day of our children's children and beyond their time, it will still testify that a sense of humor and a neighborly spirit can greatly lighten life's burden.

Will Rogers may be smiling now at the thought of capturing in a figure of bronze his humor, his humanness, his discernment, his friendliness! Yet, if so he does, then also he knows that this statue had its birth in a friend's affection and esteem for him, and in generosity and concern for others. Knowing this, he would approve and, though vain pride of self did not mar his daily living, he would be proud in the just pride that, having harmed no man and helped so many, those who knew him found him worthy of timeless tribute.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my high honor to unveil, to the view of friends who lived him, this statue to the memory of a great American, Will Rogers.

• Address to Arkansas Veterans, Little Rock, Arkansas, November 5, 1947

Every invitation to address a gathering of American veterans is for me a new opportunity to express my admiration and gratitude to men and women who have served their country in the Armed Forces. Twice in my time American citizens have left the safety and friendships of home to foil the purposes of militaristic aggression. In battle and in the waging of war, they proved themselves superior to the vaunted machines of tyranny that menaced the free world. America is rightly proud of its veterans who, on the European and Pacific battlefields of two World Wars, proved worthy of the traditions of Lexington and Concord.

Our government has attempted to make provision for the widow and orphan of the fallen, for the care of the disabled, for the education and re-integration into civil life of others. In a material way the nation has thus sought to express something of its appreciation as well as to recognize its obligations toward those who staked their lives when despotism attempted to conquer us. For 300,000 of your fellows, no earthly recompense is possible. But at this time, as they return to rest in American soil, we can rededicate ourselves to the purpose for which America sent them to war - the preservation in this country of a system that insists upon the dignity of man, upon equal rights before the law, upon the fundamental freedoms that belong to man, created in the image of his God. This purpose did not end with the cessation of hostilities; it can never end and must be backed with all or strength so long as greed for power and hope of gain lead men to the employment of predatory force to enslave others. All of us - and you veterans, not the least - have a continuing responsibility to exercise vigilance, to subordinate selves to country, if this greatest and best of all nations is to remain so until the end of time!

Now you are engaged on farm, in factory and office, at school, in the daily tasks that build a better, richer, stronger America. Having defended the structure of our democratic civilization against those who would tear it down, you now add something of yourselves - your skills and talents and knowledge - to its capacity for peaceful achievement. That is your duty as citizens, demanded of you because American citizenship – man's rarest privilege - requires of those who enjoy it productive application of its advantages. But in addition, because you are veterans who helped win victory in two World Wars, you have a special interest and

investment in the fruits of hard-won victory, and the use we make of them.

Triumph over deadly threat has given this country renewed vigor in the development and perfection of our way of life. Today we are setting new records in the production of goods for peacetime living, in the number of men and women gainfully employed, in the number of students in our schools, in almost every index that measures a nation's devotion to the peaceful betterment of human living. Nevertheless, amidst our abundance, it can be truthfully said that we are far short of the production needed by ourselves and our world neighbors; and, although the guns are stilled, we are far from assurance that war shall not again disrupt our peaceful living.

Three hungers beset the world today: Hunger for goods - for the entire range of material production from cereals and grains to heavy machinery; hunger for stability - for the balance that assures men against political chaos fomented by the partisans of extremism; hunger for security - for liberation from the fear of the future that cripples the peaceful efforts of free men in much of the world. The menace of aggression still exists. Compounded with economic collapse, food shortage and hopelessness, it threatens an end to freedom in many nations. But reality, however stark and grim, must not make a defeatist of an American.

We realize that great goals are not easily attained. Our Declaration of Independence did not by its words alone make men free. Development of this vast continent did not eliminate poverty among the unfortunate. Our conquest of nature's secrets did not release us from sweat and toil. But each advance - political, economic, scientific - the product of thought and effort and sacrifice, moved us a little closer to the fullness of human freedom and well-being. In like manner, our stupendous victory in the second World War did not end our problems once and for all time. But it has given us magnificent opportunity that no cynicism can deny.

The United States, joined by the nations of the Western Hemisphere - still rich in the spirit of freedom - working with all nations of the earth, that so will - can preserve democracy in the world and inaugurate an era devoted to peace and the fruitful life of peace.

With you I need not argue the fact that the disappearance of freedom in any part of the world affects our own freedom. A forest fire concerns us long before it reaches our own back yard. Always must we understand that no one nation, however powerful can exist as a single island of democracy in a world otherwise completely dominated by despotism. Our own self-interest, our own safety, physical as well as spiritual, require that we take the lead in fostering and supporting freedom where it still has opportunity to flourish and where people desire its blessings.

Because a few men widely separated began to plot the extinction of freedom when most of you were still in grade school, you had to spend years of your lives in the defense of your nation. You know that it can happen again; you realize that what goes on in Europe and even the most distant corner of Asia may, in your children's time, erupt into a final war for the survival of civilization. It may not be clear to us, however, what measures individual Americans can now take of themselves to increase the security of the democratic way of life - in this country, in this hemisphere, in the world. Nor can anyone provide a blueprint of the steps to be taken by each of you, their order and their details. But the broad outlines of American action are evident.

Leadership demands that we provide material help, so far as we are able, to those who seek to help themselves but who have not yet recovered from the ravages of war. To abandon them to forces that would stamp out freedom with the finality of a hydraulic press is repugnant to every American principle. The outcome would be chaos for peoples bound to us by the ties of fellowship in battle and, eventually, for our children a barren existence in a dreary world.

Leadership, moreover, requires that we who possess it provide a rallying point for the free peoples who, alone and of themselves, cannot withstand ideological aggression. Should this nation permit the cause of freedom elsewhere to become the victim of hostile political force, we would eventually have to fight for assurance of its survival in this country. Our foreign policy today is a realistic attempt to prevent war in the future.

Nor can we relax our enforcement of the peace. We must maintain our occupation forces at adequate strength and continue the building of a defense establishment of professional and civilian components, buttressed by universal training. Military readiness will be a forceful stop sign to any who may plot war. Moreover we must increase our production - agricultural, industrial and mineral - because American productivity is the primary element in our strength as a nation.

It is imperative that we live and act in full awareness that man has reached a period of crisis when the

freedoms he has achieved slowly through generations could, within a short span of years, be utterly lost. Fortunately, you veterans, and your gallant comrades under many flags, have provided us a breathing space in which we can assure our destiny. Undoubtedly - if we will work untiringly for it - we can make of this country a better place for men to live; we can, in cooperation with our neighbors, make of this hemisphere a solid stronghold of democracy. We can hold out a hand to all who will grasp it in friendship, well knowing that when, at long last, all are so joined together, the grim specter of war will disappear and no future forests of white crosses will mark the places of conflict.

The way will be long - discouragement and even rebuff will be encountered at every turning. But patience, firmness and strength - inexhaustible patience, firmness and strength - these will see us through.

In this noble effort, leadership - manifested by the sort of example it sets - is in the end more potent than words of command. Through such leadership every one of you, at your job, in your home, about your community, can be a builder of a better America and a better world. Every time you place the common good above you own desire or personal prejudice, that often do you make this country a finer place for American living. Every time you support the common fellowship of those who espouse the free way of life, that often you make this world a safer place for human living.

Never let us forget this truth: A unified, aroused America is the greatest spiritual and physical force the Almighty has yet established on his footstool. Each of us can be a part of an America united in the basic purpose of sustaining freedom, an America aroused to the threats and dangers that exist. If 140,000,000 of us join in such union, let no cynic tell you that world order is a myth and peace an impossible dream! If we resolutely lead, millions will follow.

At the nation’s call, all of you have given years of your lives, have dared great dangers, have lost loved ones and friends. I know that now you will not be found laggard in what must be done. The world needs the United States and the United States needs you.

• Address to the Pennsylvania Society, New York City, December 13, 1947

I am not one of your scheduled speakers this evening. Yet I could not depart from such a gathering as this, I could not be the recipient of such a great honor and merely say thank you. I should like to attempt to describe to you a few of the things that make this award of your Society so precious to me.

The State of Penn and of Franklin has a special place in the hearts of those who love America. But it is the closer to me because my own ancestors landed in your State in the middle of the Eighteenth Century and lived there for one hundred forty years before they went to Kansas.

What Senator Martin had to say about the religious precepts brought from that great Commonwealth to Kansas, and which all the Eisenhower boys learned from their father and their mother, is as true as it possibly can be. None of them has ever lost his respect for those teachings or has failed to believe in them.

Even more personal than that, in the First World War I was stationed, as Senator Martin has told you, in the heart of Pennsylvania and there I first came in contact with large numbers of Americans who were placed under my responsibility, whose welfare was my care, whose training was my job.

You may not know it but Dr. McClelland can testify that I am also a honorary alumnus of the University of Pennsylvania.

And today in Pennsylvania lives one of my brothers and has his dwelling there.

More than that, the award of this Society draws me a little closer to four great military leaders that I admire and have profited from association with - General Marshall, General Arnold, Admiral King, and your own General Martin.

And now with your indulgence, I would like to speak for one moment about another honor I shall always cherish.

Thirty-two years ago I was commissioned in the Regular Army of the United States. I deem it one of the greatest honors that has ever come to me, not because of opportunity for personal advancement, but because I received through that commission the right to devote my life to the service of a country, the welfare of which is the passion of all of us today. And I should like, therefore, on behalf of that Army to direct your attention to

what it is doing.

If there is one thought above all others in our hopes and our desires today, it is for a peace, a reliable, a permanent peace, based on justice and on right. That is the cause your Army serves. In far-flung stations it is preserving stability in areas that would otherwise be anarchic, that would be torn up by chaos, starvation, disorder. Its men are serving as truly and as faithfully as the men who served during the war in order that our people, our Government, our statesmen, can have a chance to develop those things for which we long.

That Army is not a thing apart form you. It is yours. You pay for it. You support it. It is made up of your friends or the sons of your friends. It is part of you and I bespeak for it your earnest consideration for its strength and its welfare. Because as surely as we hope for the day when we will no longer need armies, where we no longer have to depend upon the sword for our security, just as certainly you will advance that day by keeping your Army and your military services in all their branches strong and healthy.

And now, ladies and gentlemen, as my final word, I want to say only this:

If I could only assemble here in some way the men and the women that really earned this award from your Society, it would be the greatest joy of my life. The highest honor that has ever come to me has been the right to represent the millions of Americans who when their country called placed their all on the line. They held nothing back. My pride in them will never cease. This award truly belongs to them, and I assure you I am exceedingly proud to act as their representative in receiving it.

• Alexander Hamilton Dinner, New York City, January 15, 1948

First, a word to the guest of honor, Dr. Fackenthal. This evening I have listened in complete accord and in wholesome admiration to the list of qualifications that have been selected by the Committee on Awards for awarding you this great honor. It was with some consternation and some disappointment that I noted an omission very important to me. I have heard nothing said yet as to whether you can give me advice as to what to do on the annual Army-Columbia game.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my high privilege this evening to bring to a great American the tribute of the American Army. That tribute is not confined to the narrow sense of admiration or gratitude, but for the direct contributions made by Columbia under Dr. Fackenthal’s leadership in this most recent conflict. But in basic purpose, basic objectives, the Army of the United States sees a direct relationship between itself and Dr. Fackenthal. It may surprise some of you - it may even astonish the Doctor - that the Army should be so bold as to claim kinship with a person of his eminence in the education field. Yet I should like to remind you that the Army of the United States exists not to protect your property, the national territory, even your homes and your lives. It exists to protect and to insure against threat from without a way of life. Democracy, by whatever definition we may give it ourselves, certainly includes, as we understand it, a concept of the dignity of the individual, his right to do and act as he sees fit; his right to work for himself and to keep for himself the products of his toil - subject to some taxes (to which some disapprove).

Certainly it includes also a readiness and a determination to live by the will of the majority, and that means that our nation, in dealing with its own problems or with those problems that bring it into relationships with other nations, can act wisely and to its own self-interest only if it understands the problems of today. Democracy must defend itself by the virtues of its own institutions, for no army, no armed forces of any kind can ever protect it long. And since populations, to act wisely, must understand them, I think you will see instantly the relationship between the educational institution and the formations you have set up to protect this way of life of ours from without. I cannot conceive of any higher calling for an individual of the United States than to do his part so nobly as has Dr. Fackenthal in imparting to great numbers of students - to the forty-two classes of Columbia Students that have passed under his tutelage and through them to all corners of this country, an understanding of our problems - a realization of the responsibilities, the individual responsibilities, under democracy, as well as the realization of the priceless privileges and rights that it brings to each of us. Perhaps, and certainly it is our hope that in the long-term future, as education succeeds here and abroad in this type of understanding, finally education will not need the army as an ally to protect this way of life which time and again we have proved - all of us have proved - to be dearer than life itself. Since the first soldier put on an

American uniform, hundreds of thousands have died so that we could be here this evening, discuss whatever we may choose, and to be here at our own choice. Education is teaching us to see that that system is always healthy and sturdy from within. And so, Dr. Fackenthal, in bringing you the Army's tribute, I hope you will accept it in the terms and the understanding of a body that admires you because you have struggled so earnestly from one side with what we, in our poor way, have tried to do from another.

• Poor Richard Club gold medal of achievement, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, January 17, 1948

I gratefully accept this award of the Poor Richard Medal on behalf of the more than three million Americans who carried the real burdens and sacrifices of the campaigns in Africa and Europe. They manifested the same devotion to the cause of freedom that characterized the foremost citizen of Philadelphia.

Franklin, the preacher of thrift and careful husbandry, did not hesitate to put fortune and life in jeopardy when the choice lay between declaring for freedom or for submission to tyranny. We see him - a humble, modest man though already famous for his wit and wisdom - sailing from this city to seek support in Europe for the new nation he had helped bring forth in the western world. In his victory, he won continental fame as well as the boundless esteem of his countrymen. He returned to this, his home city, that here in the last days of his life he might help build a more enduring nation, dedicated to justice and freedom among men.

In our time, many millions of Americans - years younger than Franklin but no less convinced of liberty's worth - left their homes to fight in its defense. Hundreds of thousands of them gave their lives, and those who survived are now returned home intent to make of this land a greater citadel of freedom and of this world a place of peace. In their mission beyond the seas, in their principles and in their political faith, they were and are heirs of Franklin.

Joined with our veterans, all Americans today are devoted to the building of a firm world peace. And though two centuries have passed, the homely maxims that guided Franklin in daily life and in the mazes of international diplomacy are sound and applicable today. He had the gift of presenting a profound truth in a few words. He drove home to every reader and listener principles that volumes could not have made more clear or convincing. "A stitch in time saves nine" is a maxim that breathes the plainness and simplicity of Poor Richard. Yet the statesman is moved by it when he pleads that a dollar spent on the prevention of war is worth more than a score of dollars spent on its winning. The soldier is animated by it when he urges that to train all our young men in peace for defense in case of war is more provident than to squander their lives and their country's resources in the desperate haste of emergency measures. Indeed, all measures that may convince others that we are wisely ready to resist aggression should be considered as the stitch intended to save the nine times nine that war entails.

The truth of Franklin's words: "We must all hand together, or we shall assuredly hang separately," is sharply underlined in the international scene where the future of the democracies is dependent on their willingness to recognize their community interests, to assist each other to live by their common faith in the wisdom of cooperative effort.

And so, by the score, Franklin's apt and pithy sentences could be quoted in application to our present problems. But here in Philadelphia, where his impress is deep and lasting, a part of your daily life, it would ill become a Kansan - although partly a Pennsylvanian by ancestry - to dwell at length upon them. However, there is one point I would stress.

All of us know Franklin as printer and publisher, as author, inventor, philosopher and diplomat. But we may forget that he was first and foremost a citizen who in the advancement of the common good saw the increase of private good, who in the furtherance of the common security saw the greatest measure of security for the individual among men and nations.

How he would react to the cleavage that splits the world into two camps - if he were alive today - none of us knows. Certainly, there would be no narrowness in his views, no slavish allegiance to old prejudices. In his opinion, human liberty was a prize to which all men were entitled. So thinking, we can hardly doubt that if he were alive today, he would be among the first to support with all his strength every measure designed for the maintenance of freedom in the world.

Those who possess and cherish human freedom must never relax in its defense, either at home of abroad; for every encroachment on it, every restriction of its sphere, is a victory for human enslavement; and enslavement is a plague that, unchecked, can move with epidemic speed.

The aid in money and supply that Franklin won fro the new Republic has proved the best investment Europe ever made. The free nation built there has contributed immensely to human betterment and, twice in our lifetime, has returned across the seas to save freedom in Europe.

The aid we now give to sustain the friends of freedom nay well prove, in like manner, the best investment America ever made. It may bring to us the peace that man has hoped for through the centuries, the peace that has no end.

• Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, May 6, 1948

I am keenly sensible of the great honor this Chamber has done me. And it is doubly welcome because this award - the priceless token of your honorary membership - comes to me so quickly after my own transfer to this city. It is a distinction I shall always treasure.

I could only have wished as I listened to the over-generous remarks of Mr. Grimm that the people really responsible for the achievements for which I am honored today - for which I have been often so honored - could be here to hear them: the G.I.s, the officers, the “Brass Hats” - indeed, every single citizen of the United States, that each in his own sphere attempted to do his job in the late war.

Before such a body as this, I think it is only natural that I should attempt to speak on the general subject of our national security. I have no intention of speaking solely of ships and planes and guns and tanks, because they are not national security.

Our national security is found in the combined moral, mental and physical strength of 140 million people, including the productivity of their factories and their farms and the skills with which they utilize their own resources.

Moreover, the security forces that we have are not engaged, and it is not their purpose, merely to defend a certain area of land, certain properties; or indeed, merely our homes and firesides.

It is their purpose and their mission to defend a way of life, our form of democracy: a democracy that has at its core a system of free enterprise; by which we live and which guarantees to every single human being equal rights before the law. That is the kind of thing we are talking about securing when we talk about the security of this nation.

There can be no shifting of responsibility from any citizen to any professional group, or to any other person in the meeting of this problem. It is too immediately with all of us.

In this coming fiscal year, the prospects are that $15 billion will be appropriated directly for national security forces, at the same time that the Congress has authorized expenditures in Europe - which are in their deepest sense, certainly related to our security problem - of another $6 billion. If there is no other interest on the part of any of us, it certainly should be that of the pocketbook.

But let us make no mistake: There can be no such thing as mere dollar defense. You cannot buy security. It can be obtained by recognizing responsibility and meeting it, each in his own sphere, each according to his own abilities.

One thing that applies to the security establishments themselves - which are in effect only the cutting edge of a great machine whose power is found in 140 million people - one common characteristic among them that we must never forget is “Balance.”

Security may not be secured and maintained by the mere building of any particular type of machine and maintaining it in any amount, no matter how numerous.

The functions of the security forces in the air, on the land and at sea must be carefully calculated, so that there be no duplication; there be no add ional expense. But it is the concern of each of us to see that none is neglected.

My own background is in the ground forces, and I assure you that I, with all other ground officers, would very much like to find a way to eliminate that element of the triumvirate team that is necessary to security.

Within a theater of war, serving in front of the light artillery line, are possibly 20 per cent of the people in that theater. They absorb 90 per cent of the losses - and we can't be expected to like that.

But we cannot visualize a defense that is going to be accomplished by air alone - although everyone who has studied this problem will recognize instantly the predominant place of air in war today, and its increasingly predominant place. Without the superiority of the air, certainly no victory can be won and no successful defense established.

But from where will they operate? They will operate, if they are to be successful, from bases as close to the heart of an enemy homeland as we can place them. And in like manner, such bases must be secured against the possession by an enemy if they are close to our homeland. And that means control of the seas; and seizing and holding those bases means land forces, suitably trained, armed and equipped to do their job.

Gentlemen, I do not intend to pursue this subject of technical considerations. I want only that each of you, in giving his attention to this very, very serious thing, will think in terms of broad needs of the nation.

A distinguished member of this city is now Secretary of National Defense, a man who, I believe, has grasped the essentials of this problem, and is daily engaged in the earnest work of coordinating all the services and saving the maximum amount of money possible, as he attempts to have this great requirement met on the part of our Government.

If we are correct in the thesis that our security forces are defending a way of life, then our attention is instantly drawn to the one thing that presents to each of us more worry today than any other. That is the seemingly inescapable, implacable contest between two ideologies in the world: the one chiefly exemplified by ourselves, based upon human dignity and rights; the other upon statism.

Our great concern with the other nations of the world is that recognizing the existence of that conflict - although I am one of those who sincerely believe that all our leaders and our Government tried to avoid it - we want the greatest circle of friends that it is possible for us to have in the world.

By every man, by every nation, by every community that is added to the areas in which our form of government is practiced, and where people can practice it in prosperity and in security - by that much, we are strengthened. If that is done successfully, there can be no one that will challenge us.

Now, I do not want to be talking in terms that can be remotely interpreted as hysteria, fright or anger. No man and no nation ever made wise decisions when motivated by such emotions. I have seen it often in war and I know that you have encountered it in peace. This problems must be approached rationally, sanely, on the basis of logic, and not for one instant on the basis of prejudice, anger or even disappointment.

In the European concert of Western nations where we are attempting to set up an economy that can support itself, we must never forget one thing: that they have a common security problem.

And in your own study of that problem - which is certainly in many of its phases more profound than any I can give to it - I want to bring out one point that you may have overlooked. That is the attitude of the general staffs of the armies, of the navies, and air forces, in these separate countries. As a general staff contemplates the possibility of crisis or emergency, it wants to make sure that it has at hand those things, those raw materials, those factories, those industrial capacities that it may need in war.

If we are going to make Western Europe an economic unity, it becomes almost certain that we must make it a political unity, or certainly a group in which each member can depend upon the others without question so far as this matter of national security is concerned. Because, if it is an economic unity, it is reasonable to suppose that leather and clothing will be made in one country; that steel goods, guns, will be made in another; possibly airplanes in another. Each general staff will therefore have to depend upon the other.

And that can be done only if alongside of any attempted economic unity is some kind of a unity that has regard for this terrific problem of national security.

My friends that come to see me from those countries never let me forget that issue. They say: "Yes, we want to live like the United States. But there are many reasons why we cannot get up and shout that we want to do it." That is because there is the element of existence involved in these instances where these countries might be taken over and retire from free institutions to fall under the influence of dictatorships.

So they must be secure, and we must not quail in helping them. Indeed, I firmly believe we must make it part of our program that we make provisions for the security of Western Europe as we invest wisely, to make them economically sufficient - so that they may make a living under a system of free enterprise.

In like measure, although in varying degree, these same things apply to many other nations of the globe. They are matters for our Government and State Department to discuss in detail and to furnish us information on which we can make our own conclusions.

The whole purpose of my little talk, gentlemen, has been this: To stay sane, sober, in our approach to this problem, realizing there is no temporal power on this earth equal to the aroused, unified effort of America. There is none. We need have no fear of anybody if we will stay unified behind the great principles that have made this country what it is today.

A second purpose is to have you realize that in all of these nations today, the problem of security takes equal precedence with that one of economic recovery, and we must insist that the programs go forward hand in hand.

Let us never forget for one instance that all of these expenditures we are making for the security forces - nonproductive, sterile, negative organization that they are - they are made in the hope that we will support the principle in which the United Nations was born; that the day will come that we can avoid these unnecessary expenses, and possibly even make less acute some of the financial arguments of which I heard only the fringe here today. For we must divert that money into productive schemes for the benefit of men; or eventually we will destroy ourselves through expenditures we cannot afford.

Never let any man for one second forget his own responsibility to support, defend, the idea that eventually justice and right can supplant dictatorship and force.

Gentlemen, after such a little talk, I am not so certain that there would be any interest aroused. But I do assure you that if there is anyone who would like to pose to me a question that might be in my power to answer I would be glad to attempt to do so. In making that offer, there is only one subject barred, which was thoroughly covered in a letter I wrote last January.

• Talk at the Commercial Club of Chicago, May 21, 1948

The proudest human that walks the earth is a free American citizen. And so I ask you to think what it must mean to another citizen, such as myself, to know that such a gathering of Americans as this would come to see him and would be interested in hearing such thoughts as he may have to give to you. Very humbly and very proudly, I assure you, I appear here tonight.

I think that if we should try to identify instantly the most serious question that is in each of our minds tonight, the question that lives with us, is: What is the future of our way of life?

Seemingly, instinctively we understand that democracy, as we know it, has entered its decade, or certainly its quarter century of greatest test, of greatest trial. We worry in our minds about the possibility of global war, a war that we know would be more destructive than any man has yet faced. We worry about our problems here at home. We worry about management-labor difficulties. And we wonder where we are going. But inevitably all of these questions are included in the great one: Where do we go from here?

Possibly it is a good thing to pause and say to ourselves: What is this system in which we are so interested, and which we fear we may not be able to pass on to our children, and to our grandchildren? (This has become lately important to me as your President has just told you.)

Democracy, as we understand it, I believe, is based upon three great legs, and the first one of these is: Faith - something we cannot prove. We believe that every man is the possessor of inherent rights; rights that cannot be taken away from him by government; that are his because he is born. That means we believe man has a soul, and is not merely an educated animal. One of the fundamentals of Western Democracy, as we understand it, is a faith, almost a religious faith, that man is something above the animal kingdom that he himself dominates.

And the second leg is a system of free enterprise, free enterprise that we sometimes call competitive enterprise, the capitalistic system, the profit system. By whatever name we call it, we know that we must have it or the freedoms that the Anglo-Saxon race has fought to obtain and to sustain since 1215, can no longer exist. Because of all property and profit were ever centered in one joint colossus, call it bureaucracy, Socialism, or any other term that you may choose, there is no longer the possibility that you and I may do as we please, because that colossus must tell us where to work, how to work, for how much to work. It cannot allow any

strikes, and it cannot allow inciting of strikes, and therefore it cannot allow free speech, and all the other freedoms for which Anglo-Saxons have laid down their lives.

And, finally, the third leg is a readiness to cooperate, to perform group functions that we, each of us, cannot perform for ourselves. We do not believe in regulation. We believe that the majority must decide the rules and regulations by which each of us can cooperate for the support of the nation that guarantees all these freedoms. And if we do not cooperate, if each of us finally does not recognize his obligations under the system, and perform them just as willingly as he enjoys and exercises the rights and the privileges that go with them, then Democracy is doomed. And that applies whether we talk about ourselves as individuals, or about ourselves as groups.

Every group of manufacturers, every group of financiers, every labor union, must finally decide the question of the moment in this thought: Is it good for the whole? Because we must come to understand that unless we perform our own activities, unless we discharge our own daily obligations in terms of what is good for the whole, then there can be no prosperity, ho happiness, and what is more important, no freedoms for anyone.

In approaching world problems today there is one great thing that we must never forget: The unified energy of America is the greatest temporal power there is. There is no power on earth that can compete with 140 million unified Americans; with this great industrial empire, its financial might, its tremendous resources, and the genius of our people.

On May 8, 1945, there was marshalled along the Rhine, in the western half of Germany, and in Northern Italy, the greatest military power the earth has seen. Largely that force was American. Alongside of it was all that Britain could put in the field. But all of it, except for some relatively small, even though important detachments, was part of our Anglo-Saxon civilization, and a very great part of the industrial might that produced it was in America. Because, let us make no mistake, when we talk about might, even military might, we are not talking merely about ships, planes, guns and men. We are talking about all the things that make a country strong. It starts with the folks in the mines and in the village, and it flows along in channels that are not merely material, but is spiritually-minded, morally-minded unification, and it all flows finally to one place and there it is exerted.

On the day the unconditional surrender was signed by Jodl at Rheims there was no physical power on earth that could have stood up against the forces coming from across the Channel and through the Mediterranean, and finally meeting on that long line from the Brenner Pass clear to the Baltic Sea.

So as we approach the problem of what to do and where to go, let us never forget what we have within our grasp, if we merely will see together on broad, general lines and will act together.

Woodrow Wilson put it: “The spontaneous cooperation of a free people is the highest form of efficiency.” And that must remain true if democracy is going to live.

Today our great worry has its source in this fact, I believe: There are abroad in the world two ideologies: One which I have just haltingly attempted to describe, and of which we are certainly the champion, if not solely by military force then because of our great natural resources, and our great industrial structure. The other is one that is dedicated to Statism: Under it man must forego all that he holds dear, involving his family, himself, in order that the nation of which he is a part shall be allpowerful. And he is compelled to do that.

We thought after the end of hostilities in Japan, at the end of World War II, that there should be a method of developing a cooperative system in the world. We felt that we could live and let live. And that sort of thinking is inherent in democracy, because we believe that as long as we tend to our own business, we should not be too much concerned with that of our neighbor. But we also believe that someone can establish rules by which we can get along together even though our special and our immediate interests are diverse.

And that brings us up to the United Nations. We are disappointed - rightfully we are disappointed. One of the troubles is one in which I have had a bit of experience, and I would like to explain that to you. There are two experiences:

First, that of an Allied Commander in this war. The governments decided that when it came to committing their forces to action in fighting, to commanding them, to handling them, it would not be satisfied with the coordination principle such as Marshal Foch was compelled to use. That worked, though haltingly, in World War I, and it came about through the tremendous disaster to the Allies in the spring of 1918.

In this war the allied governments actually surrendered a part of their sovereign power, with respect to their fighting forces, by giving the right to commit their forces to action under the determination of one individual, regardless of that man's nationality. And that system worked because those countries found that in pursuit of a great objective there was the necessity of giving up some small part of their traditional rights and perogatives. And because the people operating in that system were big men who understood the issues involved, and the difficulties that beset the allied forces, they succeeded in operating as a team, as a unit, and achieved the great objective of victory.

Now the second personal experience: After the war over there was set up by the four governments a scheme for governing Germany. I know that the Americans and the British looked upon the Berlin Experiment as sort of a laboratory to determine whether in the solution of a practical and immediate operational problem success could be achieved under the principle of unanimity of opinion, unanimity of agreement. It has not worked.

I believe that as long as there is no partial surrender of rights to a central governing group in which resides, in some form or another, power to act within the scope, or within the limits of the power accorded that body, that it can never work.

In other words, I believe in the long run that the United Nations, to be successful, must be accorded some bit of the sovereignty that each nation has in the past so jealously guarded for itself. Personally I think that means no more than this: That it shall be the one authority that may exert force in settling difficulty between nations. But until we achieve that I do not believe we can achieve the permanent peace that we so ardently long for, all of us. And that is a long way off. Certainly it is something to which each of us should give his earnest attention, because we must solve all these questions just like everybody else will, from the standpoint of enlightened self-interest.

We are not going to try to be an Atlas to carry the world on our shoulders, but we must do those things abroad which will strengthen our position, because we, no better than any other nation, can live entirely alone, nor could we, alone, in a hostile world stand a global war in which forces were lined up that would carry us finally to the point of exhaustion.

And so while we hope for the day when we will see the methods and the means by which an effective United Nations may be brought about, we must pursue policies that have the direct purpose of progress in that direction and of assuring our own safety meanwhile.

First of all, if we believe in the rectitude of our standing, if we believe we are morally right, then we must be strong in defense of our position. By strength, I assure you again, I do not mean just armed forces, regiments, fleets, and air forces. We must be strong in every way there is, at home and abroad - morally, intellectually, materially. We must be so strong that all people who like to live in the same concepts as we do may do so in confident security. I do not mean they must live under our same forms and methods - I do not mean that - they must merely place the dignity of man above the power of the state. Such people we should support because as they are strong with us and they recognize with us a community of interest, then people in the other parts of the world will not dare attack us.

It may not be the most ideal peace. There will be tensions and difficulties, but it will be a peace of the greatest certainty that we can achieve until the world is ready to live as one world.

Many sections of this earth, particularly those sections involving people that would like to live in the same basic concepts as ourselves, are ruined. Their economies are destroyed, including their industrial plants, their transportation systems, their governmental systems. They are desperate. Moreover, they are hungry. In many instances and in many ways they are fertile grounds for the propagation of a system that very blithely but very falsely offers them not only security but freedom.

We must see that those people cling to us. And, gentlemen, it is not enough that we merely out of our pocketbooks give them a chance at this moment to restore their own economy, so they may make a living. They are fearful. And men in fear, men who have to live in fear and doubt and hysteria, cannot progress, they cannot think clearly.

These people must understand that we are strong, and we are strong in our word as well as strong financially, economically, and militarily. Then they can with confidence push forward to the moment that under the conditions existing today, the free world will truly be free.

In Western Europe alone, there are 270 million people from whom most of us are separated by from 1 to 7, or 8, maybe 9 generations. They are the people from whom at least originally, came our arts, or sciences, our culture added to the American and Canadian populations and we have almost 450,000,000 peoples. Involved in all of the parts of the earth that are under the Communistic ideology, you do not have that many people, and they do not have the same mastery of the arts and sciences. The free world is powerful, the North and South Americans and the Western Europeans. All we have to do is to recognize our community of interest, and stand for these great principles firmly, each recognizing that an attack upon them anywhere is an attack upon the system everywhere, because it is not merely one nation against another, it is a system against a system.

Now, to be just a bit more personal. I am leaving one branch of activity which is devoted to that particular purpose, because the army, the navy, and the air force of the United States have not existed merely to protect territory, not even merely to protect homes and firesides and lives - they have existed to protect a way of life. And if we need to be strong inside us then we need to understand what we are about. That, frankly, I believe is the great function of education. And I am attempting now to transfer my own activities to education.

The reason I bring it up is merely to make a bit of protestation of faith as to why I believe we can do something about it. You gentlemen must know as well as I do that I am not a scholar, and there is a very natural question as to why I should be in the educational world. Because of this, gentlemen: I believe that what we need now is education in the obvious, not so much in the obscure. I believe that the scientists and the researchers have already produced more facts than we know how to handle. I believe we have to go back to obvious facts; that a boy going to school, when his mind is being trained, between 7 and 15, through high school, must learn what this country means to him, how the freedoms that we enjoy tonight were won; what he must do to sustain them; to learn about the obligations as well as the privileges of citizenship.

I believe we have got to go back to fundamentals. And that is the place, I believe, where a few voices, untiringly raised, can do something about it. In that thought, in that concept, let me suggest one thing to you: With most of us, when our children are 7 years old, we send them off to the public schools, and there the child spends many hours of his day. In that school he learns something about our government, its first beginnings, and a meaning of its philosophy is born. When he comes home, he eats, he sleeps, and he goes out to play with his neighbors, and he has a good time in the back yard. We, above all things, want that child to develop a deep respect for Democracy as we know it. And to whom do we send him? We send the child to a person that today is really the victim of Democracy, and not a worthy representative. We starve our teachers in the lower grades, in the primary and secondary schools.

I believe that each one of us wants to do the greatest thing we could - not look to the federal government for any more of this paternalism and bureaucracy - but do it individually and by community, and the greatest thing you can do for Democracy today instead of providing for new post offices, and new street cars, or anything else you need in the city, is, if you please, you double the salary of your local teachers, because then that person will begin to understand the respect we have for him, the responsibility we are placing in their hands, and they will be enthusiastic promoters of the system of which we fear so much may be destroyed. Because, after all, when we stop to think about it, Democracy may be attacked and overwhelmed and subjected from without; and it may become the victim of borin Communism, or the other kind of “isms,” from within. It may be the victim of trends within our own country that come about because of lack of understanding. We may drift into it. We may not always see the real harshness of the yoke we are fastening around our necks at the particular time when we accept too much from central authority.

We have got to be sturdy pioneers like our fathers if Democracy is going to live.

I must say to you gentlemen, in going around this country, I have had hundreds and thousands of people talk to me about this question. They were the ones who encouraged me to try to do something in the educational field. But I never would have tried to enter such a terrible and bewildering, unaccustomed field if I did not believe that the great majority of people, such as yourselves, are as concerned about it as I am.

President Trees: Thank you, General Eisenhower. Here are a few questions: As an army officer and also a college president, what is your opinion of universal military training?

DDE: Universal military training is no panacea for the troubles that we have today. But this country has

always needed to depend upon its citizen forces. There is no possible way of producing in our citizen forces both the strength and the discipline that is needed when crises come unless we prepare and train those men in peace.

Gentlemen, in Africa, in the early days before we could get units that had gone through real training cycles, we lost many men just from greenness. There are many crosses standing in Tunisia today that are there for no other reason than we failed to train boys and give them a chance in time of peace.

It does take a certain amount of time out of a boy's life, and that, I think, is sometimes exaggerated, because I call your attention to this: Every time you pay taxes you are paying part of your time to the government. I do not see that it is such a terrible thing in a time such as this when we need a trained citizenry, to require that a boy give a certain amount of his time to prepare himself best to serve his government, and best to serve his country in time of crises.

Many people say: "If you are going to have a push-button war, why train men?" Now, first of all, a push-button war is a long way in the future, gentlemen. But suppose it were here and suppose a one-way flight of airplanes carrying atomic bombs should come and hit Chicago. Gentlemen, what would you give at that moment if there were two Divisions of the National Guard - not just men that have learned how to carry a rifle one hour a week - but trained and disciplined men, ready to take charge, to limit conflagration, to calm hysteria, to get things restored, and tell you what to do - because you know we are not going to do it in time of peace. We are too busy making money. Someone has got to do it. We better have disciplined people.

And the more you envision a push-button war, the more you should be sure to train the citizenry, to have them trained, disciplined, and ready to receive the shock, or I doubt if we would be capable of retaliation - the only way we could win the war.

President Trees: Here are two questions on the same subject: Is it your judgment that centralization of military control in one Secretary of Defense has become really effective? Is there any real practical probability of the ideal merger of the military forces?

DDE: Like other problems of that kind, success cannot be achieved overnight.

Actual unification must start at the bottom. Unification must start with the boy when he enters Annapolis, or West Point, or in the ROTC, or in any other school. We must teach those boys that they are not wearing the uniform of a particular service, but they are wearing the uniform of the United States. They are put there to work together so that they can be all one element in our national strength, the military element, which, remember, is only the cutting edge of a great machine that really originates in the genius of the industry of our people. We must teach them that they belong to one service: United States.

Now, the Secretary of National Defense, at least, does this: He typifies for everybody in the service that essential of unification, and he has already made great strides in assuring that we can have balanced forces without duplication and undue expense in any of them. But he is far from achieving perfection, and it will take a long, long time. The principle will work if all of us, in the cities and on the farms, will support it in the certainty that we do not want armies, navies and air forces fighting each other for our dollars, and for our power, and our attention, but are working together to do a job for us as economically as they possibly can.

President Trees: What role do you envision for the Infantry in the event of another war?

DDE: My background is in the ground forces. I was an Infantry soldier. As a matter of fact, General Walker, sitting here this evening, was a Second Lieutenant with me in the same regiment that I joined 33 years ago. So I have a great love of the Infantry. And I tell you frankly, gentlemen, if we abolish the Infantry tonight and feel that we were justified from the standpoint of the United States in doing so, I would be very, very happy to do it.

In the theater of war something less than 25 percent of your men serve in front of the light artillery line, and that group takes 90 percent of the losses. If you can find some way of reducing their losses, and we have worked at it from the matter of technique day in and day out - if you could eliminate them I would be very happy.

You cannot buy security. We have got to do our job and we have got to do it intelligently.

First of all let us assume air warfare. All right. Where are you going to attack from? We do know this: That the shorter the distance your airplane has to travel the more you multiply its power, because it does not have to spend so much time in the air and it is not so long subject to attack. Therefore, you want to get bases just as close up to your enemy as you can. And, contrary-wise, you want to make sure there are no bases close to your country from which he may attack you.

Who is going to do it? The poor, old doughboy. Who is going to support him in those places? The navy. The navy has got to haul freight. It has got to carry him there. It has got to make sure he is supported and supplied. It has got to control the sea so he may not be blockaded by submarines. Make no mistake, gentlemen, so far as we can foresee at present what we need is balanced forces.

I would say this on slightly more technical side: We have got to find ways of taking our Infantry into battle by better protective methods. We have got to carry them and not make them march and get there exhausted. We are working very hard on such things as armored troop carriers, to get the Infantry there so they will not be so tired when they get there that they will not be able to fight back.

President Trees: I think General Eisenhower has partially answered the next question. What do you think the role of the navy will be in the event of war?

DDE: Well, it is true I did answer it partly. Fundamentally it has got to control the seas. General Dawes and I were talking this evening about the comparison between the tonnage of the first World War and this one, and the comparison was fantastic. We used many, many, many times what the American forces used in Europe in the first World War. And that tonnage will increase rather than decrease, because these technological advances demand their price.

You know, the air force is the most tactical and the most mobile force there is. You can use it against one part of the world one day and against another part of the world the next day. Strategically, on the other hand, it is almost the most immobile because before you can use it you have got to haul in all sorts of material, bulldozers to make runways, gasoline, and tonnages of bombs that are frightening.

As long as the air force needs those tonnages and as long as it is not yet economical to transport that tonnage by air, we are going to need a navy. There may finally be a way to determine that the navy can bomb strategic targets by carrier aircraft most effectively and most efficiently, but that has not yet been proved. Certainly as long as we have to control the seas for our own benefit and against the enemy we need a really strong navy.

President Trees: In the event of another war will the air force play a more important part than in the war just ended?

DDE: Yes. There can be no question about that. Armies and navies are thousands of years old. You can go back to the dawn of history and you can trace the curve by which they improved. It has been a steady rising trajectory. The air force is 40 years old. Its curve is a very steep one and it is going steeper all the way through.

The role of the air force in war is becoming more and more predominant, but there is always this to remember and that is that the air boys are shouting for bases: “Get me up close to the enemy.” That is where the other ones come in.

President Trees: This is one I hesitate momentarily to ask: Did the Russian army enter Berlin ahead of the Western Allies because it was planned that way, or was that the result of the general military situation?

DDE: It was a strictly military decision, and was mine alone, and was opposed by many politicians. When the plan was made to advance toward Berlin there were certain facts you had to take into consideration. We were sitting on a line 300 miles away from Berlin. The Russians were west of the Oder, 30 miles away.

This side of Berlin, and almost at the extreme limit of the dash that we could make, in the opinion of the logistic organization we had, which was the best in the world, was the Elbe. Now, there were several problems

to accomplish. One was to cut off Denmark, in which there were many German forces; and there were more in Norway. By cutting off that neck we could bar any of the German forces in Norway and Denmark from intervention in the war.

Another thing that was a very lively proposition was this: It was definitely planned by the Germans to establish in the Alps, Southern Austria and Northern Italy, a national pocket where the last remnants of the Nazis intended to go and conduct guerilla warfare hoping to create dissention among the Allies and thereby possibly achieve a better peace than they could otherwise, by siding with one or the other.

In that situation, our plan was, as I recall, completed and sent to the Generalissimo about March 10, if we put everything on the capture of Berlin, how silly it would have been when they were 30 miles away and we were 300, and we had these two big jobs to accomplish. So the plan that was made up was on no one else's responsibility but mine, and it was to divide Germany by a rapid thrust across with Bradley's army group to the regions of the Elbe, and then halt there on both flanks; then by a powerful blow to cut off the Danish Peninsula, keeping everyone out as well as not allowing anyone to get out, and dashing down and meeting the Russians as far down in Austria as we could, or to meet Alexander coming up from Italy.

I should like to point out that at that time there seemed no very logical military reason to do otherwise. We knew, of course, that the division of Germany into Occupation Zones had already been made, and the line that we were to occupy was far west of the Elbe. In other words, upon reaching the Elbe, we would have to retreat 150 miles when the Russians finally called upon us to occupy our own zone. But in the southeast there was no line established. Whatever line we could reach would be ours. And consequently from an occupational viewpoint it seemed to us important to dash to the southeast.

President Trees: I shall combine the next three questions: Will the armament program, as you now visualize it, be of sufficient proportions to offset the business recession we are experiencing? What is your estimate of our needed total military budget by the year 1950? Can we afford to rearm both Europe and ourselves? I think those three questions are more or less related.

DDE: Well, I know this, gentlemen: I certainly do not have to disclaim my proficiency in the field of finance, but I know that we can spend ourselves into trouble as well as get into trouble by attack from without.

Any man who approaches this problem of the amount of our resources that we devote to security organizations and who does not appreciate that he must do it with the least possible drain on the national purse, is crazy and he should not be in any position of responsibility.

Let us just for a moment take the other side of the picture, take another approach: If a couple of people are about to throw you in the river with a stone around your neck, there is nothing you have in your possession that you would not give them. In other words, when it gets down to self-preservation we place no limitations upon what we will do in a crisis. But I do not think this national security question is that simple.

I believe that if we are ready to face this thing from the terms of obligation: for example, I believe if we are going to use the draft, or UMT, we are perfectly silly to talk about paying people on the terms of competing with civilian industry. I think we should do it on the basis of obligation, and do it for terms no more than cigarette money.

All the way through we must approach this thing as to how is the best way we can do it, all of us proud to do our part in meeting our obligations.

Now, the question mentions 1950. I see n relief from some sort of a 12, 14, or 15 billion dollar expense for the next three or four years. But I certainly believe that if in that time we can produce the beginnings of a lively economy in these areas of the world that want to stand with us and at the same time make it possible for them to defend and arm themselves, then we should begin to get relief.

That suggests this additional thought, gentlemen: It is not enough that we just help them. They have got to unify, and I mean unify politically certainly to some degree. It is silly to talk about an economic union in Western Europe if there is no political union, because the General Staff of France will say this: "We want, within our power, if we are going to defend France, the power to get shoes, and guns, and planes, and everything else we need."

An economic union would mean that each country would produce the things for which it is best equipped,

and it would sell those things to one country and get others from another. Therefore, each country cannot produce all the munitions of war. Therefore there must be some kind of a political union, if it is no more than a political or military understanding. But there must be certainly a political union that goes hand in hand with an economic union or you will never get it. But when we obtain that objective, expenditures for security organizations can go down.

President Trees: Can democracy as we have known it in this country exist in those countries that do not have as great national resources as we have?

DDE: Well, of course, we have more natural resources, but let us not kid ourselves, gentlemen. There are unquestionably people here who are in the steel business and they know that we do not produce our manganese, and we are in the steel age. Where do we get our manganese? Well, we import it. And we are getting low on oil. And the Messaba Range is not going to last forever. Lead and zinc are getting low. Copper is not inexhaustible. So while we have great natural resources, let us not kid ourselves that we could live alone in a Democracy surrounded by a sea of dictatorships. It just can't be done. I am not talking internationalism, gentlemen. What I am talking about is approaching world problems from an enlightened self-interest of the United States.

Every country that has a paucity of resources, of course, has a greater difficulty in producing a standard of living that makes people content, and difficulty in making sure that workers and all others achieve a constantly advancing standard of prosperity that keeps them happy.

Of course, we need them. Of course, we ourselves cannot live alone.

President Trees: The last and a very important question is: Is there any logical explanation for the trouble you experienced on the 18th hole at the Glenview Club this afternoon? Thank you, General Eisenhower, again.

• Address at Institute for Crippled and Disabled, New York City, June 10, 1948

As Mr. Hope was speaking, I noticed he used the expression "My willingness to come down." He should have said: "My anxiety to get here." That anxiety was shared by Dean Rappelye.

The first reason for wanting to come down is because of the very nature of this institution. Behind all of the techniques of which Mr. Hope has just spoken to us, lies a spirit - a spirit that is too often lost in this world of today when we pride ourselves so much upon our efficiency and talk in high-flown terms about the speed of our progress. A spirit that has time to remember that life is nothing but association with other humans and that all humans are important. And it is not merely whether they, at the moment, are in tip-top shape to deliver the ultimate in efficiency, but whether that human can be given a satisfactory life - one satisfactory to himself and beneficial to society. So it is that spirit, lying behind all of the technical progress that this institution has made, that would attract me here if nothing else would.

But there are a vast number of other reasons. Every veteran here is a particular reason for my coming down to the Institute. Many of them unquestionably served under my direct command in Europe and in the Mediterranean. No man that served, or woman that served, in the uniform of his Country, with me there or in any other part of the globe, or in any other war, can ever fail to have the right to claim my attention if there is any single thing that I can do - even if it is only to uttering a friendly word. It is not that I am making a distinction as against civilians. But you people should all know that there is a special bond that links veterans together. So much so that among ourselves we agree that old soldiers never die - they just waste away.

I cannot conceive, therefore, of a greater work for any group to undertake than to pay the tribute of attention to them. Attention that involves and comprehends within itself all of the most modern techniques, all of the cooperation it can get from other hospitals, in order to bring to the men and women that paid the highest price of all in the War to preserve our freedoms - to bring that service to them without any thought of personal reward or remuneration, but because, as a group, they remember in their hearts what they owe to those men and to those women.

On the other side of the fence, could I speak to you veterans very, very definitely and distinctly for a

moment? And that is to remind you of what you owe to these people, because many others in the preoccupations of their daily life would walk past and say: “Isn’t that too bad” – “Why doesn’t he have a tin cup on a street.” It is the defeating of that idea and that attitude that I believe you are so fortunate to encounter in this Institute and to be here, day by day, with that spirit. I could not believe there is any place that any of you could be in better position to have held up before you every day the certainty that because you did suffer disabling and permanent wounds in the War, that you have not passed out of life - that you are still useful members of society.

Columbia is proud of its association with this institution. Columbia is very definitely and distinctly proud of its own Medical School and of the services that that school performs in many hospitals of the City. But certainly it has no association anywhere in which it takes greater pride and will, in the future, give greater attention to, than its association with this one. And that will mean to continue long after all you veterans are out earning far more than a poor college president ever will.

• Problems of Combined Command, National War College, Washington, DC, June 18, 1948

I have been allotted roughly forty minutes this morning for my direct statement on allied command. Now that would seem to be plenty of time, and to assure that I don’t fall into the habit of old soldiers and grow too garrulous, I am going to ask General Collins, an old associate of mine, to watch the time. If about five minutes before the expiration of my allotted time he will begin to look pained and, roughly two minutes ahead, if he will give me the sign to cease fire, we will pass into the cross examination period.

About five hundred years before Christ the Athenian council one day, in accordance with an agreed treaty, sent to Sparta and said, “Hurry up to send your forces as we have agreed because the Persians are about to land.” The Spartans consulted the oracles and found out it was a day on which they could not march because the gods would be displeased. It was an early example of an ally finding a convenient excuse for failing to carry out its obligations with respect to another.

That type of failure on the part of allies has been typical of the world’s military history. Even Napoleon’s reputation suffered in staff colleges when students finally found he always operated against allies. And even the great Napoleon himself, when in his invasion of Russia he attempted to operate as commander of an allied army, found with his first disastrous defeat that actually he had defections among his troops, and within a short time some were fighting on the other side.

In 1921 I had a very great privilege. I went to serve under one of the accomplished soldiers of our time, Fox Conner. Fox Conner believed that another war was coming, and I served under him intimately so he had plenty of time to expound his views to me. He said that the war he visualized was necessarily going to be fought with allies. He believed that tensions arising in Europe and Asia were certain sooner or later - he used to say within thirty years - to plunge us into war, and he said we must prepare ourselves to be ready to fight with allies. The one thing he insisted upon was they had to work out a scheme whereby control in the field would be under one command. There would be single responsibility and single authority, and he said no matter what else we did, we should insist upon it.

We have an unexpected guest this morning but he used to be quoted by Fox Conner. Fox Conner said there was one man in the Army who understood these things, and that man was George Marshal. He said, “When the war comes George Marshal will understand that we cannot be satisfied with the coordination conception under which Foch was compelled to work. Even under Foch’s final setup he really was a man trying to secure agreement among three or four commanders who felt themselves truly responsible to their own governments.”

I was brought into the War Department a week after the Pearl Harbor attack. One of our earliest concerns was what to do in the Southwest Pacific. It was clear that at that moment no great land or air reinforcement could go into the Philippines. But lying just southward of the Philippines was the great Indonesian empire, very rich in natural resources, and the Allies were desperately anxious to keep it under Allied control. It was, of course, a possession of the Dutch. As circumstances went from bad to worse, someone thought of the idea of getting the whole under a single command. So the British General Wavell was brought from India and set up with a title of Commander in Chief ABDA. I have forgotten just what those initials stood for, but ABDA was

the command in the Southwest Pacific embracing everything except the Philippines where General MacArthur was in command, and which could not be reached anyway. Wavell never had a chance. He had far too little, far too late.

But there was one valuable thing which came out of the attempt. In Washington the representatives of the British Chiefs of Staff and the American staffs attempted to write a charter for an allied commander. We were not yet experienced, and therefore we thought everything had to be reduced to writing. One of our great problems was what to do about the matter of administration, and particularly about administration as it applies to supply. Each nation was going to be responsible for supplying its own forces, and therefore we felt there had to be clear, independent authority residing in nationalistic command. But it was also clear that it is impossible to divorce strategy and tactics from supply. Therefore the job of writing a charter for General Wavell that would give him ample authority over the problems of logistics and still not interfere with the nationalistic rights of each of the participating nations was something that consumed days and nights.

If we had been as wise as we later became, we would have saved ourselves lots of trouble because we would have understood that there is no charter that can be written for an allied commander and made to stick. As long as nations are sovereign they always have the right to reverse a prior decision, get out of any situation they think they can when they can cut their losses. Therefore there is only one basic thing that will make allied commands work, and that is mutual confidence.

That mutual confidence must start way back. First it must be between the political leaders of the associated countries, and then the highest military chiefs responsible for the direction of the war must have some type of organization where they can meet, decide upon things, and above all develop confidence in each other so that when they set up a single allied command in the field they know it will work because the confidence exists higher up.

I think that when the true and final history of this late war is written, that despite all the argument and despite some of the heated discussions that lasted for days and far into the night, the true lesson and almost the glory of that history is going to be the fact that in the highest levels that kind of agreement was reached and that kind of confidence finally developed. I want to lay this background, gentlemen, because without that high-level cooperation and confidence no allied commander in the field can be successful, and don't forget it.

An allied commander cannot, of course, relieve an officer of another army. That is administration. He cannot demote him; he cannot promote him. Therefore he is deprived of one type of authority which he has with respect to his own nationals, because in this war the Chief of Staff of our Army gave to me these instructions: "Every American officer you have under you is of your own choice. The fact that you keep him is evidence to me that you are satisfied with him." The Chief of Staff placed upon my shoulders the responsibility of determining who should serve under me in the American Army. But the British Chiefs of Staff could not possibly give me that in terms of promotion and demotion. But before the war was over - I should say right here - Mr. Churchill and his staff did give me this authority, repeated many times: "Any British officer with whom you are dissatisfied will be removed by us instantly." I couldn't do it but they could. But that was after the growth of a lot of confidence.

One of our early problems, as it affected us later, was the determination of a plan for the employment of the American forces in Europe. I shall not go back into the ABC agreements, with which I think most of you are familiar. But in April 1942 General Marshall went to England to secure the approval of the British Chiefs of Staff to the concept of attacking across the channel. Shortly thereafter General Marshall sent me to England to begin to organize the American contingents in England which would be necessary for the war in Europe.

It was not long until examination of British resources showed that that attack could not possible take place, even though we saved everything we could for it, before some time late in 1943. Now no one in his senses would attack across the channel after the middle of summer. Therefore it began to look very likely that the major, all-out, attack against northwest Europe could not take place before possibly early in 1944. That was a bitter blow. It was a bitter blow to all of us. It was particularly bitter for our political leaders because they had the job not only of organizing forces and turning them over to their military chiefs, but they had to maintain morale at home. They believed some kind of positive action should be taken against Germany earlier than the spring of 1944.

Out of that realization, out of that knowledge, the American Chiefs of Staff came to London, and from the

ensuing conference was born Torch. Torch was the first Allied command in the Atlantic theater. As I recall, the final decision was reached on the twenty-fourth of July. If my dates are wrong, it is a day or so either way. I remember that General Marshall, and Admiral King had been there for some days. They were getting in very much of a hurry. I was called into the General's room in the Claridge Hotel. From his bathtub he spoke to me, just outside the door, and said, "You are Allied Commander of an operation going to Africa." That was my first notification that I was an Allied commander.

Instantly arose the basic question of how we were going to organize so as to take forces of more than one nation and put them together so they would operate effectively in a military operation. Within the Combined Chiefs of Staff the virtual head on each side of the water was the President, at least remember that the Joint American Chiefs of Staff were direct advisers to the President - and on the other side, the Defense Minister, who was also the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill. That meant that within that body any question of British versus American interests had to be settled, and having been settled there, the first problem was to keep any of the differences from percolating on down to the field command. Therefore the decision was instantly taken to have no staff in which we would have a British part here and an American part there - nothing based on nationalistic lines.

We ran into another, but relatively minor matter. The British staff procedure and organization are different from the American. The British do not give the same scope of authority to the man we call Chief of Staff as do we. They set up a Chief of Staff and a Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief of Staff is really for operations. We, on the other hand, give to the Chief of Staff supervision over all staff activity. That made a difficulty in organizing, but, as I say, relatively minor. The chief thing to remember is this: In every single part of our staffs which had to do with operations or which touched on any joint matter, British and Americans were thrown in indiscriminately throughout; the whole was treated as if it were a single body. That was done with the determination to keep out of Allied headquarters any possibility that subject was going to be decided upon nationalistic lines - to make it impossible to consider it on nationalistic lines. All through the war we maintained the preposition that all such questions were settled by our superiors, and we would have none of them. It did take at times, of course, a very great deal of assistance, but it did work and by and large it was rarely violated.

We went into Africa, though, with certain preconceived notions, operational notions, for which we later paid a penalty. You will recall that Spain was sympathetic to the Axis, and here was an operation going in the Mediterranean with Spain in position to cut off its rear at any day that it chose to go into the war. Moreover, even if it didn't go into the war actively, would it be subjected to such pressure by Germany that German aid and, let's say, large guns could come down into Spain and deny us the use of the Strait of Gibraltar? It was a matter that engaged the attention of our governments, our military superiors and ourselves right down to the day of attack, and for many, many weeks thereafter. But because of the fear that our rear would be cut off - and also emphasized by this - that within Morocco we knew the warlike tribes were somewhat under the domination of a man named Nogues, a Frenchman serving as a Foreign Minister to the Sultan, and who conceivably could bring those tribes into action against the Allies very quickly - that fear had a very great influence on the American insistence that Casablanca be included in the scope of the attack.

At one time I did not want to attack Casablanca. I said, as long as we are putting all our chips on the wheel, let's put them all on one number and go all inside. However, because of this threat to the rear, we went in this way: The Americans would take and hold Morocco and with their land and air forces provide solid protection to our rear. If the Germans tried to come down through Spain, we would be close by in protected airfields, and we would start operating against them right away. In addition we would have the little rickety railway from Casablanca through Oran. Once we were landed, the British First Army, which was called that by courtesy because it consisted only of three brigades of infantry and a brigade of obsolete tanks, was to land as far eastward as we could, which was Algiers, and from there conduct a rapid campaign against Tunis.

Because of this great separation of the two nationalistic forces we had an American air commander and an American ground force in the West; we had a British Army commander, Anderson, in the East to conduct that campaign, and a British air officer, Welsh, to support him. That looked all right, and we had no such titles as Service Commanders in Chief in that first operation except for a Naval Commander in Chief, who was that grand old sea-dog, Andrew Cunningham. The sea work was always perfectly coordinated throughout the campaign.

Within a short time it began to look less and less like any move would be made against our rear, and it became clearer and clearer that the Germans could reinforce in Tunisia far faster than we could bring any troops from the homeland, and indeed, faster than we could bring them from the West. But in the face of that situation, we began to throw all the forces we had - land, ground, air, everything we had - into the East in the desperate attempt to get Tunis before the winter weather should descend upon us.

That created a command problem. We had no Air Commander in Chief, but now we had air of two nationalities operating in the same areas, frequently, necessarily, from the same airdromes. We brought up land forces and we had made no preparation for their command. The only way to do it, therefore, was to give them by detachments to Anderson.

To make a start in reorganizing our command structure the Chief of Staff approved my application for Tooey Spaatz. He was brought down from England and given the title of Deputy Commander in Chief for Air, and he was given the job of coordinating the British and American air operations in Tunisia. Land operations became even more difficult as we tried to absorb the French. The French at that time were occupying the hilly masses through Central and Southern Tunisia. Very badly armed, poorly equipped, they were almost naked in the military equipment sense, but they were all we had to occupy the hilly masses south of Pont-de-Fahs.

Now we ran into this: There was only one line of communication, and therefore there was only one real command on that front, and that was an Army command because there was only one supply line to be handled. But the French wouldn't serve under the British. They had the incidents of Syria, Oran and Dakar in mind, and it was a situation that would not allow Allied headquarters at that moment to straighten it out instantly in the only way it should have been. We, the Americans, within a few weeks began to shove to the South to protect an ever exposed right flank as the situation deteriorated to the North. So we had the British in the North, the French in the center, and the Americans in the South, and because the French were in the center they separated the command, and it was impossible to establish a unified command. The only thing we could do in this situation was to establish a forward command post for me, and I attempted to operate all the way from Oran through Algiers up to Souk el Arba, and then in addition to a battle line. It was an impossible thing.

The Combined Chiefs of Staff met in Casablanca in January, and they were quite aware of the situation that was developing, and that something had to be done to give us help. Another factor was that Alexander, who had started his attack at El Alamein on October 23 was now approaching Tripoli with every indication that if that port would give him any supply at all - and we believed it would - he would soon be on the southern border of Tunisia, and we were all going to come together. Therefore the Combined Chiefs of Staff organized the first complete unification of our forces by saying that when these forces all joined, they would come under once single command. There was to be a top Commander and three Commanders in Chief, the three subordinate commanders of ground, sea and air. In this were included Alexander's forces and the British Desert Air Force. From that time on the history of Allied command was one of perfecting detail and growth of understanding and of confidence. The pattern that we used was never markedly departed from thereafter.

Now merely because you had a ground Commander in Chief didn't mean that every operation you did on the ground had to be carried out under his direction. For example, we decided it was a good thing to take Pantelleria. This decision was taken before Tunis had fallen, and the ground Commander in Chief was going to be very busy planning the attack on Sicily. So Allied headquarters staged the operation. General Alexander gave us a British 1st Division, amphibiously trained. We organized the air and the sea, and an expedition against Pantelleria was carried out without regard to the ground Commander in Chief.

What I am trying to show is that flexibility was always preserved. All through the Mediterranean campaigns we did preserve then the organization of a top Commander in Chief, and under him three distinct service Commanders in Chief.

I here should drop a little idea, I think, that I have never tried to express before. But there is some virtue in it. You may have a new and important subordinate who is of a different nationality than yourself. In the early days, while you are in this business of establishing confidence, make sure that one of the larger commands of that man's nationality contains some of the troops of your own nationality. Now this is not only good in the promotion of trust and confidence, but remember this: There is also a club there, too, because you, and you alone, can pull those troops out. And a commander never likes to lose troops. But you must work in every way you know to develop the confidence of your subordinates in the commander, in his common sense, straight-

forward thinking, and absolute refusal to touch a problem on a nationalistic ground.

You must develop confidence with your superiors. They are far away in capitals. To give you an example - and I am sure that General Marshall will recall telling me this, because he is the source of my information - one day the British Chiefs of Staff made a rather informal or casual remark at a meeting that they were sorry that my headquarters always seemed to be so close to Bradley's because they thought that I would fall under the domination of his thinking. And the American Chiefs of Staff replied their only fear was that I lived so close to the British Chiefs of Staff, that it was their fear that I would fall under the British thinking. So there must never be any act on the part of the Allied command that gives either superior, and I don't care how many capitals with which you are operating, reason to believe that you are operating from nationalistic lines, because that will be the thing that will defeat you.

I want to say one thing more about flexibility in organization. I do not by any manner of means say that always a supreme commander in the field should have an air Commander in Chief, a ground Commander in Chief and a naval Commander in Chief. Ordinarily I should say that with respect to the air and the navy it would be better always to have one commander in chief, but I can even show you exceptions to that rule. The Strategic Air Forces of Europe, the 8th American Air Force and the British Bomber Command, had actually very wide missions, and it is probably true that they logically should have stayed always under the direct command of the Combined Chiefs of Staff. But when the Combined Chiefs of Staff sent all that they had in the Overlord operation, it became clear that the crisis of that battle, lasting from some time before the actual assault started until some weeks after the troops were solidly on shore, was so important to our nations - it wasn't an ordinary tactical battle - it was so important they had to give to the tactical commander every available ounce of strength. And the United States Chiefs of Staff backed up the contention that the British Bomber Command and the 8th Air Force should both be under the command of the supreme commander during that period; and even thereafter when it was found or believed no longer necessary to keep them under command, there was maintained in the directive of those air forces an overriding paragraph that no matter what other operations were in sight, they would always answer the emergency calls of the supreme commander. So, as far as practical effect was concerned, they stayed under command down to the end of the war. Actually assigned to me was a tactical Air Commander in Chief.

So these two big strategic air forces came in, each with an officer of equal standing with my own Air Commander in chief, and did not want to serve under him. Primarily they were frightened that the strategic air forces would be used incessantly by the tactical air commander for his immediate purposes, but they cheerfully came in under the command of supreme headquarters, because then they felt they would not be used every day just for fighter-bomber work along the front lines. But you did not have during all that time, from April 12 to September 15, a single air Commander in Chief.

On the ground this flexibility must be even more pronounced. The largest command, the largest headquarters that we normally use for actual supervision of battle lines is the Army Group Commander. When you get any further back than the Army Group Commander it becomes almost impossible to give to the battle the hour by hour attention that coordination and cooperation so incessantly demand. Therefore, you try to get each army group, if it is at all possible, located in a natural channel of invasion or sector of defense. You try to fit it to the geography of the theater. And each of these men becomes for that area a ground Commander in Chief.

I can see no purpose whatsoever in placing any ground headquarters between an army group and a supreme commander because by the nature of his duty the supreme commander has control of the navy and the air. They are the only forces that can be allocated suddenly and in emergency. The only thing an intermediate headquarters can do would be to come to the supreme commander and propose or recommend help in some particular line. Therefore geography, as well as everything else, helps to determine the details of your organization - and for goodness sake, apply it to allied as well as any other organization. I doubt, gentlemen, that it would ever be possible to take a large allied force organization and diagram it in the method that we are so accustomed to use in the G-3 section, with the black lines and dotted lines. I don't believe it can be done. But there is something there that is effective and will never fail, and that is confidence, after it is once developed.

Now so far we have talked about commanders, their staffs, how they operate to get together. The problems are not all confined to the staffs and to commanders. There will be definite problems far on down the line. One

of them is this: The American is the highest paid soldier in the world. He is the best fed. He is entertained the most. He carries recreational services to the field that no other army in the world knows.

You have a big headquarters in Algiers or Caserta or Oran, and serving side by side are thousands of enlisted men of different countries. One is living on his rations, and that is all he gets. He has no clubs, he has no place to go, and he is doing it on very little pay. Therefore he is not able to buy the wine or entertain the girls in the same way that his more fortunate ally can. There is no rule, of course, to solve the problem, but I believe this: In the field there are many things that a commander must do that he probably doesn't even bother to tell his own superiors - and in fact he should not do it. He must apply this truism to the problem of enlisted morale in allied command.

The American Red Cross, which is the big recreational facility we take with us, was bound by this: Their contributions, voluntarily made by Americans, were given to support Americans, and the Red Cross would not voluntarily do anything for the soldiers of other nationalities. Therefore I felt that as a commander I should do what I could with the facilities available to make decent recreation available to all the people who are dying on the same fields and bearing the same sacrifices day by day.

I would like to put one thought in your heads. I don't believe in time of war we should think that when America gives a rifle to a Frenchman that we are making a present to him. We were trying in that war to kill Germans, and if we could do it on the basis of furnishing only a rifle, instead of the rifle and a man, I think that lend-lease from that viewpoint was the finest thing our governments did as a prewar measure. I have never seen why we resented the fact we did give divisional equipment to the French as long as they stuck their necks out on the battlefields, and as long as they used that equipment and used it effectively. Then we were that much ahead.

I want to call your attention to a specific point of the experience in Europe. We had only two Allies, the Americans and the British, who were absorbed into the high command. We were always justified in maintaining that basis because it was America and England that provided all of the supplies, the facilities, the equipment, everything with which the war was fought except men. Admiral Hill has already read to you the list of nations that provided some of the men, but they were usually considered segments or auxiliaries of the particular nation that was arming them. For instance, the Poles always served with the British Army because the Poles used British equipment. But when we came to operating with the French - I have forgotten the exact number of French divisions that finally served, but in Italy and France combined there must have been eleven or twelve divisions, we did make provision for seeing that the French viewpoint was always clear to us. We had liaison officers and we had various types of interpreters and others around the headquarters to keep us informed of what General Juin and General De Gaulle and the others thought. But we did not incorporate them into the staff itself.

Now remember we did have problems, and what would happen if you had to put four or five together, I am not so certain, because then none would be predominant. Whereas two partners can frequently find a solution to a very difficult argument between themselves, when you put in four or five with maybe one or two of Latin temperament, I don't know what would happen. But I do thank the gods of war for this one thing, that we had only two to work with.

Arguments arose by the score, and sometimes, of course, when they were brought up by the Prime Minister the feeling was inescapable that they involved nationalistic considerations. For example, the Prime Minister did not want to conduct Anvil, later known as Dragoon. He believed he saw definite disadvantages to that attack with great advantages to continuing on in greater strength in Italy and trying to force the Ljubljana Gap. From a purely military basis I believed he was wrong, and I urged him that if he was considering the postwar political situation he should take that to our President, that I was not allowed to decide things on that basis. Moreover if he were going to reduce it purely to military efficiency and speed in the destruction of the German Army - which was the only mission I was given, the mission of destroying the German Army at the earliest possible date - then I had to stick with that mission. That one argument lasted seven hours, and that was only one of the sessions.

As I said, the miracle of the war was that these fights could occur and could never break up the soundness of the whole organization because the big men at the top saw the necessity of unity; and any one below who tried to break it wide open would have been crucified very promptly and very quickly.

I should have said, before I left the matter of dealing with the enlisted man, the action we took on one scheme was this: I went directly to the Government of Great Britain and I got them to put in a certain amount of money for the organization of a few Allied clubs. With even token support from them, I felt justified in organizing and supporting a few great clubs throughout Western Europe. One was in Brussels, a very large one in Paris, one in Frankfurt and so on. The great thing that Britain supplied for those clubs was the hostesses, and the proof that their hearts was in it was shown by the fact that many ladies of high birth and great station would often be scrubbing floors in those clubs. The clubs were wonderful. I know of nothing around the headquarters where soldiers of different nationalities mingled that kept a more even and satisfied morale, one ally toward another, than those clubs.

In the field the matter is not so important, because you rarely have troops operating with each other in smaller units than the corps, and once in a while the division. They have their own little rest towns, they are separated more, and the problem is not so acute. But when you get around a great base, a great port or where both are using a great headquarters, the problem is always with you.

Another matter, and one of almost tremendous importance, is the press. There have been many differing ideas about the value of censorship. Frankly, I am one of those who opposes any bit of censorship you do not have to use. It always flares back in your face and you live to regret the imposition of censorship unless it is absolutely necessary, and then it should be imposed for only the briefest possible space of time. The first thing is that every press representative, every representative of the allied press should be treated as a quasi staff officer. You should put on that man's shoulders a sense of responsibility. You should use him as such, and you will find that much good comes to you from their observations all over a great theater.

But here is the particular problem you have with the allied press. Without a very high and intense degree of patriotism, nations could not possibly absorb the punishment they take in war, the casualty lists that come back, the tremendous taxes, the regimentation, and in the case of England, the bombing of her cities and finally the conscription of all her women from eighteen to fifty-two. You have to have a very high degree of patriotism, and it is strictly national in character. Therefore each press representative, American or British tends to cater to this homeland feeling - the British wants to make the British Army or the British Air Force look better in Britain, and the American wants to do the same back in the United States. And if he considers it necessary to go to excesses in this matter, he will do it at the expense of his allies, not thinking of the over-all harm he does.

I think it is true to say that some of the longest hours of worry that I had in this war were brought about by stupid statements on the part of high officers, which, garbled, distorted and misinterpreted by the press, finally caused very great mental anguish in the minds of the Allies, on one or the other side of the house. I know of nothing which I would be more careful to get organized with a very splendid man at its head. And I would keep that type of organization running all down through the command, and I would make sure early in the game that every commander understood its tremendous importance.

For example, let me give you a small one - I say "small" because it soon disappeared. We were going into Paris and we were very anxious to send the French in first. We sent Le Clerc's Second Division. They got there on the afternoon of the 25th of August. Now De Gaulle was not too sure of his position in Paris. There were great groups of the Maqui. Some were organized and responded to Koenig's orders. Others did not and there was great danger they were going to become brigands and so on. De Gaulle wanted to do something that would establish his prestige and authority, and he asked me for two American divisions because the British were far away to the north. I said I didn't have two divisions to spare but that we had two divisions going through Paris on their way to battle, and that if he would take a reviewing stand in the city, these two divisions would march by on their way to battle; that General Bradley would come down to signify Allied unity, and that De Gaulle's position would then be assured. All very well! But the fact was that a British reporter wrote home that American divisions paraded in Paris, and mentioned that after all the 21st Army Group on the left had something to do with the liberation of Paris, and ended up with the remark that "After all, the Americans love a parade." The resentment that arose immediately was something that we had to move quickly to stop. That took a long and laborious explanation. I explained it in far greater detail than I have to you gentlemen. But you have to let the people of the opposite nationality see that in everything you do, in every move you make you are preserving strict impartiality. Literally you had to refuse in such a position to be wholly a citizen of your own country. You were half one and half the other. You had to recall that and keep it in the forefront of your

conscious mind every single minute of the day.

Now I am not going to try, in drawing toward a conclusion of this rather rambling story, to point up any specific lessons that are to be remembered always. But there is one thing I should like to call to your attention, that in Europe the thing that won the war was first Allied unity, and second, balanced forces. There was no possibility that any one of the services could have won that campaign alone. It was a sheer impossibility. But by the proper reasonably coordinated employment of all three services there were daily achieved results that brought the whole war to a very rapid conclusion.

I must tell you something of the actual results achieved in that campaign compared with expectations. Several times just before D-Day I had long talks with Mr. Churchill. He repeated this time and again, not only to me but to others of my associates - probably officers here have heard him say it. He would say, “If you by fall, by the time snow flies, have thirty six divisions on the Continent of Europe, and if you are holding the Brittany Peninsula and the Cotentin Peninsula I shall say this is one of the most successful operations of the war. And if, by that time you have succeeded in crossing the Seine and seizing the great part of Le Havre, I shall say it is one of the most successful operations in all history.” And I would say, “Mr. Churchill, we are going to be on the borders of Germany by winter, and the only question for the German to decide is whether he is going to hang on beyond that.” He would smile, and then he would say, “It is well for commanders to be optimistic.” But there was no great belief that we were going to sweep ahead through France at the speed we did. There was no widespread belief, and there was no thought expressed by anyone I heard on the morning of June 6, 1944 that eleven months from that day Germany would have surrendered.

No one can ever minimize the part that any one of the services played in that great achievement. The Air and the Navy, of course, had been in the war long before the land forces engaged in operations in that theater. The Navy had been watching the German surface units and combating submarines. The Navy had taken mountains of supplies to England. It had built up a supply depot that was so great that a facetious saying of the time was, “Except for the barrage balloons floating in the air, England would sink under the sea.” All that the Navy did.

The Air, in the meantime, was continuing its relentless pounding of the Continent. Some of that pounding was directed directly at the heart of Germany, some of it on communication centers and defenses to the westward, to help us. Each Army Group had its own Air Force subordinate. The Ninth Air Force supported Bradley’s group. The Second Tactical Air Force supported Montgomery’s group. Each army had its own tactical air command. All of the air was always retained under central control so that at any one moment all of it could be used in any sector. One shining example was when the enemy launched, at Mortain, the counterattack to try to get out of the terrific position we placed him in by the break-out at Avranches. On that morning all of the Second Tactical Air Force’s Typhoons came over, equipped with rockets, and the effect of the rockets on the tanks, while not as great as the enthusiastic pilots reported, was certainly serious and terrifying to the Germans, as amply demonstrated by the reports of the time. We did similar things time and again, and on several days of that war the combined air forces of the Mediterranean, England and our command flew fourteen thousand sorties in support of our land forces.

Coordination meant that the direction of the air was all of the time toward those things that would most definitely help the whole. For example, we early found that one of the critical shortages on the part of the German was oil, and that, of course, had a direct effect upon our land operations. Almost the first priority target, I think, from February 1944, was oil. Every oil resource of the Germans that we could hit was constantly pounded which helped us forward. This in turn reduced the territory the air had to bombard, and pushed forward their bases, particularly their fighter bases, so their fighters did not have to fly such terrific distances in support of the bombers. All worked together for the common good.

I have spoken of the Navy. About the last time we used them in any strength was when we crossed the Rhine. They brought the landing boats up over land, put them down and crossed the Rhine, and they helped us make out last amphibious landing.

One other thing before I close: In such vast undertakings as an Allied force that finally reached a strength of five million of all arms, you must be prepared, whether you are a subordinate commander, staff officer, or higher commander, to accept minor inefficiencies as long as that is promoting the great and common purpose. You should not try to change ideas and concepts on the part of some subordinate of a different nationality

because you disagree with him. If you can achieve the great over-all unity of purpose that inspires loyalty, inspires teamwork, never bother your heads about minor things in seeking perfection because too many difficulties can arise out of minor irritations and frustrations. You must not lose your sense of humor because if you do your allied command will blow apart.

Now I am ready for cross-examination.

• Address at IBM Corporation Dedication, Poughkeepsie, New York, June 26, 1948

Having kept some rough track of the people who have come up to this place this morning, I noticed that my position corresponds roughly with that of the pitcher. Now, every American knows that when the pitcher comes to bat there is nothing much expected. Of course, I am well aware also that he is expected to be reasonably brief in bowing his way out; and as long as he doesn't swing at something over the grandstand, he can get through, and everybody is happy.

As a bit of further alibi, let me remind you, ladies and gentlemen, that for the past thirty-seven years I have, after all, with my veteran friends in this audience, been dealing with machines that were far more effective than my vocal cords.

The freest, most independent, and therefore the proudest individual who walks the face of the earth is the American citizen; and whenever numbers of them - by the hundreds or by the thousands - assemble for any event, their very gathering gives to that event a significance which should never be lost on any of us.

We have met today to dedicate to its future use a building of the IBM Corporation. Yet this number of proud free Americans would not assemble, if we were here, merely to say some words and utter a few platitudes about a collection of mortar, glass, stone and metal, no matter how artistically it might be put together - this event has for all of us a far deeper meaning.

For the workman who will be in the building it means the conveniences, the sanitary protection, of all of the help that science can give to spend his working hours under better conditions, to make more certain that he can provide for himself and for his family through the revenue he will derive.

And to the community it has given a wider meaning. It means in the long run not merely greater profits for the merchant, greater income for the professional men. It means a better standard of living in the community of Poughkeepsie. It means better and wider playgrounds, more opportunity to combat juvenile delinquency, it means better pay for teachers. Certainly it should.

It should mean everything that we want in our effort to make the America we want to turn over to our children and grandchildren, and this last has recently become very important to me, ladies and gentlemen.

But even beyond the community of Poughkeepsie, think of what this building means as a symbol of the faith that America has in the system of free enterprise. We often hear those words; they are uttered from platforms as if there was something sacred about them. Indeed there is, but only as we search out the inner meaning and significance of those words "free enterprise."

The political freedoms we know, the American concept of democracy, certainly include, whatever else it has, these three essentials: first, a faith, a faith related to some religion that man is more than an animal, that he possesses a soul.

If we have not that faith, then why should any of us admit that any other is born equal, with rights equal to himself? Each of us instinctively recognizes - and our forefathers so stated - that an individual, because he is born, possesses certain rights. And to prove that, ladies and gentlemen, we must go back and depend upon faith and faith alone, and I say it is a faith akin to religion, to most of us, Christianity.

It depends upon a system of free enterprise because eventually, if any government or any individual or in any other way, all property residing within a nation's borders were owned by the government or by a particularly small group of individuals, there would be no recourse for that government or for those individuals except to order each of us in the way of life we must follow, in order to make that tremendous, staggering business a success.

Without free enterprise the political freedoms we know cannot exist, because if that government had to order each of us to do our jobs, it could not permit strikes, it could not permit inciting to strikes, and the

freedom of the press which is the very foundation upon which our whole system of political freedom rests would disappear.

Finally, there must be included in any concept of democracy as we attempt to practice it, a readiness to cooperate in the performance of group functions - such functions as national security and the establishment of rules and orders among us that even our own system with all its virtues may not fall prey to its own weaknesses, may not be exploited by people of evil intent.

We do have to establish rules. We must do it by majority rule, and we must cooperate in carrying out the systems and the policies that that majority lays down, because just as sure as we exist today, if any nation finds itself in peril because its free citizens will not cooperate to perform those necessary group jobs, they will eventually do it by fear, and then we have dictatorship.

All of this is important because the freedom of the individual, the dignity of man is the thing for which at least the English speaking races of the world have been ready to die ever since 1215. It's the one thing that every veteran here among you placed above all else when he went to war and when he faced everything that the enemy could bring against him. I have heard cynics say that we who went to war went because some shrewd politician was working out something that was nefarious in itself and was merely the advancing of his own evil intent. I know this, I know that every soldier abroad, though he may have been inarticulate and though he didn't voice his deeper convictions, and though he was often a wise-cracking, rather careless, cynical looking sort of human, underneath he was sustained by a faith that he was fighting for the freedom that his father gave him, and any man who says differently is a liar.

Industrial expansion must go on then, if we are to retain a system of free enterprise, because every year our population increases. What we had five decades ago, a century ago, is not enough for us now, and in the same way it will not be enough for our sons and grandsons. A building such as this, then, typifies, first, our faith that the American system shall go on; second, it typifies our readiness each to do his part, the man who directs the business, the community in which one of his buildings is situated, the people who work for him, each to do his part to see that that future will be ours in the full measure that free Americans deserve it.

The dedication of such a building could scarcely be completely fitting unless some mention was made of the noble character of the man who has been at the head of this organization for thirty-four years, a man who has understood that no business can be completely and long successful in the American sense unless it is conducted for the prosperity, the happiness of every man who works in it, for the families and friends of those workmen as well as for the legitimate profit of those who invest in it. I think if there is one thing for which Mr. Watson has been noted throughout the country it is that in everything he has done with respect to individual enterprise, he has certainly attempted never to lose sight of those basic considerations.

And so, ladies and gentlemen, I think that all of us here together today can agree that we are dedicating this magnificent building to the future of American, a prosperous, happy, and above all and always, a free America.

• Address at IBM Corporation dedication luncheon, Poughkeepsie, New York, June 26, 1948

To say that I am touched by this evidence of extraordinary cordiality and generosity is to be guilty of understatement, the like of which the British won't even understand.

I should first apologize for Mrs. Eisenhower's failure to attend, but you will understand when you realize that she, with our new daughter-in-law, is engaged today in getting a home ready for our grandson, which was so important she couldn't neglect it.

The other day I heard a very grand old statesman and scholar, ex-president Angell of Yale, say he thought he might perform a service if he could invent something that made sure that a man's larynx wore out ahead of his brain.

I accepted this statement at face value. It sounded to me at the moment that there could be no challenge to it. And then this morning I had my moment of doubt when I heard the artistic treat that all of us got from our two guest artists of honor.

But then on further thought, I realized that President Angell was still right, because no one could sing like that except with their heart, their brains, as well as their throat. I have never enjoyed anything more in my life.

Now, with respect to my qualifications for college president, I will prove that I haven't the first qualification, and, therefore, the others are unimportant, because it is like the man who was thrown out of church; the other six reasons didn't have any value whatsoever.

At West Point, a man receives instruction in various things that have no part of the curriculum, and the upper classmen make sure to see that the instruction is very thorough. One day it became my duty to report about boat races, and so coming from Kansas, a very simple state where we pronounce the English language according to the way it looks to us, where we make fun of a state that finds it necessary to torture the word "Ar-kansas" into "Ar-kan-saw," I said the boat race at Poughkeepsie for so-and-so. For the rest of my plebe term, three times a day I was called upon to explain what was happening at Poughkeepsie. So that being a sample of the extent of my learning, you can understand that the job of college president is one for which I have no qualifications whatsoever, except a very earnest, if somewhat blundering desire to do the best I can to help pass on to the people that come after us, an understanding of what we have, how we got it, and what we have to do to preserve it.

This day has been an important and enjoyable one in my life, and to have this token and this present to take back to my wife this evening has added immeasurably, I assure you, to its total enjoyment.

Thank you very much.

• VA transcription for July 4th message, 1948

On this day of special significance in American history, it is something like a homecoming to be speaking again to veterans - but I wish this microphone were a two-way device so that we could talk together; as we so often did when we were all in uniform.

Most of you are now in civil life and I, too, have donned civilian clothes. I have become part of Columbia University where, as I did during 37 years of military life, I am still trying to insure the maintenance of American strength.

When veterans speak of national strength they do not only mean tanks and planes and ships. They mean the combined moral, intellectual, economic and military strength of our 140,000,000 people. The corner stone of that strength is an essential unity among us. Without unified and concerned action no military unit, no infantry, no nation can exert, either for good or evil, the full measure of its power. But, whereas in some countries this concerted action is achieved by the police power of the central government, the American system repudiates every suggestion of central dictatorial control. This means that in our country, basic unity must come from a common knowledge and understanding of the critical problems of our time. To help promote such knowledge and understanding is the fundamental mission of educational institutions. Every school, from kindergarten to the greatest universities, such as Columbia, must remain true to this purpose if it is to be of the fullest service to our nation. Of course these schools are responsible for turning out the best doctors, engineers, lawyers, nurses, farmers and businessmen that can be produced. But unless our schools, above all else, strive to train America's youth for effective citizenship in a free democracy, all their other efforts will, in the end, result in failure.

No other postwar development has been of greater significance than the eagerness with which so many millions of veterans have successfully seized the opportunity, provided by the government in cooperation with our schools and colleges, to complete their academic and professional education. To the soldier's training in discipline, leadership, team play - to his courage, fortitude and loyalty - they are adding professional skill and a broadened understanding of the critical elements in our own future. Inescapably they are marked for leadership; their mass influence upon the future of America will be greater than that of any other segment of our population. This fact is full of encouragement to all who look forward to a constantly increasing prosperity and happiness for America.

You veterans have fought in defense of human freedom - you will be especially watchful that it is never imperiled, either from external attack or from creeping paralysis from within. In many countries you have seen the effects of governmental seizure of all property, industry and activity including educational institutions, and you will never permit us to so enslave ourselves. You know the value of cooperation - you will struggle to see that our domestic problems are settled on that basis. You have witnessed the destruction, the suffering, the

stupidity of war. You will do every honorable thing to see that global war does not again engulf us and the world. You will maintain the integrated national strength that will discourage any from attacking us, while you work unceasingly for the growth of international understanding that will eliminate war.

We live under a concept of human freedom because our ancestors fought, suffered and sometimes died for it. Freedom is hated by all who seek dictatorial power over their fellowmen. It can continue to flourish only as those who love it are ready to sacrifice all else for its preservation. In this understanding you will seek supporters of freedom everywhere in the world - and will be ever-ready to extend a helping hand to those who choose it for themselves.

On this Independence Day, I would particularly like to say to those still suffering from disabling wounds – "May Providence continue to watch over you and bring you back to health." To all veterans, everywhere I send warm greetings. You are now, in all walks of life, taking over day by day, the leadership of our country. Our nation could not be in better hands.

• Opening of the 49th Summer Session at Columbia University, July 6, 1948

It is my privilege this morning to bring to you a very warm welcome to Columbia and I do not use that adjective in the sense that the thermometer brings us today. Columbia is exceedingly proud that you people have chosen this institution to assist you in further training for effective citizenship in this great democracy. In a very real sense I am a member of this class. It is the first group that I have been privileged to welcome here and I am a freshman president. So I hope that we may be called students together. I hope that we will learn from each other and that I will be the principal beneficiary of this common and cooperative effort. Just as I am a student with you, so you are a soldier with me. Because you are here fundamentally to prepare yourselves to make this country a greater and better place for yourselves, your children and all who may come after you. The American Army and all of the Armed Services have existed from the beginning not merely to defend property, territory or even rights. It has existed to protect a way of life. Washington, Jackson, Grant and Pershing have done this in uniform, just as have many of you who are here today. Others, like Jefferson, Marshall and Lincoln have done this in civilian activities. All of these names are merely symbols of the growth of a great country. We are engaged today in the same struggle that they devoted their lives to accomplish. The rights that we have today we may consider as natural rights, but they were won by blood, sweat, sacrifice and death. You have the same responsibilities as those who went before us. If we are to have better homes, better working conditions, better anything, then each of us has the responsibility to defend with his life the liberty and the rights that have brought all this about. In doing so we recognize our kinship with all people throughout the world who recognize the dignity of man, the invaluable character of the human soul and who conduct government in that concept. The other governments of the Americas and of Western Europe and everywhere who follow this concept are with us. I hope that Columbia may be able to do something to bring to you a fresh clarity of vision in these matters and that when you go home you will feel that you have profited by your studies here - not only in the ways in which you may realize your personal ambitions, but that you will never forget that the happiness of yourself is dependent upon the Nation's advance with us. No part can advance faster than can the whole. Again I say to you, welcome to Columbia and make certain that Columbia is proud that you are here.

Thank you very much.

• Overseas Aid United Nations Appeal, Waldorf-Astoria, July 8, 1948

Just now I must say that I am a bit confused as to why we came here. I thought it was to get out of you, for a worthy cause, all the money that you have got. Instead, we have been listening to words that shine so brightly that they should appropriately appear on my tombstone, if anywhere. I am embarrassed by the generosity of the remarks of our National Chairman and the Chairman of this meeting because I deserve n credit whatsoever for being here. Every individual in the world is the center of the universe; everything that effects him is seen in the light of his own desires, his own ambitions, his own hopes, his own fears. That of necessity must be so.

Therefore, when something of great importance to him is projected he feels an impulse to participate in it. For that he deserves no particular credit. In this movement I see something of transcendent importance to all of us.

I am not here to plead the essential charity and mercy aspects of the movement with which your presence here brings you into participation. I am not going to talk about humanitarianism, I'm going to talk about self-interest. To my mind, this is one of the many fronts upon which the battle of peace must be won, and I am not alone among old soldiers and sailors in believing this, as is evidenced by the fact that the old comrades of mine of World War II are here in the audience. They have seen war, they know what it is, and their ambitions, their ideals, like my own, are devoted toward every worthwhile measure that will keep the scourge of war away from the face of the earth.

That objective cannot be won, ladies and gentlemen, through any narrow approach. The United Nations, as noble as it is in the concept, as deserving as it is of the support of all of us, cannot do it alone. There are many ways, ranging through the whole gamut of activity by which each of us may participate toward this goal and these are the ones we must discover and support.

The children of today are forging each day the mental concepts, the mental prejudices, the emotions, that are going to rule and govern them through their lifetime. Overseas, half of the earth, there is hunger and want. In many countries, children are going in packs up and down alleys, they are searching for a garbage heap in which they find all too little of any kind of sustenance that will keep them alive. Every man here who served with me in Europe has witnessed this with his own eyes. How can we expect children who are reduced almost to an animal life level of existence - who struggle each day for any kind of food that will keep them alive - how can we expect them in the future to be apostles of peace? They are, by the very nature of the struggle they are carrying on, wedded to the philosophy of force. Whatever they get, they get by their own efforts and by fighting each other for the pitiful products of the garbage heap. This cannot go on if we are to have peace.

It isn't merely a question of money, it is a question of everything you do by your daily lives to advance this idea.

I recall some months ago one of our political leaders mentioned that if America would eat less, most of the world could get what it needs. There was a political outcry about that and yet I stand here today and say that everyone who saves the food that he does not need, is contributing towards the solution of the problem that worries every single one of us present and a hundred and forty million people throughout the United States as well as the rest of the world.

Fundamentally, that worry is what is the future of our way of life, of the freedoms that have been won for us by the blood and sweat and sacrifice and suffering of our ancestors going back to 1215. Those freedoms are threatened on every side. After a great war like this there would be sufficient distress if there was relative peace in the world, but we see a world torn by conflicting ideologies which, on one side, is characterized by aggressive purposes. We cannot operate successfully on a cooperative basis. We are not free to devote ourselves exclusively to the basic human needs of men. We must take measures among the freedom-loving peoples of the world to spend much of our strength to sustain our way of life.

This problem of peace and the problem of sustaining our way of life are identical, and the problem of feeding the children of today is a very essential part of it.

Were we involved with only one section of the world, the problem would probably not be too serious; but it is widespread. There are people present who have traveled in Indonesia, in all of Southeast Asia, in China and Korea, and all of Western Europe, and almost without exception the story is the same. In North Africa it is repeated.

How can we then, if we are serious about saying that we want to travel the road to peace, realizing that there can be no permanent security or assured peace for ourselves unless it is shared by all nations of the globe, how can we attempt to say that we are traveling that road unless we do everything that lies within our power to create conditions in which peace may flourish. We must eliminate starvation - we must see that children are well nourished. Not only must we give our money, we must give our earnest efforts and thought to this thing; we must do it with our hearts, we must save food and we must produce more food.

There is a group today which is attempting to enlist American interest in the saving of our land. They stirred my interest when they told me that if I should stand on the dock at New Orleans that every third minute a

ten thousand dollar farm would go past my feet. We must do our part to save those farms if we are to find ourselves and help feed the world.

What I am trying to get over is that we each can do a part, we can help, and there is going to be no peace unless all of us are bound together in a common concept of the fundamentals of the problems and common concept of what we are going to do about them. We are not going merely to await action even by such a great organization as the United Nations. Each of us must be inspired to do his own part.

When we are unified in that sense there is no problem on earth that will not yield to the determined, enthusiastic and united support of a hundred and forty million Americans. That kind of power cannot be resisted and unless we have it, there is no victory.

Every soldier, every sailor who served in this war is a witness to the mighty strength that America can develop when aroused.

I think my own example of that power was found in an incident of destruction. On June 19, 1944, the greatest storm in forty years swept the English Channel and on the beaches of Normandy were piled up hundreds of ships of seagoing capacity. It was the kind of catastrophe that to any other country, or in any other time, would have spelt disaster and defeat. Actually, it occasioned little more than a wrinkle in the smoothly-developed plan that brought about the victory in Europe. That brought home to me, more than anything else, the might of this country, what it can do when aroused, and how much it can absorb on its march to victory.

This job can be done. The only thing that is necessary is that America develop this same unity in the cause of peace as it did in war. This question of overseas aid for children is but one part of the campaign - a vitally important one - and if we will unite behind it in the cause of peace we can certainly win through. Thank you very much.

• Address at IBM Corporation banquet, Endicott, New York, July 14, 1948

I understand that once before today this body has been addressed by an Eisenhower. The young man must be possessed of a certain element of shrewdness and of wisdom because considering the unusual character of the name, it would seem inescapable that he and I are at least distantly related - but I understand that he has been far too wise to admit any such connection.

And when I was informed also that the address was characterized not only by what he had to say and the character of his thought, but by the manner of his delivery. And frankly, that placed me somewhat behind the eight-ball, because I claim no pretension whatsoever to the title of orator, and I seriously considered hunting up your Mr. Eisenhower and suggesting to him that for the honor of the family name, and in order that he should not be disgraced before such a body, that he might substitute for me on this platform this evening.

But then I thought a second thought, and I decided that being another Eisenhower he would probably refuse to be considered for the nomination.

Once in a hurried trip from France to the United States I stopped at an airfield near Paris and picked up some men who were waiting for a ride home, and among them was a young paratrooper.

Within a few hours we were ready to make our first stop on the Azores, and just before we landed I noticed that this young paratrooper displayed signs of great excitement. He dashed from one porthole to the other to look out. Finally he asked me whether I thought it would be all right for him to go up in the cockpit and watch the landing.

I said, “Why, of course,” and then, thinking that his actions were a bit strange for a paratrooper I said, “Wait a minute, young man. You’ve certainly been up in an airplane before.”

He said, “Nineteen times, General, but this is the first time I have ever landed.”

This is the first time that I have attempted to address a single industrial family, and therefore you can understand how I would search my mind and my heart for a topic that may be appropriate to the occasion, and on which I might know enough to venture a few opinions and thoughts.

I thought of making it a eulogy to my dear friend, Mr. Watson. Many of you have been with him and know him more years than I have. You know of his leadership, what he has done in American industry, what he has done in the American system of making a business work on the human side of the question.

Certainly I am not qualified to talk to you about business machines, because one little tour through the show tent over here on the grounds this afternoon had me so confused that I could not even tell identical twins one from the other. And most assuredly I am not going to talk to the Hundred Percent Club about salesmanship, although for the benefit of the Yale men who may be present, I might remind you that you did not get Lou Little! But in the title of your Company there was a word that attracted my attention, “International,” and so, being nothing if not modest, I decided to take the widest subject I could, the “world.” But instead of talking about the “world” in any erudite or academic fashion, I decided to see whether it would be profitable to talk about the world for a few minutes from the standpoint of each of us - just an ordinary, common man’s outlook on the world today, and what it means to him and what he might do about it.

Now, if we are to make any progress in such a discussion - which I am sorry to say will have to be one-sided - we will first have to look at ourselves. Possibly we have to understand, each of us, himself, with respect to this world; and then possibly we will have to have a bit of understanding with respect to the problems about us that touch upon our everyday life. And then, possibly something of the vast currents that seem to be sweeping the world, in order that we might relate something of our own feelings, our own desires, to this world movement and to the world problems.

Starting with ourselves, then, each human in the world is of necessity the center of the universe. All the universe is seen through his eyes. It is colored by his desires, his hopes, his fears, his ambitions. It is meaningless except as it impresses itself upon his consciousness. He is the important thing to which all other things are related in his consciousness and therefore the very center.

If that is true of each of us as an individual, of course it is equally true of the community and of the nation, and therefore possibly in our examination into this subject, we should first say, “What is our greatest hope, our greatest fear, our greatest ambition?”

It seems to me that the history of free men has proved that above all else, we prize the freedoms that have come to us in a package that we call the American Heritage. We prize our right to work where we please, for whom we please, to worship as we please, to speak as we please, to have equal rights before the law, and in the package of which those are the essential parts are those things for which the people of America and of American ancestry and their fathers before them have been ready to die. There has been no sacrifice too great to preserve those freedoms, those rights.

If that is true, then, fundamentally or underneath all else, each of our ambitions must center into and be a part of a great desire to perpetuate that system not only that we may enjoy it but that our children and grandchildren after us may do the same.

And likewise, our greatest fear therefore is not that you might not get a raise next month, but there may be forces working in the world today that endanger that system which for want of a better expression of phrase we usually term, “The American Way of Life.”

Then we come to the proposition, what is it that we can do about it, how may we analyze the problem to see what we can do about it?

I think first we should remember that the loss of that way of life can come about in many ways. The threat to it can come from several directions. One might be conquest from without; another might be the workings of zealots, of little cells from within our own body politic, but a third might be a creeping paralysis brought about by our failure to look at our life of today directly in the face, and to set ourselves with all our strength against such tendencies.

It would seem to me profitless before such a body as this to talk too much about any threat that may come from without. Such threat as there is in the world today is plain to all to see and we regretfully decide that we have to preserve a position industrially, economically, morally, and militarily in the world that will save us from any direct threat.

Likewise, there seems to be no dearth of means by which we may deal with the outspoken, avowed Communist or Fascist from within our own body, but the creeping paralysis - there is something where we are likely to put a yoke around our own necks, thinking it is a wreath of roses, and not finding its thorns until possibly it might be too late.

As we turn to government for everything, we will be neglecting our own duties and responsibilities in this world. We hear much, for example, of drives to help out in overseas aid for children, in the support of our

hospitals, in the support of the private school, in many other group activities which no one man can take care of alone, but which he doesn't step forward to meet with the full power of his purse and of his heart and in the spirit of the crusader that he is doing something for democracy today exactly as the men that fought at Bunker Hill.

I believe that when we allow these things to be done by the federal government, we are tying another silken cord around our own necks because if government finally has to absorb all responsibility for every group activity, it is likewise going to accept the authority and demand the authority to act, and that, at the very least is state bureaucracy, which can become state despotism.

I believe that the problems of the community, wherever you may be living, whether it is in Pasadena, New York, or Buenos Aires, or Rio, or any other place - when the community refuses - not refuses - fails - to meet the problems that are placed before it day by day in this matter or group responsibility and says: I pay taxes. Let the federal government do it - we are that much closer to statism and, consequently, to the loss of these freedoms which, remember, underlie every ambition, every hope that we have for the future.

I believe it is not enough merely to subscribe normally to the community chest and to other charitable organizations. Each man, in my opinion, has the opportunity and the responsibility, the duty to take these things upon his shoulders.

The soldier who fought in the war understands that only through cooperation can success be won. In great humane organizations there is no power of inspired leadership in any one man that can obtain success in a job except as he can help to imbue all others with an equal desire to do the job and get it done. Certainly you men have learned that in your own business.

Within a democracy our method of cooperation is by obeying the will of the majority, but there are thousands of things that must not be turned over to the only agency that majority may set up; otherwise this statism arises; individualism, freedom, and independence disappear.

It would seem to me, without belaboring the subject, that each of us in his own heart can discover ways and means in which he may exert himself day by day, week by week and month by month to insure that democracy shall not disappear through our own failure to meet our group problems within our own communities, because it is only when this power is centralized into a single federal sovereign authority that the danger truly arises.

There is no true analogy between state and city and township authority and that of the federal government, because the federal government is answerable to no one, but every subordinate authority is through the power of the Supreme Court. Therefore, the thing that we must watch is to avoid passing our problems in any form where they can be accomplished within our community, within our own area, from passing them on to the Federal Government, because that is the way eventually of statism.

We cannot allow the Government to do everything for which we are responsible unless it does those things we do not want it to do.

How would we relate this problem and these responsibilities to the world today? The struggle is ideological - it is a struggle between systems; it is not merely that in today's papers we see that the United States of America and the USSR are not getting along well together diplomatically.

There are two systems; one, that of statism, the other, one that recognizes the dignity of the human, a system that believes he has a soul, and that because of that he has inalienable rights that may not be taken from him by a court of law or anything else; that those rights are his inherently, and that as long as he does not trespass upon similar rights of others no power on earth can take them away from him.

Those two systems are in a struggle. That means that it is to our advantage, if we are really serious about what we are going to pass on to the future, even what we are going to live in the rest of our lives - because parenthetically, I should tell you that I believe democracy has entered its decade, certainly its quarter-century of greatest test and trial.

It is to our advantage, then, that that system is revered, respected and supported as widely in this world as it is possible. Because I say again, the struggle is not fundamentally between two nations, it is between two ideologies and the more widely ours is practiced, then, the greater support we have in any struggle. And if, today, the nations that want to live freely and independently with us could recognize a community of interest that could not be destroyed, that could not lead us along a diverse path in our dealings with opposite ideologies, then the practitioners of that opposite ideology would have to say, "It is no good to provoke a quarrel with these

people, they are too strong!”

Remember, in Western Europe today there are 270 million people that are in a very large sense the fathers of all of us present here tonight. Moreover, most of us, you know, are sons of downtrodden people. We, or our fathers, had to leave Europe because of religious persecution, some of them because they were debtors and for various reasons - but usually it was seeking a new opportunity to go somewhere. We are related to those people very closely, and those people are possessed, possibly without the same opportunity, but possessed of the same skills, the same basic intellectual capacities as are the Americans, and we know what they have done in various times and especially in this last war when they combined their efforts to accomplish a common purpose.

Therefore, if you take these 270 million people, link them to the other countries in South America and Africa and of the Southwest Pacific and with us in North America that want to live that way, there is no power that can challenge us.

Now, to bring us a little closer home: There exists a thought that if the United States just merely builds a wall around itself and lives to itself, devotes itself and its ideas and attention only to itself, it can be perfectly safe. I cannot imagine anyone stupid enough to say such a thing if he has been as far as the third grade. Today we are the greatest industrial nation of the world, and we use, possibly, I suppose, 70 per cent of the manganese that is mined - and we do not mine a pound of it. If we were surrounded by enemies, how could the great industrial empire of America continue to exist? If we are surrounded, if we should be an island of democracy is a sea of enemies, we cannot live. The same applies to a dozen other critical materials.

Moreover, we look with anxiety at our iron ore deposits, our oil deposits, and we realize that no longer are we an inexhaustible reservoir of material strength that we can draw on as we please. The time has come when we must realize that the downtrodden can no longer rush to the western part of America, to Australia, to New Zealand, and there carve out for themselves a living and escape that tyranny that drove our own forefathers out of Western Europe, or out of all of Europe.

Today we must understand we must get along together in the world, and if we will relate our own problem to our own basic desire, our own basic fear, there can be no doubt about the outcome.

First of all and as the greatest element in the combination of strength that would be presented to the world is the United States itself, and united America. I mean united behind basic purposes, not so much questions as to high and low taxes and whether you should have split income or not. I don’t know and I don’t care. But I do know that basically if we will view these problems the same and they will motivate our great purposes and our readiness to sacrifice for the common good, there is no other temporal power that can equal it, and I do know that if that power is combined with the other nations of the world that are determined to live that way and if we see it to our advantage to restore their broken economies and industries so that they can march together with us as proud and equal partners, then there is no danger to our way of life.

It all comes back, then, to our readiness to understand, our readiness to look these problems squarely in the face on each side of us, to make sure that here at home democracy is not in danger itself by the action of an enemy or by our own indifference, and then look at the world with the same clear eyes and approach it in the same spirit as those men that went ashore at Okinawa or on the Normandy beachhead, or Italy, or any of the other places where the armed services of the United States so proudly carried the flags of the allied nations during the great war.

Ladies and gentlemen, there are a thousand directions in which this subject can be pursued. In my own case, I enlisted in the educational world because of a belief that our schools have a tremendous job to do in thinking of these things. I did not join the educational world because I am under any illusions as to my scholarship and my erudition. I am an old soldier, and I know it; and I scarcely know the real difference between a dean and a professor. But with all the teaching they may do in the realm of physics and of law - and they have given us the finest practitioners of every art and science - underneath it all we need to reeducate or at least to remind ourselves of the obvious.

The only reason, therefore, that I can be in the educational world is because of my intense belief that we must, through the student and through the teacher, through everybody we can reach, remind ourselves of these obvious truths, so that the America that we pass on will be the glorious, wonderful heritage that we received, and which with its company in the world will finally reach that point where there are no ideological differences, armaments may disappear, and all men may live at peace with each other. Thank you!

• Address at IBM Corp factory buildings, Endicott, New York, July 14, 1948

I wonder whether any of you have ever taken the time to wonder what on earth you would talk about if you were suddenly called upon to stand up on a platform in front of thousands of your fellow-Americans. I assure you it is no easy task to figure out something that would be interesting and still said in such a short time that you can get to your work or your houses or your dish-washing or whatever you are going to do.

One thing I know, and that is that among you is a bunch of my old buddies, so the war is out for a subject. They don't want to hear anything about it, and the rest of you would probably say we are just a bunch of old soldiers anyway and if we couldn't think of anything except a lot of fighting to talk about, we ought to have stayed in Europe.

But I do want to bring up an aspect of that war as possibly having some application to what we are trying to do here today, and I will call on every soldier here in discussing this subject later to bear me out that only through cooperation is success possible in war.

There is no such thing as a brilliant leader through his own efforts bringing victory on the battlefield. It is a mass result produced by the hearts and the brains, the efforts and the sacrifices of the people on the battlefield, backed up, as we were in this war, by the mightiest productive machine, the greatest national economy, ever produced on this earth.

A commander can order and, through his succession of staff and command subordinates, can get those orders translated into a great number of plans, but every soldier knows that unless there is a readiness to cooperate on the part of all, a readiness to do more than is expected or than is ordered, then victory will elude you.

It is not possible in war, for example, to determine every stone behind which a machine gun may be hidden, every cellar in which there may be a tank, or every bridge that may be blown out. The soldier that meets the occurrence on the spot must react to it intelligently, effectively and instantly and on his own initiative or we will never succeed.

And so today, as we talk or hear talked about this thing of winning the peace, it is rather a vague term and certainly it seems to elude most of us as to just what we can do about it. We are ready to cooperate. We are ordinary Americans. We know that the system by which we cooperate in America is our willingness to obey the will of the majority, but again that will, expressed through the government in Washington, cannot tell each of us what to do. They can't foresee every opportunity that may come to each of us.

What can we do then in this business of winning the peace? The first and great thing that is necessary is a strong America, strong morally, mentally, industrially, economically, and finally militarily, but the military strength is only a small segment of the strength that we need.

How then in this job can we as a citizen do something to advance the strength of America, each feeling that he can do his part?

When you go out to tee off on the first tee or pick up your racket when you get a little recreational time or when you go to your machine to do your work, how can you have your own conscience tell you, "I did my best?"

All around us, it seems to me, are opportunities. It is merely, have we the courage to look them in the face and meet them and do the best we can with them? For example, in a great community such as represented here today, do you go to your lowest political caucus, do you there thrash out your ideas and send your delegates to the next senior caucus determined to represent your ideas of democracy and freedom and decency in the treatment of Americans here at home and the people elsewhere? Do you support your community chest? Do you help fresh air funds? Do you try to inform yourself of the problems that are involved, let us say, in European recovery programs? One politician says to us, "Why should we give something to Europe and starve ourselves?" And another one says, "We do it because we are humanitarians."

There is no such thing. If we help Europe, we help it from the viewpoint of enlightened self-interest because we know that if freedom is going to be strong in America it has got to have strength throughout the world. It is purely enlightened self-interest, and it is a cold investment, just as an investment in education.

Do you interest yourself in your schools? Do you see that the teacher that is taking your children and talking to them about democracy is someone who has a right to feel proud of his or her position? Are teachers getting the pay they should have? Do they have the respected position in the community they should have?

The school the church, the club, the fresh air funds, but, above all, informing ourselves as to what is going on in the world - and those problems are not too complicated. They are simple if we are ready to do the work of thinking and pulling them down to fundamentals.

There is no man in the world that has more faith in the future of America than I, and it is not because you have, as exemplified here in this city, the finest industry that can be produced, wonderful working conditions, clubs, recreational centers. I believe in the fundamental ability of America to think and to develop that unified power that comes about from common understanding of major issues.

We did it in the war. There never has been on earth any kind of temporal power that could equal the power generated by the United States of America between 1941 and 1945. There is no problem of today that can defy you. If is only this: each one of us must think of what the job is, where he can fit in and how he can help. Once we decide all our major actions and projects in the light of “What is good for the United States is good for me,” we will have no trouble.

I suppose there are here among the veterans a good many that I met during the war, where I stood on a jeep and chinned with them. They probably find some difficulty in hearing their old Uncle Ike talk so seriously, but I believe these are serious times.

Moreover, I ask them to remember that this is hardly a place to use the barrack room language that then seemed to be OK and customary. In any event, this does give me a chance to say specifically to all those veterans, thank you again. Some, of course, I did not see during the war. Thank you for what you did. I want to express the confidence that if you carry on as you did then, there is no problem that cannot be solved. Because you are taking over America, make no mistake about that. After all, there are sixteen million of you now in this country. You have many lessons behind you that few others have or can get. You are going to take over, and your brothers and your sisters and the people who supported you.

In your name I should like to thank them, because we did the greatest job that history had given to any people to do up to that time, and you can do anything that can face us in the future.

Thank you a lot! I’m sorry I kept you so long.

• American Overseas Aid - Appeal to Children, Denver, Colorado, August 17, 1948

This is General Eisenhower. I am speaking to you from Denver. During the war, you placed in my trust your husbands, your sons and your brothers. I can never forget the great responsibility you gave to me then. But today, you and I can share an even greater responsibility - that of teaching our children, the children of the world, the ways of peace.

The children of today are shaping the concepts, the prejudices, the emotions that are going to rule and govern them through their lifetime. But, around the world, 230 million of these children are on the verge of starvation. In many countries, almost universally, they are going in packs up and down alleys; they are searching for garbage heaps in which to find sustenance to keep alive.

Many millions of these starving children are war orphans. But for a whim of geography they might be our own children. Yet, in a very real sense, they are our own...because on them and on all children we stake our hopes for the future of the world. And so tonight I have come to tell you that the emergency of feeding the hungry children of the world is more urgent than anything we have faced together since the war.

In the next hour, many of the famous artists in the United States will participate in this broadcast. They are here - as I am - to ask for your support of American Overseas Aid - United Nations Appeal for Children. I respectfully urge that you join with me in this...□Crusade for Children.□

(Middle)

This is General Eisenhower again. The many famous stars you have been hearing - and the others to follow - have joined me tonight on behalf of American Overseas Aid - United Nations Appeal for Children, in this “Crusade for Children.” Personally, I am convinced that this is the most important effort that you and I, as

individuals, can make in the search for peace.

For this is a campaign to stop starvation and to rebuild the lives of the millions of children left homeless or orphaned by the war in all parts of the world. I have seen many of these children with my own eyes. They have been reduced - in vast proportion - to an animal level of existence. They are, by the very nature of their struggle for life, driven to a philosophy of force and violence. What hope have we for peace in the future if half the adults of the future – today's children - grow up with minds and bodies twisted from years of bitter starvation. These children need food and they need it now. The world must help them. America especially must help them. You and I must help them. Ten dollars will keep one child alive for a whole year. How many children will you save? Send your contribution to Crusade for Children, New York. Send it tonight. I'll repeat the simple address. Crusade for Children, New York.

(Closing)

This is General Eisenhower. Now you have heard about them, and you have heard them, too. Now you know the voice of hunger, the whimper of sickness, and the thin whisper of hopelessness - and this, all this, from children.

Ask yourself - what did they do to bring this upon them? Nothing - except that they were born into a world where there is not enough for them to eat. And those you have heard are just a handful, a tiny handful in one corner of the globe, of all the many who are hungry. Multiply them and you have 230 million children who know, as little children should never have to know, the true meaning of "Give us this day our daily bread."

You have heard the world in one child's voice, but behind that child stand millions upon millions - and they all speak to you. You have heard them: be thankful - for the sake of your sleep and your conscience - that you have never had to look into their eyes or see their faces. For we who have seen them can never forget.

And when you hear voices that reflect so much hunger, so little hope - when you realize that in parts of Europe and Asia, a baby born tomorrow has one chance in ten of living to see April - that the children look to you for the difference between living and dying - you want to help. Of course you do. And you want to know that what you do to help, will help. The way to insure that is through this Crusade for Children.

And there is this. It is your children who are heir to the same world these hungry will inherit - if they live. And if they live, unhelped by us, they will grow twisted into ways that do not bring peace. Hunger knows no ethics, no politics, no appeal to reason - hunger knows only hate, and fear and once again war. It is up to you, for your sake and for your children's, to feed today's children if tomorrow's people are to live in peace with each other.

Your support of this Crusade for Children is no passing act of simple charity. It is an investment in the future of mankind itself. That - even that, is up to you, now.

• Remarks for inaugural ceremony broadcast, new Twentieth Century Limited, Grand Central Terminal, New York City, September 15, 1948

Thank you, Mr. Metzman. To be here today, to witness this important event in the history of transportation, is of itself a great personal privilege. But for me there is additional satisfaction in the opportunity here afforded to pay a sincere tribute to the American railroads and the people who make them run.

During the recent war, I was well aware of the splendid job those roads - and the men and women who worked them - did in moving the personnel and the material of war across our continent toward their worldwide destinations.

In a much more direct way, I - and the command with which I served - had reason, every day, to appreciate the loyal and efficient service rendered by the railroad men in the Transportation Corps, thousands of them in the same Theater of War where I was stationed. Their magnificent efforts were essential to the victories our fighting men achieved; their skill and devotion did much to give those victories to the Allied peoples months ahead of the most optimistic estimates in 1941 and 1942. Frequently the time table of our offensives was written by these railroad men, turned soldiers.

After the Allied landings in North Africa in 1942, transport was a most critical problem. Roads were few and miserable; trucks to operate over them were, at the beginning, so scarce as to require rationing. We

possessed a single track railroad winding through the mountains from Casablanca toward the front, but its daily capacity was only 900 tons - a driblet of supply with which to meet the flood of arms and metal the enemy was pouring into Tunisia from Sicily and Italy. The success of the campaign was seriously jeopardized by our inability to move men, supplies, and equipment. Then the men of the Transportation Corps took over our rickety rail line and its battered equipment. Without the addition of a single boxcar or engine, they raised the daily delivery from 900 tons to 3000 tons. From this they went on to constantly greater accomplishments. What they could have done, had they possessed a train like this new Twentieth Century, is beyond my imagination.

That sort of pace they maintained through the Mediterranean and European campaigns until in a final magnificent gesture of American capacity for the impossible, they bridged the Rhine in 10 days - building a bridge the Germans would have taken months to duplicate - and across it rode American locomotives and trains into the heart of Germany.

All that is history now. Nevertheless, the spirit the men of the Transportation Corps manifested, the command they exercised over the tools of their trade, from mammoth locomotives and mile-long trains to the ingenious tricks that eliminated bottlenecks and cut so many complicated knots - these are still American assets.

The spirit of a nation alone is not enough to preserve its position or even its freedom. Physical and inventive strength in its industrial structure, able to produce and deliver at all times all that is needed for the security and betterment of its people - that too is essential. And beyond that is demanded the will never to be content with the imperfect, always to be seeking improvement and increase in the ability to do every job well. Consequently, I am pleased to be here to witness a concrete evidence of the railroad industry's response to this twin necessity. For the Twentieth Century is more than merely a train. To America and to the world, it symbolizes the forward looking attitude, the daring, and the vision that have characterized our country and its people in all their undertakings.

Indeed it is a symbol of even a greater thing. It is a shining example of what can be accomplished by the partnership of ingenuity, brains, management, and labor when freely and voluntarily associated together for the accomplishment of a definite purpose. I earnestly believe that you see pictured here today the future of America.

Our security and our prosperity do not rest exclusively in the patriotism and intelligence and moral sturdiness of our people nor in any amount of armed might that we may mobilize. These must always be supplemented by industrial sufficiency and efficiency, and all must be bound together by the sense of partnership that springs from a common devotion to the nation and a common realization that only what is good for the United States as a whole can possibly be good for any individual or group of citizens within the nation.

I am proud to pay a soldier's tribute to the men and women - all of them - in the industry that made possible the new Twentieth Century. Their accomplishment in this one field typifies what we can do throughout the length and breadth of this great land - what we will certainly do so long as we combine, by intelligent cooperation, our entire array of human and material assets to the benefit of America.

• Talk at the Jewish Theological Seminary, September 27, 1948

The gap between an ordinary citizen of the United States, a man who has spent his life in the service of arms, and one who today receives an honorary degree from your institution seems tremendous. But it occurs to me that the difference is actually not great.

The United States Army fights to defend our way of life and its freedoms, among the principal of which is freedom for each of us to worship God in his own way. That way of life is described by the words "Western democracy and American democracy." We know exactly what we mean by these terms and an essential foundation stone of our philosophy is an indestructible faith in the freedom of the human soul.

I can see no reason why we ourselves, if we believe - as the dictators would have us - that men are merely animals, should defend equal rights for each other before the law. But we believe that because men have each been born with a soul they have inalienable rights and none can take them away. These rights can never be destroyed. That belief came from the ancient Jewish leaders. They taught and gave their lives in this belief.

They taught us that although man is made of the dust of the earth, having had the breath of life breathed

into him, he is a living soul. On this belief is based the doctrines that the American Army fought to defend. In this sense all the free world is the seed of Abraham, Moses and the ancient kings.

This is the oneness that came to us and that was taught in our spiritual heritage. We learned this philosophy at our mothers' knees. Therefore, I believe that any American can come to this Seminary with pride and a sense of kinship.

In my latest association, with old Columbia on the Hill, I have joined the men who are your faculties, your trustees, your officers and students, in the field that holds the future of our system. As I see it, the true purpose of an educational institution here today in this country is to make certain that each of us is equipped to be a citizen in a democracy, and to perform his duties voluntarily. I think that this objective is the true job of the schools.

In my own definition of Americanism I should like to see this come about:

Admitting the need for theological seminaries, such as this, for teaching theological doctrines, and the necessity for giving this education to teachers, we must grant their right to designate themselves, as in this instance, "Jewish." But my hope is that in the future development of this country, except for some such limited use as this, the day will come when in speaking of an American there will be no reason for applying a qualitative adjective of any kind.

• Speech at the Newspaperboy Thrift Club meeting, Convention Hall, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania October 1, 1948

Hello, boys. Of course I am proud to be with you tonight. I lived for 37 years of my life with soldiers and possibly I grew to admire more than most of us the qualities of courage, initiative and self-dependence. And that is what the newspaperboys of America show. They are asking no favors. They say, "Give me a chance and I will take care of myself."

I could not have had an award that would please me more than this token from the newspaperboys of Philadelphia. But I must get myself straight in front of you. My newspaper-carrying experience was in the Spanish-American War, long before any of you were born. My family and my neighbors were very much interested in what was going on in the Philippines and when we won the Battle of Manila Bay under Admiral Dewey it was my job to get to the Abilene Reflector every day and get the latest edition to them as fast as I could. According to reports, I did a pretty good job, too.

Now there is an element about this party that I want to talk about tonight and that is the thrift part.

You fellows, in your job of delivering newspapers, must have had a chance to read in them a lot about a class or group of men called capitalists. Often they are referred to in terms of anything but respect. They are called anything but gentlemen. In fact, they are called the source of all our evils.

But now you are capitalists. You have exercised the right of a free American citizen to save a portion of what he has acquired by his own efforts and put it aside for a rainy day or possibly for your schooling or a bicycle - what difference does it make? You are a capitalist the second that you save any money.

Now because of that I congratulate you fellows heartily, for to my mind a capitalist, far from being someone to condemn, in this country is one who by his own efforts in the past has made it possible for this country to be what it is today. The accumulated savings of this nation by investment and reinvestment have established these great newspapers that you boys carry to your clients and have given you a chance for a job.

You read a lot about people who say, "Why have property? Let the government have it. Then they will take care of us all when we are old."

Now men, here is something to remember. There is a bunch of rights and privileges that you enjoy that they do not have in some nations. One is the right to talk and say what you please as long as you tell the truth; to go to the church or to the school you please; to work at it as long as you please, and if you don't like it to quit when you please. And no one can stop you.

Now remember this. All of these rights are like a great stone arch. Remove one and all the rest fall. When you do not have the right to save money like you are doing, you are going to have no right to speak as you please, to worship as you please, to go to the school you please. Indeed, you will do as you are told.

The people that forget the value of these rights forget what American initiative, courage and resourcefulness have done.

Let me tell you just one little story of the war.

When we landed in Normandy we got into some very bad country where breaking out looked almost like an impossibility. One of the troubles was the great hedgerows of that section of Normandy. The fields were divided into such small patches that this auditorium would make three or four fields.

Therefore, when our tanks tried to go over them they bellied up. A machine gun could pierce the under side of them. The guns of the tanks were pointed at the moon and we were losing men by the score.

Then there was a man named Sergeant Culin, an enlisted man in an ordnance company. He had an idea and he went with it to his captain and his captain rushed to the general and the general rushed to General Bradley and General Bradley rushed to me. Then we all rushed to the sergeant.

His idea was to fix a couple of big pieces of steel. When he fixed these pieces of steel, made into knives, in front of the treads of the tank, it walked right through the banks. We not only went through on the level with our guns firing but we carried a part of the hedge as camouflage. That was a little bit better than ever.

But someone said, “Where are you going to get all this steel?” He said, “That’s easy. The Germans put a lot of it on the beaches to keep us from getting ashore. We will just take the Germans’ steel.”

Now that sergeant contributed more with his idea to win the battle of Normandy than any other single operating person I can think of.

And boys, I ask you this. In what country in the world would there be the enlisted man who would have the initiative, the ingenuity, the resourcefulness to think of the idea and above all have the courage, the upstanding self-confidence to come forward and present his idea and win a great battle?

In my opinion, that courage, that resourcefulness, that ingenuity is present here tonight in full measure; demonstrated by each one of you who is ready to take on his shoulders responsibility for helping himself and his family and, above all, ready to use that resourcefulness, that each one of you has, in defense of and for the promotion of the welfare of this great country, the greatest on earth.

You are not only citizens, the future leaders and guiders of this great country, but you are our great hope. We hope you will do better than we did and you have a great start to do it.

• Inaugural Address, Columbia University, October 12, 1948

Never in her long history has any honor come to Columbia grater than that accorded to her by this gathering of friends. No other testimony could more convincingly demonstrate universal respect for this school as a fruitful agent in the promotion of human knowledge and human welfare. Among you are men and women from the learned professions, from the offices of management and finance, from labor unions, from the machines of factories, from the shops of small towns, from the farms and the plain homes of America,. No school, narrow in its outlook, fearful of the new, bogged down in sterile allegiance to the past, could provoke such a diverse assembly as is this.

Columbia welcomes you and will record with lasting pride the tribute of your presence.

I feel a sense of high personal distinction that I am privileged to participate in this ceremony. If this were a land where the military profession is a weapon of tyranny or aggression - its members an elite caste dedicated to its own perpetuation - a life-long soldier could hardly assume my present role. But in our nation the army is the servant of the people, designed and trained exclusively to protect our way of life. Duty in its ranks is an exercise of citizenship. Hence, among us, the soldier who becomes an educator or the teacher who becomes a soldier enters no foreign field but finds himself instead engaged in a new phase of his fundamental life purpose - the protection and perpetuation of basic human freedom.

Today’s challenge to freedom and to every free institution is such that none of us dares stand alone. For human freedom is today threatened by regimented statism. The threat is infinitely more specific than that involved in mere adherence to opposing ideologies. Men of widely divergent views in our own country live in peace together because they share certain common aspirations with are more important to them than their differences. But democracy and the police state have no common purposes, methods, or aspirations. In today’s

struggle, no free man, no free institution can be neutral. All must be joined in a common profession - that of democratic citizenship; every institution within our national structure must contribute to the advancement of this profession.

The common responsibility of all Americans is to become effective, helpful participants in a way of life that blends and harmonizes the fiercely competitive demands of the individual and of society. The individual must be free, able to develop to the utmost of his ability, employing all opportunities that confront him for his own and his family's welfare; otherwise he is merely a cog in a machine. The society must be stable, assured against violent upheaval and revolution; otherwise it is nothing but a temporary truce with chaos. But freedom for the individual must never degenerate into the brutish struggle for survival that we call barbarism. Neither must the stability of society ever degenerate into the enchained servitude of the masses that we call statism.

Only when each individual, while seeking to develop his own talents and further his own good, at the same time protects his fellows against injury and cooperates with them for the common betterment - only then is the fullness of orderly, civilized life possible to the millions of men who live within a free nation.

The citizenship, which enables us to enjoy this fullness, is our most priceless heritage. By our profession and wise use of it, we enjoy freedom of body, intellect, and spirit, and in addition material richness beyond the boast of Babylon. To insure its perpetuation and proper use is the first function of our educational system.

To blend, without coercion, the individual good and the common good is the essence of citizenship in a free country. This is truly an art whose principles must be learned. Like the other arts, perfection in its manifold details can never be attained. This makes it all the more necessary that its basic principles be understood in order that their application may keep pace with every change - natural, technological, social.

Democratic citizenship is concerned with the sum total of human relations. Here at home this includes the recognition of mutual dependence for liberty, livelihood and existence of more than 140 million human beings. Moreover, since we cannot isolate ourselves as a nation from the world, citizenship must be concerned too with the ceaseless impact of the globe's two billion humans upon one another, manifested in all the multitudinous acts and hopes and fears of humanity.

The educational system, therefore, can scarcely impose any logical limit upon its functions and responsibilities in preparing students for a life of social usefulness and individual satisfaction. The academic range must involve the entire material, intellectual, and spiritual aspects of life.

Underlying this structure of knowledge and understanding is one immediate, incontestable fact: Time and again, over the span of the last 700 years, it has been proved that those who know our way of life place upon one thing greater value than upon any other - and that priceless thing is individual liberty. This requires a system of self-government, which recognizes that every person possesses certain inalienable rights and that rules and regulations for the common good may be imposed only by the ultimate authority of the citizens themselves. This individual freedom is not the product of accident. To gain and retain it our forefathers have sacrificed material wealth, have undergone suffering, indeed have given life itself. So it is with us today.

But it is not enough merely to realize how freedom has been won. Essential also is it that we be ever alert to all threats to that freedom. Easy to recognize is the threat from without. Easy too is it to see the threat of those who advocate its destruction from within. Less easy is it to see the dangers that arise from our own failure to analyze and understand the implications of various economic, social and political movements among ourselves. Here is a definite task for the teacher.

Thus, one danger arises from too great a concentration of power in the hands of any individual or group: The power of concentrated finance, the power of selfish pressure groups, the power of any class organized in opposition to the whole - anyone of these, when allowed to dominate is fully capable of destroying individual freedom as is excessive power concentrated in the political head of the state.

The concentration of too much power in centralized government need not be the result of violent revolution or great upheaval. A paternalistic government can gradually destroy, by suffocation in the immediate advantage of subsidy, the will of a people to maintain a high degree of individual responsibility. And the abdication of individual responsibility is inevitably followed by further concentration of power in the state. Government ownership or control of property is not to be decried principally because of the historic inefficiency of governmental management of productive enterprises; its real threat rests in the fact that, if carried to the logical extreme, the final concentration of ownership in the hands of government gives to it, in all practical effects,

absolute power over our lives.

There are other internal dangers that require constant vigilance if they are to be avoided. If we permit extremes of wealth for a few and enduring poverty for many, we shall create social explosiveness and a demand for revolutionary change. If we do not eliminate selfish abuse of power by any one group, we can be certain that equally selfish retaliation by other groups will ensue. Never must we forget that ready cooperation in the solution of human problems is the only sure way to avoid forced governmental intervention.

All our cherished rights - the right of free speech, free worship, ownership of property, equality before the las - all of these are mutually dependent for their existence. Thus, when shallow critics denounce the profit motive inherent in our system of private enterprise, they ignore the fact that it is an economic support of every human right we possess and that without it, all rights would soon disappear. Their demagoguery, unless combatted by truth, can become as great a danger to freedom as exists in any other threat.

It was loss of unity through demagogic appeals to class selfishness, greed, and hate that Macaulay, the English historian, feared would lead to the extinction of our democratic form of government. More than ninety years ago he wrote of these fears to the American historian, H.S. Randall. In a letter of May 23, 1857, he said, "...when a society has entered on this downward progress, either civilization or liberty must perish. Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand; or your republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the Twentieth Century as the Roman Empire was in the Fifth; - with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and that your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions."

That day shall never come if in our educational system we help our students gain a true understanding of our society, of the need for balance between individual desires and the general welfare, and of the imperative requirement that every citizen participate intelligently and effectively in democratic affairs. The broadest possible citizen understanding and responsibility is as necessary in our complex society as was mere literacy before the industrial revolution. It follows, then that every institution built by free men, including great universities, must be first of all concerned with the preservation and further development of human freedom - despite any contrary philosophy, or force that may be pitted against it.

At all levels of education, we must be constantly watchful that our schools do not become so engrossed in techniques, great varieties of fractionalized courses, highly specialized knowledge, and the size of their physical plants as to forget the principal purpose of education itself - to prepare the student for an effective personal and social life in a free society. From the school at the crossroads to a university as great as Columbia, general education for citizenship must be the common and first purpose of them all.

I do not suggest less emphasis on pure research or on vocational or professional training; nor am I by any means suggesting that curricula should be reduced to the classical education of the nineteenth century. But I deeply believe that all of us must demand of our schools more emphasis on those fundamentals that make our free society what it is and that assure it boundless increase in the future if we comprehend and apply them.

Love of freedom, confidence in the efficacy of cooperative effort, optimism for the future, invincible conviction that the American way of life yields the greatest human values - to help the student build these attitudes not out of indoctrination but out of genuine understanding, may seem to some to be education in the obvious.

Of course, the reverse is true. There is a growing doubt among our people that democracy is able to cope with the social and economic trials that lie ahead. Among some is a stark fear that our way of life may succumb to the combined effects of creeping paralysis from within and aggressive assault from without.

Fear of the future with a concomitant sense of insecurity and doubt of the validity of fundamental principles is a terrible development in American life - almost incredible in the immediate aftermath of America's most magnificent physical and spiritual triumphs. Only by education in the apparently obvious can doubt and fear be resolved.

Here lies a heavy obligation on Columbia University and all her sister schools; unless such fear is banished from our thinking, the sequel will be either the heavy curse of tyrannical regimentation or the collapse of our democratic civilization in social anarchy.

Love of freedom, confidence in cooperative effort, optimism, faith in the American way will live so long as our schools loyally devote themselves to truly liberal education. To assign the university the mission of ever

strengthening the foundations of our culture is to ennoble the institution and confirm the vital importance of its service.

Historical failures in the application of democratic principles must be as earnestly studied as the most brilliant of democracy's triumphs. But underlying all must be the clear conviction that the principles themselves have timeless validity. Dependence by the country upon the schools for this vital service implies no infringement of academic freedom.

Indeed, academic freedom is nothing more than a specific application of the freedom inherent in the American way of life. It follows that to protect academic freedom, the teacher must support the entire free system which, among other things, guarantees freedom for all. The teacher's obligation to seek and speak the truth is further safeguarded by university custom and commitment.

There will be no administrative suppression or distortion of any subject that merits a place in this University's curricula. The facts of communism, for instance, shall be taught here - its ideological development, its political methods, its economic effects, its probably course in the future. The truth about communism is, today, an indispensable requirement is the true values of our democratic system are to be properly assessed. Ignorance of communism, fascism, or any other police-state philosophy is far more dangerous than ignorance of the most virulent disease.

Who among us can doubt the choice of future Americans, as between statism and freedom, if the truth concerning each be constantly held before their eyes? But if we, as adults, attempt to hide from the young the facts in this world struggle, not only will we be making a futile attempt to establish an intellectual "iron curtain" but we will arouse the lively suspicion that statism possesses virtues whose persuasive effect we fear.

The truth is what we need - the full truth. Except for those few who may be using the doctrine of communism as a vehicle to personal power, the people who, in our country, accept communism's propaganda for truth are the most ignorant of its aims and practices. Enlightenment is not only a defender of our institutions, it is an aggressive force for the defeat of false ideologies.

America was born in rebellion; and rebellion against wrong and injustice is imbedded in the American temper. But whatever change our rebels of the American past may have sought, they were quick to proclaim it openly and fearlessly, preaching it from the house-tops. We need their sort, and here at Columbia we shall strive to develop them - informed, intelligent rebels against ignorance and imperfection and prejudice. But because they have sought the truth and know it, they will be loyal to the American way, to the democracy within which we live. They will never tire of seeking its advancement, however viciously they may be attacked by those content with the status quo. Their loyalty will be enhanced by each day they spend at Columbia.

The American university does not operate in an unreal world of its own, concerned solely with the abstract, secluded from the worrisome problems of workaday living, insulated against contact with those other institutions which constitute our national structure. Just as the preservation of the American way demands a working partnership among all 146 million Americans, its continued development demands a working partnership between universities and all other free institutions.

The school, for example, that enjoys a partnership with the manufacturing industries and labor unions and mercantile establishments of its community is a better and more productive school in consequence of its non-academic associations. Its influence permeates the entire community and is multiplied many times over while the school itself, energized by the challenges and dynamism of community life, grows and broadens with each problem it helps surmount.

Together, the university and the community - the entire record of human experience at their call, able to apply academic, technical and practical knowledge to the problem, joined in voluntary cooperative effort - together they can analyze and evaluate and plan. By such partnership, it is not too much to hope that the university - losing none of its own freedom, but rather extending its academic horizons - will in time help develop a new freedom for America - freedom from industrial strife.

Partnership is the proof and product of unity. In a free democracy, unity is attained by our common approach to fundamental principles regardless of even shared differences with regard to details. A unified America is the greatest temporal power yet seen upon the earth - a power dedicated to the betterment and happiness of all mankind. Columbia shares in that dedication. Columbia University, like so many other, has been established and is voluntarily maintained and supported by free people. In no other environment could it in

the space of two centuries have attained an international stature as a home of learning and research.

Columbia University, consequently, an independent gift-supported institution, free from political and sectarian obligation, will forever be bound by its loyalty to truth and the basic concepts of democratic freedom. It shall follow, then, that Columbia will always be characterized by:

First, an undergraduate body of men and women, schooled in the broad expanse of human knowledge and humble in their heritage - resolute that they shall pass both on with some increase. From among them will come scholars, executives, statesmen. But Columbia shall count it failure, whatever their success, if they are not all their lives a leaven of better citizenship.

Second, Columbia will be characterized by: a graduate body of men and women who, each in his own field, shall advance frontiers of knowledge and use the techniques of science in the service of humanity. From among them will come skilled surgeons, engineers, lawyers, teachers, and administrators, great leaders in every profession and science. But again, we shall count it failure, if they, by specialization, become blinded to human values and so ignore their fundamental duty as citizens.

Third, Columbia University will be: a dynamic institution as a whole, dedicated to learning and research and to effective cooperation with all other free institutions which will aid in the preservation and strengthening of human dignity and happiness. Our way of life and our university are the flowering of centuries of effort and thought. Men of the ancient world - in Jerusalem and Athens and Rome; men of all epochs, all regions, and all faiths have contributed to the ideals and ideas that animate our thinking. Columbia University is, and shall continue, both heir of that past and a pioneer in its future increase.

My personal dedication is, in the manner of my illustrious predecessors - who in late years have included Seth Low, Nicholas Murray Butler, Frank Fackenthal - to devote my energies to the support of Columbia's able and distinguished faculty, in the service of America, in the service of all humanity.

Interpolation

Ladies and gentlemen: As I say those words my heart is torn with doubt that they can convey anything of the intensity of my feelings. As I look over this gathering and see hundreds of old personal friends, the man who in the Army and in the armed services and civilian life have stood by my side through the years, members of my family, and all these thousands, who are friends of Columbia, I want my first act as the officially installed president of this institution to be to extend to all of you on the part of all the officers and students and trustees and myself, a very hearty thank you.

• Dedication of Hudson River site, Riverdale Country School, October 16, 1948

I have been assigned the title, the subject, Education for Peace. It would seem scarcely possible to pack into a three word title words that meant more to us today, the two, education and peace.

Some of the time has gone by when it is no longer necessary to argue the need for peace, the compelling necessity that the world finds ways to settle its problems through peaceful means. I think already we have been sufficiently impressed with the picture of desolation and destruction and decay that would follow upon any global war being carried to that extent that one side, through almost complete destruction, would have to acknowledge defeat. Certainly, there could be no victor in the traditional sense of that word; military victory could scarcely mean any more than the mere negative assurance that some outside force would not instantly overrun it but there is one phase of the matter that I should like to emphasize just a bit from the standpoint of a country so great and so powerful as is the United States.

The Secure Forces are maintained to defend a way of life and not merely to defend property or even homes or even lives, to defend a system of government that is based upon the dignity of man and his inalienable freedoms, based truly in the conviction that man is created in the image of his God. Now, that system needs a certain fundamental foundation stone on which to rest. Among them, and I'm not going to try to enumerate all of them, but among them is a system of free enterprise. That is the economic base for all our other freedoms. If that economic freedom disappears, all our other freedoms are bound to follow in its path. Now then, if we

should assume that we have won the war, how much longer would it be possible for us to maintain the economic system that we how have; therefore, how long could we maintain our freedoms? And indeed why did we fight the war in the first place, because we have fallen prey then to the very system that we set ourselves to oppose.

So, dismissing the whole idea of the compelling need for peace with that one single observation, which I have not seen often impressed upon us, let us go to the field of education and what it might be in furtherance of this great purpose, this great objective. Manifestly, I am not going to attempt any philosophical address on such a subject. It is as broad as the world, as the universe, and certainly I am not the type of scholar to tackle a philosophical discussion of such a great subject. But there are two or three specific elements in the problem that I believe we can all see if we merely remind ourselves of them.

First, I believe there's a misconception that we often fall prey to in listening or to studying this subject. Someone will say "Nationalism versus internationalism." I think it is a misconception to believe that there is any conflict between these two ideas. On the contrary, I would urge every boy in this school who comes from another country to defy anyone who tells him he should not love his country, that he should not be devoted to its traditions, its cultures, indeed to his friends and his relatives throughout that country.

The only thing that is necessary is to understand that no nation can longer live alone at peace. There is no nation that, even in the materialistic sources of the world, is sufficiently wealthy and sufficiently endowed that it can live alone. It must, perforce, in order to live alone, live with others. Therefore, I simply urge that in our love of country, in our patriotic devotion to it, we see that there are international connections and international impacts that force us, if we are going to live prosperously, happily and at peace, to attempt to apply the golden rule to that great problem. And I believe it is just that simple. If we attempt from our side or any other nation, to use the relationships with other countries merely for exploitation and for our own enrichment, then there will be no peace. We must recognize that, for good or for ill, the nations of the globe are put together and we must find ways and means of regulating, observing, watching, governing those relationships so that we are not again stupid enough and silly enough to resort to the arbiter of war for settling the dispute. So, the point that I must make is this: that a greater patriot today is the man who is most assiduously pursuing every type of action that he can think of to create understanding among our own people and among others in order that we will do a job, by necessity, even if we didn't start out with the initial desire.

And now there is another misconception. Because we believe in this country that our nationalistic purposes are pure, we are very apt to fall into the great error of thinking of people either as black or white, and I am speaking in a spiritual or a moral sense. Either we have wholly good motives or we have wholly bad motives. Each of you boys and girls that is being educated in this school is certain to be a leader in some field of activity, in your home, in your community, in some branch of the professions or of the services of some type. By the very fact that you are educated above the average, more able to comprehend and more able to express the comprehension you gain, you are certain to be leaders. Now, here is one thing a leader may never forget. Every human in the world is made up of two parts. On the one side are those nobler virtues that we refer to as courage, the spirit of self-sacrifice, loyalty, gallantry, all of that type of characteristic; and on the other side and inescapably, each man and woman is the center of the universe, he must be and is compelled to be that center because all the world is known to him only by its reactions upon him and, therefore, he is also a selfish human being.

Now, the problem is this. How to relate self-interest to the great and magnificent purpose we are trying to achieve. How we can sublimate or diminish the influence of these reckless characteristics, these more ignoble characteristics of selfishness, "get what I can, while I can" and I must be careful about my use of language, but anyway, "never mind about the others, just get what I can." What I am trying to get over is that you must expect no one to be a saint and you must not expect that anyone outside, I believe it was Shakespeare who said, "is totally and completely without some nobler virtue that he is ready to exercise if properly appealed to and properly led." So, the problem then in peace is to get these nobler virtues in control and, above all things, to show each of us, each as an individual as well as a nation, that our own self interest is served by producing a peaceful solution for our world's problems.

I believe that people in education today see the importance of this problem; I liken them somewhat to the infantry in war. Wars are won, or have been in the past – let's talk about no future one - they are won by a great

variety of activity. First of all, you must have the unified influence of a nation, industry, its moral strength, everything must be behind the effort. But when you get on the battlefield, you have bombs and you have artillery and you have tanks and you have a thousand things to use, but the victory is clinched only when the infantry moves in, takes charge of a place, and say there will be no more opposition in this region and then they turn and say to their government, “Here we are, now when can we go home.”

In the drive for peace, just like winning a victory in war, the attack must be on a very broad front. Everything must be used. You have your spectacular artillery, possibly in the form of ECA, and you have the United Nations, another weapon that we may use, but no matter how successful all of these are, the problem finally comes back to the men and women of the world, and among those, the educated men and women must take the lead. They’re the only ones that can clinch the victory because they bring home to each of us that wars are started inside each one of us, not merely by some wicked person or some wicked nation elsewhere. They are started within us and I don’t mean merely us sitting here today, I mean the individuals of the world. We have got to find a way to bring home to each of us the individual responsibilities we bear.

Now, I would not like to leave this platform under any misconception. I believe, and thoroughly believe, that those nations living today in what we call the free sectors of the globe are desperately anxious for peace, and I believe that the measures they are proposing are certainly, by and large, practical as well as we are certain that they are morally decent. I believe those efforts are being defeated by a group of men whose primary consideration is personal power - one of the things that has always wrecked peaceful effort in this world - but I also believe that because a man is fallible, man is human and he has a limited time upon this earth, that that condition cannot always endure. I believe that the mass might of an educated world population will finally defeat every effort of that kind, and we can defeat that group. The great problem is to defeat it before they can bring again a catastrophe upon the world, and our greatest hope - certainly our greatest hope for final victory - is in schools and it is therefore particularly encouraging and inspiring to see that a school such as Riverdale is not merely tackling the problem in the terms of generality and principle, but is trying to get down to cases, put us here together almost as a little League of Nations ourselves, and get right down to the problems. I congratulate the man whoever thought of the idea, I congratulate everybody here who has done his part by his support in making the scheme a practical one and putting it on the material road to success, and it is certainly on the spiritual road to success. Thank you very much.

• Address at the Sales Executive Club luncheon, New York City, October 21, 1948

Naturally, I am touched by the spirit that prompted the presenting to me of such a gift, just as I am touched by the overgenerous and flattering remarks of both your chairman and of your principal speaker. Incidentally, I should say, with respect to the personal tale told about me by Mr. Williams and which is largely true, that he forgot the final and, to my mind, the most ridiculous part of the whole story, which was, that when the Major finally oriented me with respect to my own office, I was standing ten feet from my front door.

Once, in Africa, in the very early days and before the Allies had achieved that preponderance of force which finally brought our great victory in that region, I was making a night inspection of the front. I was accompanied only by an aid, Tex Lee and a staff officer of the front-line unit, Red Akers, who were conducting me through a very long tour along that continuous battle-front extending southward through the mountains of Tunisia. And during this trip, we finally came back somewhere along about three in the morning on a road which presented to us our only route back toward our headquarters and some firing broke out in front of us. Well, this caused great consternation and particularly among those two staff officers who has the chief “brass hat” in their care and who felt a very deep sense of responsibility. They stepped outside - one of them out of his jeep, the other out of the car with me. They had a hurried conference and the remark that came to me read, “What in the hell are we doing here, anyhow?”

Now, ladies and gentlemen, if I should have to list the subjects in this world upon which I should have to confess to a very dismal and abiding ignorance, I think two topics that I would have to place high on the list would be salesmanship and economics. And so, the question arises, why am I here, I think that a similar question could be posed – “why am I a college president?” And I assume that among my distinguished

associates in that profession here today, probably that question is more acute than it is with most of us.

One answer that I bring forward in my own defense is this, for both of these positions, these questions of positions - I am convinced that what we need today among us far more than a further education in the obscure, in refined research, even in the fields of basic science and so on, is education in the obvious and I believe in attempting to bring home such a lesson as that with respect to our future in this country. There is a service to be performed because, and, associating you instantly with the effort, I believe that when you sell me an automobile, or a tire, or a refrigerator, or a service, or anything else, you are not merely selling that article, although it may be the best in the world. You are selling a production of America and more than that, a part of America.

To the public, the profits of our system are in a peculiarly advantageous position to keep before us all the obvious things that we hold and must never forsake. I certainly subscribe, if we will omit his early and flattering remarks to myself, I subscribe wholeheartedly to what our speaker of the day has said and you will note that he referred several times to our system that is based upon the concept that each of us is an individual of dignity with inalienable rights but what has not been stressed is this - that we have so long enjoyed them, we have inherited them from our fathers, that we forget just how valuable those things are to us. The English-speaking race has certainly proven time and again and more particularly since 1215 and Runnymede, that the one thing for which it will sacrifice everything, including its life, is its freedoms. So those freedoms become almost the very reason for which we exist - to enjoy them and to pass them on unalloyed to our children and to our grandchildren. In connection with that thought, we frequently hear this expression - some, let me use the word “mountebank” is constantly saying to us because we believe in a system of competitive or free enterprise as an essential of our system, that we are upholding property rights as against human rights. I believe that is entirely a false view. A property right is merely one of the human rights and if it is not sustained, all the others will disappear. It seems to me that if we can conceive of a state where the title to all property, to everything that is necessary for the sustenance of the human race can pass into the hands of a government, an oligarchy, any kind of centralized organization, that eventually we must face the fact that that government must, of necessity, direct us by order as to what we shall do. There will be complete regimentation, in other words, dictatorship and there is no escape from that concept.

Therefore, I believe that every businessman who is doing his best to bring the products of our country home to our people should never forget that he is bringing to them a part of a system, a system that is condemned sometimes because it has what our speaker called, “boom and bust.” That is held up as a condemnation of the whole democratic, capitalistic system that we had 11 million people out of work at one moment in the early thirties. But, gentlemen, they were not working in the salt mines and they were not working under the whip and the bayonet. When any kind of dictatorship that has ever existed on the earth found problems involving humans who showed weakness or recalcitrance, the answer has been to cure the problems with the sword - all that has not been democracy’s method. And so, as you go out, I believe that you can cooperate with every educational system, every church, every kind of institution that directs itself more specifically to the spiritual and intellectual side of this problem, you come along in your own sphere, equally important and prove to the world that free democracy can and shall exist on this continent.

• Notes for Association of National Advertisers, New York City, October 26, 1948

We who follow the American way of life today number more than 146 million human beings. In our livelihoods, our attitudes, our national temper, we reflect the physical diversity of a vast continent and all the human deviations of mankind itself.

Nevertheless, from the Atlantic coast to the islands of the central Pacific and from the Aleutians to the Caribbean, in spite of infinite variety, we constitute one united society. Our unity, not imposed by a despotic government, not enforced by arms, not entrenched in the ignorance of fanaticism, is founded on a spiritual conviction.

We believe in the dignity of the human individual and his possession of inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Our government - the political expression of the American way - exists only to

assure each of us the fullest enjoyment of those rights compatible with their just exercise by our fellows.

Because the individual among us thereby has been free to exploit his talents and his opportunities, spurred by the challenges of competition, able to retain his earned profit, protected against arbitrary government interference by our system of free enterprise, we have progressed as a nation beyond all others in material things.

At the same time, because our underlying faith in the dignity of man has been stronger than the lure of gold or the lust of power, we have striven to liberate all men from the shackles of disease, poverty, ignorance and serfdom of every sort.

Whenever the contest has been between profits and humanity, between business-as-usual and even the most bitter struggle on behalf of human rights, the American people have always placed their ideals before their dollars and even their own lives.

Our national strength - product of competitive enterprise and spiritual unity - was never more manifest than in World War II. On the day of the German surrender, the millions of Americans whom I had the privilege to command constituted the mightiest fighting machine of history. Yet they were only one element in a global array armed and manned by our people for the defense of human freedom.

In that war we proved one principle beyond question - an aroused, united America is the most powerful force in the world today.

Despite that truth, millions of Americans are now fearful of the future. Their fear is rooted in ignorance of our system's enduring worth and fruitfulness. Such ignorance and fear corrupt unity and spawn dictatorial regimentation. To banish fear and to replace it with the knowledge required for confident, productive citizenship is a major task for our schools.

But the school, as of now, is only a part-time venture for part of our people. Even for those of school age, what is taught in the classroom and lecture hall can be undone and nullified in the hours away from school.

There is another force in American life which must be rallied to the extension of knowledge about our system, the building of confidence in our way of life, the strengthening of our unity. You, the advertisers and advertising men of the United States, represent that force.

Through newspapers and magazines, billboards, radio, television and all the other media of your profession, advertising has the eyes and ears of America. No other group possesses tools and techniques with so great an impact on public opinion and attitudes as you.

You have used them to raise the material and physical standards of American life far above the level of the most Utopian dreamer a few generations back. You have built a consumer demand for your products that is the fuel of our mass-produced economy.

But what is the ultimate profit if you double and triple your sales and at the same time the way of life that sustains your freedom to advertise and sell and produce becomes the victim of its internal and external enemies?

Self-interest and patriotism both demand that the talents you possess must be devoted in a certain measure to selling knowledge of this country and its freedoms. Otherwise you may not long be free to sell your products in a free marker.

What methods you should adopt, what techniques you should use, are technical matters on which I must not presume to advise you. One word of counsel, however, I would give you.

Shun the selfish!

All Americans are bound by the self-interest that is inherent in a common citizenship. But this can be lost to sight in appeals to group selfishness. Undoubtedly, we as a people are separated into groups by business or profession or even geographical location. We belong to groups whose necessity and whose worth in the economy has been proved - stock exchanges, granges, labor unions, associations of all sorts. But if you become labeled as a mouthpiece for one set of groups to the exclusion of others, your influence is divisive instead of constructive.

Seek instead to present the common ground on which all groups, loyal to our way of life, stand; tell the facts of our freedoms. The truth about America is the most cogent argument for the American way.

You, above all others, have the means to tell it.

• Address at 180th anniversary dinner of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, Waldorf-Astoria, November 3, 1948

It is quite natural, I think that I should experience a feeling of distinction, almost a glow, under the impact of the laudatory remarks of Mr. Aldrich. Yet I must confess to you that there is at least one passage I would far rather he would have omitted from his talk, and that is when he described me as an orator.

Shortly after I came to New York last May, I had the very great honor of meeting with this Camber and being permitted to address it. In later days, in thinking over that occasion, there was one very satisfying reaction that came to me. I thought that here in the Chamber I have met representatives of every possible profession, industry and activity in New York City, and therefore it seemed reasonable to assume that my speaking engagements in New York were begun and terminated on the same day.

In the months since that time I have found I was mistaken, and now tonight I seem to be starting on the second round. I suppose that up at the college they would say that I failed in the first course and I would have to take it over again. But there are certain points of advantage about this particular circumstance. The first of these, of course, is that I am permitted to renew acquaintanceships that I formed on that earlier occasion and which to me are very valuable personally; secondly, because I once appeared before the Chamber, I assume that any second address can lean solely upon brevity for its wit; and, thirdly, I have made the assumption that many of you were, like myself, stubborn enough to stay alongside your radio and television set last night instead of going to bed as you should have and, also like myself, have had no opportunity today to catch up on the lost sleep. Therefore you are looking forward to an early meeting with the downy couch as a very pleasant prospect.

But in this meeting with you gentlemen and in the other meetings I have had in New York, I have well realized that for me, in my new position as the administrative head of a great university in the heart of this city, there are great advantages because Columbia is definitely and distinctly a part of this metropolitan body.

After the First World War, New York became inevitably the financial center of the world. With the establishment here of the United Nations - certainly due in no small part to the great and public-spirited attitude of your member Mr. Rockefeller - New York has become the political capital of the world. In the same way, I believe that New York is and should be the educational capital of the world.

We have seen many examples, particularly in late years, of what unity, unified effort, will accomplish. We saw not only the effect of unity among allies in the recent war, but we know from our own experience what the combined effort of the farmer, the miner, the industrialist, the banker, the soldier, the sailor, the airman, did. It produced on the Western Front the mightiest military force the world has ever seen, at one and the same time that that same notion was providing in the Western Pacific a force mighty enough to drive a great and proud empire to its knees.

There is no limit to what a unified America can do. Now, in the same way here in New York City, with respect to this body and to New York's educational institutions, of which Columbia, of course, is only a part - to me, certainly, an most important part - think what we can do through unified effort. Certainly the university has much to offer to every industry that is engaged in mining, that has anything to do with the preservation of our soil, anything to do with lumbering and the agricultural industries, and to anyone engaged in the professions. There in the university is the great source of research, a word that we no longer apply merely to activity in the dusty closets in which long-haired professors are supposed to work, but we recognize research as a definite commercial asset in our business.

Therefore, the community of interest between Columbia and the other universities here and the businessmen, the industrialists of this City, is something that not only should be recognized by all, but it is of immediate advantage both to the industrialists and likewise, of course, to the university which in its own turn profits from the necessity of surmounting the problems of practical, everyday affairs and of everyday business. But more than this, the university exists to prepare the future American to discharge his duties in this great republic.

Now, I submit that every one of us is vitally interested in this process, because, after all, we are not proud of our particular corporations, no matter what they may be, or our particular professions, merely because they yield to each of us a good living. We realize that there is something of the spirit that each of us values in the last

final crisis, the last final analysis, far more than any amount of material wealth or any amount, any degree of human comfort and convenience.

The freedom that we possess, our right to express ourselves as human beings, to walk in dignified demeanor wherever we may please in this country is, after all, the most precious thing that we own. It is a spiritual rather than a material heritage. One of the functions of the university is to preserve that spiritual heritage, and you yourselves, for the sake of yourself today and your descendants to come after you, are equally concerned. If we reach, through these universities and through these schools, through the medium of the leaders, the teachers that we send out from these great institutions, then we know that in the long run there is constantly growing up a solid wall of defense against all imported “isms” of every kind that can possibly damage this great thing that the English-speaking races have proved to be more valuable to us than any material wealth, even than life itself.

Up on Morningside Heights is a great array of public service institutions, churches, various types of buildings for public service, some of them serving international purposes, great schools, theological seminaries, and so on. To my mind that place will never reach fruition until it is recognized both spiritually and physically as the world’s modern forum of education. For as the Roman Forum typified the ultimate in poser in the political world of twenty-three hundred years ago, Morningside Heights can typify progress in education and culture in this country and in the world. The basis of all this is a sound-thinking, highly qualified, great faculty, and I assure you, gentlemen, it is there. The men of that faculty are the organism through which resources of various kinds are translated into the spiritual and intellectual materials that our young need. I know that we often refer rather loosely to our colleges as centers of these very “isms” we are determined to combat.

Now, gentlemen, whenever groups of young men are concentrated any place, there are bound to be radicals, and how fortunate it is that the young are radical.

After all, how was this country founded? Alexander Hamilton, in King’s College, was making political addresses at seventeen years of age, and in what respect do you suppose that the loyal subjects of King George III held an institution that would permit such terrific types of propaganda to be propagated?

It is fortunate for us that the young do rebel against custom and routine, and let us not only tolerate it; let us encourage the intelligent rebel who will never be satisfied with disease, with failures, with whatever he can see or believe, even, to be bad. After all, I remember as a young lad they gave me a book and I became a very ardent believer in the law of supply and demand, and sometimes I think that is radical today.

And I certainly remember that I argued once long and very heatedly in favor of free trade, only to have an old business friend of mine say to me, “Son, I never saw a boy yet that graduated from high school that wasn’t a great free trader, but after he had been making a living for a year or two he was a radical and ardent protectionist.”

Let us encourage radicalism as long as it seeks betterment. We want to be sure only that the things that these young people imbibe from their elders who are serving as their mentors, through the formative years of their lives, comprehend what we in this country have, how we have gained it, and what we must do to perpetuate it.

And I should like to stand here and testify that in the months I have been on Morningside Heights I have met a group of men so devoted to the American system, to our rights and privileges, to the perpetuation of the American freedoms, that I can recall in all my experience no other body that has held these convictions more firmly or expressed them more eloquently. I do not mean to say that there cannot be in any body somebody who holds views that you and I would consider somewhat queer. Possibly each of us holds such views with respect to all the others occasionally. But by and large, I should like to tell you that there is no finer body of humans existing with whom I have any acquaintance than the great body that composes the faculty on Morningside Heights.

It is that kind of body that I feel can profit immeasurably from intimate association with you people - not only at a business luncheon. I should like to see that association one of friendships on the golf course, of social life, where you can find out and become convinced what great things they are going for you and your children, and, moreover, and above all, what they are doing for this country. I should like for them to realize that you have the identical problem. You are translating it to all the country every day through the processes of your businesses, because you are exercising one of the greatest of all human rights, that of property, as you dispose

of your services or your materials to the consuming body which you have built up through great advertising agencies. All of this you can do only because we live in a country where we still have freedom and liberty.

I sometimes feel like apologizing for invariably getting onto the subject of the freedoms of this country and the necessity for each of us taking thought unto himself as to what he may do to preserve them. And certainly I do not want to become maudlin in attempting to express my view toward this subject. But after all, gentlemen, you sent to me your brothers and your sons and your friends, and you told them to do a job, and they did it, and they dared not count the cost they might have to pay; and finally, for many of them, far too many, it meant the ultimate cost. Now, the thing for which they fought and many of them laid down their lives, is not yet won. Today it is in more deadly danger, in my humble opinion, than it was in 1941, and I honestly believe that unless all of us take every opportunity on the community level, the state level, the national level, indeed possibly on the family level, to cooperate, each with the other, for carrying on the work in which they did their part so well, then we are failing in our duty as citizens.

And moreover, I have this great faith and confidence: there are very, very few Americans - certainly, I myself know none of them - who, understanding this problem and what we are up against, will not do their best. The only failure is that we do not realize how important the matter is, how critical the danger, and consequently fail to saddle on our own shoulders part of the responsibility for executing it.

That, to my mind, is the function of Columbia which can never be fully realized unless we are an intimate family part of this great city, the city that is represented right here this evening.

I believe that as you will go up to Morningside to see us, as we get opportunities to come to see you, more and more there will grow in you the conviction that all that Columbia has done in the past, all the great benefits that the country has derived from its services, can still never equal what it still can do in view of the tremendous conflict that now engulfs the world, involving and based upon conflicting ideologies, because there is no single agency so important as the educational institution to combat and defeat, and defeat utterly, those false philosophies of dictatorship. There is no way in which the businesses that you people have brought to their present state of prosperity - and which you hope to see grow and prosper with the years - they can continue to do so, unless the understanding that the university can impart spreads to us all.

Gentlemen, I cannot tell you how honored I am by this invitation to meet with you. If in the days and months and years to come all of us, by working together, can promote the purpose, the ideas - I venture to call them ideals - that I have so feebly attempted to express and discuss, then indeed I will feel that my greatest service has begun after coming out of uniform. Thank you!

• Address at annual dinner of the New England Society in the City of New York, November 9, 1948

I think I have more than the normal appreciation for your wonderful address, Dr. Angell. I share with all the other guests the satisfaction in hearing such an entertaining and interesting discourse, but I have the additional very comfortable feeling that after a nine-course dinner like that it doesn’t matter whether the salad is rather wilty and even if it is skimpy in portions.

I cannot claim any eligibility for membership on either side of my family in the New England Society, but I hope that I shall regain some little atom of respect in your opinion when I tell you that my son on his mother’s side is an eligible since one of his ancestors far back came from Guilford in Southern England to settle in Connecticut.

This dinner which we are so fortunate to attend has now been repeated 143 times. It has, certainly, as time is measured in our country become a tradition.

Now, a tradition has this one peculiarity; we may fix with certainty its beginning but it has no ending - at least in our purpose. We hope that this dinner will be repeated time and time again on into the dim future beyond our own powers even to imagine.

Suppose we pause on the way about the year 2048. Certainly there must cross our minds the wonder or the question as to whether descendants of yours at that moment will meet with such eagerness, with a certain moral or a community of interests and spirit born of the same type of thing that inspires you to meet here. In other words, will they have the same pride in New England ancestry, will the things for which New England has

stood in American history, among the American people wherever they may be, will those things still be significant, will they be observed, will they be of value in our lives?

Now, I submit that they will be so, if we, each of us, and those of succeeding generations after us, operate in the same spirit as did those ancestors, and attempt to pass them on to those who shall come after.

Therefore, I think we must pause and say, what has New England meant to the United States as a whole.

Dr. Angell said that at least a part of the colonies was settled with the hope of establishing a theocratic state but I think that for most of us that historical fact may not be of great significance. What we do think of the New Englander is a man, first, of rugged integrity, a man of sturdiness, a man who dares, a man who is ready to pit all that he has, including his life, in order to gain for himself and his family those things which he considers valuable, even if among them there were a few who wanted to set up a particular type of state of which we no longer approve.

Their sturdy self-reliance, their independence, their readiness to work for what they got is the true source and inspiration, in my opinion, of our Constitution - although I was thoroughly intrigued, and I must say to Dr. Angell that I learned much this evening about some of the more immediate sources of inspiration for this Constitution.

We look about us today and say, oh, it is very well to talk about passing on those qualities, this type of appreciation, but as we look about us, can we discover anything that we believe may be evidence of a change in our thinking?

I should like to ask each of you as you talk to your young high school sons or your sons and daughters of college age what are the words you probably hear most when they start talking about their future. If your experience is anything similar to mine, I hear far too much of individual security. Rarely do I hear the words, opportunity, a chance to work, a chance to prove himself and his place and his ability to serve mankind, and so because of that service advance himself.

These words, “individual security,” it seems to me at times is almost paradoxical the way we speak of it. If you want security, if anyone wants only security, it is the easiest thing in the world to get. All you have to do is to walk out in front of this hotel this evening and commit a serious crime, and you will be secure for the rest of your life. You may not wear the clothes your tailor would design for you, and the world may have a curious stripe-like appearance of a vertical character, but you will have enough to eat. You will be looked after. You will be secure.

So when they talk about security, they don’t really mean that. They really mean that they hope that something can be worked out so that as they go about their effort to be useful citizens of society, they don’t have to concern themselves too much with the system that is no longer completely individual, where each man is a self-dependent unit - operates a self-dependent unit like a farm or a small factory or a shop.

Because of the character of our civilization, the man himself becomes somewhat helpless. Above all, he does mean freedom to do as he pleases, because otherwise he would choose the penitentiary.

Therefore, one thing that we can do is to keep straight in the minds of those whom we may meet and influence that after all they are not thinking merely of security; they are thinking of the opportunity to exercise the freedoms that were established on this continent in no small part by those great colonists of New England.

Those freedoms are the most valuable things that we possess, the most valuable that we can ever possess. Time and again people who have enjoyed our way of life have proved their readiness to sacrifice everything, including life, for the preservation of those freedoms. Witness Nathan Hale, of whom Dr. Angell spoke so eloquently and feelingly.

So I believe that if succeeding generations can keep their sense of values in balance - if we can do that, I believe that every detail of our system, everything that happens to us politically, economically, and socially will be weighed in the balance of that ultimate objective, because, gentlemen, in any battle finally you must sort out all of the things that you should like to do into the one thing you must attain and then all the other things that you would like to attain. The one that we must attain in this battle is the preservation of our freedoms.

Every tendency, every trend toward the centralization of responsibility in our Federal Government carries with it a comparable, even though unseen, degree of centralized authority. It must be resisted. We must keep in our heads a sense of values that places individual freedom, the dignity of man above all else.

That is the thing that, if we can pass it on unsullied, undamaged, will keep us on the broad highway that

always leads to greater and greater freedom, and which will make the man of 2048 fully as proud, maybe even more so, to meet here as we are tonight. Thank you very much.

• Address to the Lawyers Club, 115 Broadway, New York, New York, November 17, 1948

Of course, I am highly honored by this singular mark of distinction. I assure you that the opportunity to come here from time to time, to meet with you, I hope sometimes probably less formally, is something to which I look forward with true and pleased anticipation.

Now, I confess that today, as I stand here, I am a victim of some terror. After all, I believe that lawyers are trained to examine every word that a man says, to look at his written record and decided exactly what is meant. Therefore, a person who is untrained in this art - if it can be called an art - of standing before his fellows does contemplate an audience of this kind with considerably less than egotistical satisfaction, let us say.

But on the other hand, I remember once I heard a venerable lawyer say that when your case is desperate, then is the time to talk. And I also understand that the more desperate the case, the more the talk.

Now, my experience in New York has led me to believe that those of my friends that have worried about my physical endurance, the capacity of my digestive organs and so on, has been just a little misplaced. I truly believe that the concern should be given to my vocal organs.

I am not going to be presumptuous enough to talk today about law; at least I am that wise. Certainly I am not going to talk about it in the philosophical or general sense. Perhaps, as I go along, and with your forbearance, I will mention a few incidents where I have come into contact with the law, possibly with lawyers' opinions, as to some of the things concerning which I have borne a responsibility or have had some kind of experience.

For example, I know that groups of lawyers in examining the legal procedures in the Army have believed that it would be very wise indeed to observe, in the Army and in the Armed Services in general, that great distinction that is made in our Governmental organization, of a division of power, a system of checks and balances that retains in the hands of those who are legally trained, and only in those, the eventual and final decision as to what shall be done about an offender in a particular offense that he may have committed against our Government.

Now, no one can, I believe, be more devoted, more sincere in his devotion to the idea of theoretical justice among a people, among whom a Government was set up, among other things, to insure justice. But I should like to call your attention to one fact about the Army, about the Armed Services: It was never set up to insure justice. It is set up as your servant, a servant of the civilian population of this country to do a particular job, to perform a particular function; and that function, in its successful performance, demands within the Army somewhat, almost of a violation of the very concepts upon which our Government is established.

Gentlemen, I should like to say that when a platoon has been directed, let us say, to capture a hill that is definitely defended by the enemy, the one thing that the people of that platoon - I don't mean the leader, the people, the individuals of that platoon demand is this: A leader who will demand and compel compliance by everybody. That is the antithesis of the system of government that we have been set up to observe, to believe in and which controls our actions from day to day.

Therefore, it is impossible to conceive of the Army as an institution that completely parallels our democracy all the way through. It is a group that is given a job, in emergency, conducted under conditions of the greatest terror, of the greatest kind of fright and privation at times, to do a particular job.

So this division of command responsibility and the responsibility for the adjudication of offenses and of accused offenders, cannot be as separate as it is in our own democratic government.

Somewhere along the line - and I don't care particularly where it is - but somewhere the man who makes the final decision must have also on his shoulders responsibility for winning a war; and please never forget that.

It may be in the Secretary of the War, it may be in the Secretary of the Army; but some place this independent judiciary in the Army must be in the line of responsibility because the whole purpose of discipline in war is merely to do the job that you people put on the men in uniform. And you cannot carry the analogy too far of the separation of command and policy-making and judicial functions in the Army with the similar

activities in our democratic form of government; it simply won't work.

So somewhere, and I repeat, along the line, the man that you hold responsible for the wining of the war must also be responsible for the supervision of the judicial system.

That does not mean that any act, judicial act, within the purview of the Army's authority be not subject to review finally by the properly constituted courts of civil America. Of course they are, like everything else the Army does; we are subject to the orders, the policies, the instructions, the regulations of civil authority.

But that review must be in timely and judicial fashion, and while the battle is going on there must be this responsibility and this authority going hand in hand.

I realize that possibly many of you have signed documents saying, showing how this thing should be done. And gentlemen, I will tell you this frankly, just as I presume to no authority in your field and to no credence, no validity or argument, I say there are certain things about the Armed Forces that I would ask you to come and see before you make too strong a recommendation about them.

I want to say another thing about the Army: The Army and the other Armed Services have not existed in this country merely to protect property, territory, or even national rights; not even merely your firesides and your families. The American Armed Forces have existed to protect a way of life.

There is no greater or more devoted servant to the theory that civil power under the dictation of the majority is supreme in all our land than are your Armed Forces.

There is no instance in all our history when any military or naval man has attempted to use a current power over an army to seize civil power in the manner that our history shows has been so often done in civilizations of the past, and in other countries. That has never been attempted.

And such instances will come to your attention, notably Aaron Burr, and so on. Never was there a soldier who, with his forces, headed such a thing. And it is the proudest boast of all of your men in the Armed Services that they are true servants to one thing only, the supremacy of civil power and their readiness to touch their hats and do their duty no matter what the circumstances and, moreover, no matter what the cost.

There is a law that has been recently passed which, to my mind, is of extraordinary interest to all of us. It is the so-called law of unification of the Armed Services.

If I may revert for an instant to my statement that the Armed Services live to protect a way of life, I might qualify it now to say that they exist to defend that way of life from threat, from without. But from all that may happen from within, you people bear the primary responsibility, as does every citizen.

Now if, in our anxiety to protect from this threat from without we allow our Armed Services to run riot in their demands upon our economy, we can find that our very effort to provide this security from without can eventually damage seriously and possibly destroy the very thing they are trying to protect, namely, not territory, not even lives, but a way of life.

Therefore, every one of us must watch with the utmost jealousy, the utmost concern everything that happened in Washington that is affecting this great problem, because the two curves of cost and of security finally cross somewhere that we say represents the apex of what we may legitimately support.

Now, in the unification of the Armed Services, the great purpose behind it is to achieve for us the maximum of security at the minimum of cost.

A start has been made, and I believe that no student of the whole development would claim more for that law and for the experience of the past some months that it is merely a start.

I believe that until we understand that security is the problem of all of us, the financier, the ordinary citizen in doing his work, the miner, the farmer - until we understand the term "Global War" in the terms of common responsibility as well as common threat to destruction, we are not going to look this thing squarely in the face. And if we look at this problem in that sense we will find that the Armed Services in war are merely the cutting edge of a great machine, the power for which comes all the way back to the remotest hamlet in the rear.

It is the united, spiritual, moral and material efforts of a nation that are necessary to win a way, and the Armed Services are merely the cutting edge of that great machine.

And in the exercise of the power that that cutting edge can accomplish, we learn this: There is no such thing as separate land, sea and air warfare; it is all one. And it must be considered as one if we are going to get at one and the same time the greatest efficiency and the greatest economy. And that means this: that the law - and now I should like parenthetically to remark that I will agree with all of you, the law can't do everything; we

had a proof in the 18th Amendment, I believe - but still, the law must provide the maximum possible and feasible power in the hands of a civilian; and I emphasize “civilian,” Secretary of National Defense responsible to the President for the preparing for and, in war, as his delegate in the execution of these great plans that must result in the safety, the protection of a way of life.

Until that law, in all its manifest details, is based upon the principle that we want this problem handled as a unit, you are not going to get the security that you are entitled to for the money you are expending. And it is my firm conviction that if you spend too much money for what you don’t need, then you are going to ruin, internally, the thing that you set up externally for your Armed Services to do.

Therefore, I say that every lawyer who, as I understand it, is among the most articulate of all our people, of all our types and professions - unless you look at that particular problem squarely in the face and use your influence to direct the certain - at least partial modifications of that law, and in the direction of putting in the hands of a civilian Secretary all the operational, strategic and administrative power that is necessary to assure true unification, you are damaging your own interests every day you do it.

It seems to be my fate that every time I get up in front of an audience, and I have thought of two or three funny stories before I get us, I forget them all and go into very serious matters. Perhaps it is because through the past some years I have been engaged in very, very serious business, and it has made such an imprint that all else seems to desert me except this earnest conviction that we have in this country the greatest single thing that any person in the world can possess; citizenship in a free country.

I believe if there is any problem, any common problem that disturbs all our people today it is the future of this system that we respect so highly because of its accomplishments in the past, and that now we see attacked from without violently, insistently; and we see it also subject to sort of a creeping paralysis from within, because among us are people who become, let us say, suffocated, possibly in subsidy, by something at least of immediate advantage, and forget that we must look ahead and see where we are headed.

With regard to the foreign threat, the greatest comfort I take out of the whole situation is this: Even those who advocate communism most vehemently, even those who profess to be its most emphatic supporters, must believe that a free system of government appeals to mankind, to the hearts and souls of men more than does their own; else why would they not be content to allow time to win for them?

They know that the system that they have does not appeal to men in comparison with our system, and therefore, every free system of government in the world must be under constant attack, they must use every possible means of creating, as someone expressed it, a high plateau of pretension, to keep the world upset, to keep our expenditures over and beyond what we think is almost bearable in order that through chaos they may succeed in establishing their system.

But they are unwilling to sit side by side with freedom and democracy in the world and allow the two to win on their merits.

And the greatest item of comfort that I can secure out of the whole situation is that they realize as well as we do, that the democracy, given time for the minds of men to absorb what we are talking about, will win.

We have in this country, in the united purposes of 140,000,000 people, the greatest temporal power there is or has yet been seen upon the earth, a power that could produce, in Central Europe on May 7th, 1945, the mightiest fighting force that has ever been known in the world. At the same time that the same nation almost single-handedly, without the support of great allies as it had in Europe, was defeating a great and arrogant empire in the Western Pacific.

That is the kind of force this country can develop. It is that memory, that knowledge that is today the greatest comfort to those people of those nations who, with us, believe in the dignity of man, and in his freedom, in his readiness to conduct his life as he sees fit - particularly in all its economic, political and social expressions - that is where they find their comfort, because they say: “With United States believing with us we are secure.”

When we diverge in any direction in the foreign or domestic field from the strict adherence to those great principles, those people are shaken because they know if this is an ideological conflict throughout the world, then in the great strength of the free countries is our salvation and our security.

And so we know also that in our adherence to the so-called Marshall Plan or the European Recovery Plan we are not entirely altruistic. We are not acting solely from motives of charity. Our self-interest is involved with

theirs, and we must, through all the years to come, recognize that we have a community of interest with every nation that wants to recognize the freedom and dignity of man as the concept upon which its government is based; we must recognize a cumulative interest with those people, and we must be ready to stand firmly, as long as the threat of dictatorship, right or left exists, we must be ready to stand firm with them.

Possibly there are no laws that are directly and immediately affecting us, and after all I don't know who among you is a lawyer and who is a banker and who is a visitor. But I do know this: I have seen Americans respond to their duty, to their responsibilities once they understood them in many, many types of critical situations. They have done it uncomplainingly, quietly, without asking for heroic awards or commendation; they have just done their duty. And I believe that every body of Americans, seeing their duty in these times, the threat to the freedom that we value above property, that we value above life and privation, then when they see the threat to that they will assume their responsibilities, each of them take part not only in the laws of the land but in everything we do by commission and omission.

And I for one am extremely confident that when the United States understands these things clearly there can be no danger of the outcome and that freedom and man's dignity will persist through the generations to the remotest date of which we can think. Thank you very much.

• Address to first Columbia Forum on Democracy, Columbia University, February 12, 1949

I think the temptation to reminisce is very great when an oldster such as myself gets up in front of a younger generation. I will take advantage of that habit to go back to my boyhood for just a moment, but I assure you I am not going to bore you with long tales of the Kansas prairies.

The feature of that boyhood I'd like to mention is this: I was of a big family of boys, six of us. And we were very poor, but the point is we didn't know we were poor, and that's the point I want to make with you. The mere fact that we didn't do all the things that others in cities may have done made no impression upon us whatsoever because there was constantly held out in front of us by every one around us, and certainly it was embodied in our consciousness, that opportunity was on every side.

In those days we didn't hear so much about the word security, personal security through life from the cradle to the grave, some kind of assurance that we were not going to have to go out with a tin cup or sell apples on the streets. But there was constantly around us the right and the opportunity to go out and do better for ourselves than merely to follow the plow down through the field, or to work on the section gang, or anything else that we might do to make the extra few dollars in the summer that we needed.

And I believe that came about because of the character of the country in which we were raised and in which you are raised. I do not mean the character in terms of cities, vast resources, agriculturally and in every other way. I mean because of the system under which we live. It is a free system that gives to each of us of any religion or of any location in that country the right to do something for himself. He has the right, and the opportunity is always there.

I think that far more important than talking possibly about any living man today would be to think a little bit about the life of the man whose birthday falls today, Abraham Lincoln.

I think each of you has a very special reason for venerating his memory. We think of him always as the great American. One thing I like to believe about him is this: that he had the proper attitude toward power. He finally came to be the President of the U.S. in a very special time, in war, when the power devolving upon the President of the U.S. is so great that if used evilly or to the disadvantage of his fellow citizens it can become a dictatorship. And that was essentially true in the war between the States, because the very life of the nation was at stake day by day.

Yet there is nothing in Lincoln's life or in Lincoln's writings that could lead any of us to believe that he recognized or believed that he himself was a source of power. He was a director of power, a man who might give it its trend to go somewhere, but he had no ambition to associate the source of power with himself and, thereby, rule others. He served others. That, to me, is the true essence of liberty and of freedom.

A man placed in a position where he could have been arbitrary, unjust, unfair, could have done many things for his self-glorification, and he refused to do any of them. As he said: "I have been given a job to do for the

U.S. And I will serve in that job to the best of my ability. More I cannot do" - and be true to the principles on which this country was founded and which he described so eloquently at Gettysburg.

Very naturally when we talk about a man so great, of such overwhelming stature, the thought comes to us: "Well, what relationship has that got to us; we are not Lincolns?" But the principles by which he lived, the faith he had in freedom and liberty was exemplified, for example, in his very great and, I believe, it was called an unconstitutional act, in the Emancipation of the slaves. His passion for individual liberty of thought, of worship, freedom to act, freedom of opportunity, is the virtue that each of us can emulate and more than that, I believe, it is the virtue that each of us must emulate if we are to preserve to ourselves the opportunities which, I believe, I recognized in my boyhood and which I am certain that you young men see around you on every side.

Because the kind of dictatorship under which we may fall today is not that brought off by means of a coup d'etat and a suddenly seized power using the army or the navy and its guns to put us all in straitjackets. There is a kind of dictatorship that can come about through a creeping paralysis of thought - readiness to accept paternalistic measures from government, and those paternalistic measures are accompanied by a surrender of our own responsibilities and, therefore, a surrender of our own though over our own lives and our own right to exercise our vote in dictating the policies of this country. If we allow this constant drift toward centralized beaucratic government to continue, finally it will be expressed not only in the practice of laying down the rules and laws for governing each of us in his daily actions to ensure that we do not take unfair advantage of our comrades and other citizens, but finally it will be in the actual field of operation. There'll be a swarming of bureaucrats over the land. Ownership of property will gradually drift into that central government and finally you have to have dictatorship as the only means of operating such a huge and great organization.

I believe it is things such as that that we must watch today if we are going to be true to the standards that Lincoln gave to all of us.

And to come down specifically to today and to youth, I believe that opportunity is greater today - and I mean individual opportunity - than it has ever been at any time in our history because opportunity, regarded in the sense that Lincoln regarded it, is this: opportunity to serve the society to which you belong. And, frankly, when our democracy with its system of free enterprise is operating properly, then individual reward comes about in the measure that you render service to others.

All about us with the changing economic scene, with concentrations of great labor groups in cities, with the dependence of the farm and city each upon the other and still unable to find ways in which they can get along together, problems of distribution, surpluses in one area and starvation in another, there are thousands of things to which you gentlemen can apply your talents and with greater opportunity to do good for your great country and, by doing so, to receive greater rewards for yourself than has ever been the case in the past. And that, I honestly feel, gentlemen, includes even the days of the Revolution and of the War between the States.

I cannot tell you how honored Columbia feels that this Forum has been held here on the campus grounds. Frankly, we hope a lot of you will come back and stay with us for several years. Everything that can be done around here for you is not a particular favor to you, it is part of the service that Columbia hopes to provide throughout this nation as widely as it possibly can. The purpose of keeping a brilliant faculty, teachers, facilities here is merely to make sure that the United States of the future pushing ahead in its culture, its educational advantages, will be of as great service to a future free America as it is possible to be. And that we conceive as the ambition of every right-thinking American.

Thank you all very much for coming to see me today and for giving me the chance to see you. This takes me back, I must tell you, at least forty years.

• Address at American Red Cross Campaign, February 28, 1949

In every village, town, city - in every home of our country - this March of 1949 is a month of test. In the next thirty-one days we Americans, by our deeds, can prove again that generosity, greatness of heart and individual acceptance of responsibility are truly characteristic of this nation. The American Red Cross, dedicated to voluntary humanitarian service, needs our unstinted help.

Before me in this hall are 5000 men and women who during the month ahead will give freely of their time

and effort that the American Red Cross may continue its mission. With them in similar meetings, across the face of the country, are many other thousands, girding themselves for the March campaign. Together, they constitute an army whose objective is assurance of relief and aid for those who are stricken.

Soon they will bring to millions upon millions of Americans opportunity to show ourselves worthy of our heritage - a heritage that requires each of us to look upon individual and community misfortune as the business of each of us - not merely the responsibility of an overpowering central government.

The American Red Cross is the warm heart of a free people.

With millions of other men and women in the Armed Forces, I am a witness to its magnificent war-time spirit and achievements. I shall never forget the sight, often repeated, of Red Cross women moving into a battered town, lately held by the enemy, to take over a shattered building and get down on their hands and knees to scrub it to spotless cleanliness. There they worked far into the night so that by morning our men would find in that foreign land a bit of home, a touch of the United States, a wealth of friendly American welcome.

Behind the groups that worked so hard and enthusiastically in the field was a vast organization of supporting citizens. Millions of you, by giving of your blood to Red Cross banks, made sure that fighting men, stricken in their country's defense, might win new life and health. There were the volunteers, too, who in hospitals throughout this country and abroad lightened the weary days of our sick and wounded. And there were millions of women, busy with the tasks of house and family or office and factory, who set aside all their hours of leisure, that in some Red Cross-sponsored enterprise they might aid those who were in the country's service.

Truly, the American Red Cross in war was a manifestation of American teamwork and American spirit. No compulsion of combat dictated membership in its ranks. No decree of government regimented those who formed it. No physical power on earth could have enlisted in so splendid a way the hearts and bodies and minds of America. It sprang from a sense of oneness within our people and it was rooted deep in the neighborliness, in the fundamental acceptance of all men as brothers and members of one family, that is uniquely characteristic of the American way of life. Its strength was of the spirit and, therefore, its success, even by the most material measure, was unbounded. It was the America of our fathers in action - to abandon or neglect it would stamp us as unworthy of the freedoms that made possible this kind of voluntary cooperation. Our neglect would justify and even compel a governmental intervention in a field where government has no business in a free country. By that much, then, would we cease to be free.

For those of us in the fighting services, the campaigns of Asia, Africa and Europe of World War II are over. But the Red Cross is always at war - at war against suffering, privation, disaster. And part of its work is still for the victims of America's wars. Today, thousands of veterans, not yet recovered from the wounds of battle, look to the American Red Cross worker for a multitude of services no other organization can give. Hundreds of thousands of veterans' families are assured a fuller reconversion to a peaceful life at home because the American Red Cross is at their call. Moreover, a million and a half men in the Armed Forces, standing guard against any new aggression, depend on the American Red Cross every day of their service.

Every contributor is an active participant in this great work. More than that, every one of us may some day owe his life to the American Red Cross. Disaster by fire or flood or disease is no respecter of persons, or power or of wealth. In crisis, when action must be quick and trained and abundant, no agency of our people is so well fitted as the American Red Cross to care for the injured, to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked and to house the homeless. Whether it be a devastating fire, or a flood that endangers hundreds of thousands, each of us who contributes to the American Red Cross is on the scene of action in the work of mercy. Moreover, whether we give ten cents, ten dollars or ten thousand dollars, we are equal partners in this glorious work, so long as we give what we can.

As a soldier and a plain citizen of this greatest of all nations, I carry the conviction that when we support the American Red Cross

- We vindicate individual responsibility and combat degradation of the individual to a State ward and dependent.

- We demonstrate the mighty effectiveness of voluntary effort and we silence those who preach "only government can do this job."

- We prove ourselves in our day worthy of our heritage and devoted to it, ready to sacrifice so that all who share that heritage with us, even in misfortune and disaster, will know that we are all members of a single, free,

responsible citizenship.

- In short, we defeat regimentation; we support freedom.

• Address to Alumni Association of Columbia University, University Club, Chicago, Illinois, March 1, 1949

I have been in Chicago a number of times since the end of hostilities in Europe, but this is the first time in this city, or in any other city in the country outside of local groups in New York, that it has been my honor to be greeted by a group of Columbians and their friends. I assure you it means a very great deal to me. You must feel something of the diffidence and reluctance with which I went to Columbia and attempted to enter into the educational field, and I do assure you, ladies and gentlemen, I was keenly sensible of my inadequacy, and it took a great deal of argument to make me believe I could do anything, but one of the things they urged was this - that there was a certain spiritual bond among Columbians that should make the work, to which at least I attempt to devote my life, fruitful, and which would make it easy. That work, as I see it, is the future of America, the future of the same freedoms - of religion, education, speech, and the other freedoms - which are part of our inheritance.

Then why should Columbians, merely because they went to school on Morningside Heights, be so loyal? I feel it is because every one of us in this country who has had the advantage of schooling realizes that we got that education from our forefathers. Our forefathers built good schools, and supported them, while to us was given the advantage of going to them, and, even though we paid tuition fees, having the privilege of improving our minds and above all our opportunity in life, because of what we inherited. So, feeling and knowing that Americans have a deep sense of obligation to do whatever they can for the general welfare of their own and future generations, I know that they want that great advantage of education for their own children and their grandchildren, and, incidentally, grandchildren are becoming quite important to me personally, because I now have a grandson.

And so I feel no reluctance whatsoever in talking to a Columbian group intimately about our problems, about the future of Columbia both scholastically and financially, about what Columbia means in the greater store of American history.

I won’t burden you now with figures on deficits, but I feel that if all of us all over this country, in every city, town and village, will do out part, if we but follow the dictates of the spiritual bond that ties us to the past and gives expression to what the future will produce through the medium of Columbia, we need have no fear about it. We are passing through a crisis of affairs, but when we know that every Columbian lends of his good will and financial support, the answer will be adequate.

At the moment it looks like we will have to close scholarships until we get our feet on the ground, but there seems to be no other way right now to meet this problem although we are hopeful that this situation will not be of long duration. Having been born of a very poor family in the west (although, fortunately, we lived in a community where we didn’t know we were poor) this problem gives me great concern. I do know we will never close the doors of Columbia [remainder of thought was lost - the reporter could not hear what DDE said]

I am certain in the long run this situation will be on a firmer basis, so if you hear any criticism at present, do not despair about Columbia’s future. If we cannot believe in its future, then we’d better despair about the future of most American institutions, and none of us are going to do that.

I can scarcely tell you what a pleasure it has been to meet each of you today and to have this brief moment to be with the husbands, wives, and friends of Columbia.

Thank you for turning out.

• Recording for Scholastic Press Conference, March 12, 1949

On behalf of the entire Columbia family - the faculty and staff, the student body, the alumni and friends - I want to express our heartfelt appreciation of the privilege Columbia University has enjoyed as your host during

the three days of your 25th Anniversary convention.

Possibly, during the course of this academic year, groups with more distinguished names in the arts and sciences have visited this University. Most certainly, in point of years, you do not approach the venerable age generally associated with academic visitors. But, by all odds, you are one of the most important gatherings here this season. You young people are for men of my generation a preview of what our country will be like, what sort of men and women will guide it, years after we have moved off the stage.

All of us, knowing what you have already accomplished and realizing the ideals that animate you, can feel that our American heritage is in good hands. You possess the optimism of youth; you are learning in the schools of our country the truths that make men free and able and wise; you face challenges so manifold and immense they will develop within you greatness pf mind and spirit - if you face up to them squarely and unafraid. Only one word of caution and advice will I offer you.

In the classroom your goal has been the truth in whatever subject you might be studying, whether it was geography or mathematics or history. In the conduct of your school papers, your purpose has been a faithful presentation of the truth, the facts of your story and nothing but the facts. In your homes, in your association with your classmates and your friends you have come to appreciate that truth is all-essential, that falsehood and deceit and double-dealing destroy the very foundation of home and friendship. So trained, you may come to think that truth is a commonplace element. Far from it.

The truth, certainly in human relationships, is often obscure; constantly shadowed by prejudices, partisanship and outright campaigns of distortion and lies. The truth must be constantly sought after, zealously guarded, everlastingly preached by us Americans.

In this country we have received a way of life from our forefathers which they, with the help of God, developed through centuries of toil and courageous battle and the sacrifice of life itself. None of us, even in an entire lifetime, can come to know all its fullness - the entire story of each individual American’s contribution to its development. But each of us should, to the best of his ability, learn about it all he can. And then help everyone he knows, everyone over whom he has any influence, to a better knowledge of his country and its institutions. The truth about America, about the American way of life, is an invincible defense against those who may to sabotage it.

You already have the opportunity. Through the columns of your newspapers and magazines, you reach directly and with personal impact millions of other young people who with you will be the men and women of tomorrow. You can better fit them for their great task if now you help them learn more about their country and their heritage.

We are proud indeed that you have traveled - some of you thousands of miles - to be with us. We shall be, by far, more proud if, on your return home, you diligently apply yourselves to learning and presenting - to the best of your ability - the truth about America - the privileges, the opportunities, the rights, freedoms and obligations of American citizenship. For you will then be worthy of your own schools, of this University, of your country and of yourselves as Americans.

• Commencement Address, June 1, 1949

When Columbia’s first graduating class was awarded its degrees, the pace and tempo of the human world had changed little from the days of the Caesars and the Pharaohs. Life then, as viewed from our observation post two hundred years later, had in it more leisure and less of strain; more of meditation and less of hysteria; more of faith and confidence and less of doubt and fear. But underneath the surface, in the generation of Columbia’s founders, there was spreading the spiritual fire of a new social and political philosophy, based upon the concept of equality of right among men, regardless of the accident of birth.

For centuries that fire had glowed so feebly as frequently to disappear almost completely from view; but it persisted sufficiently to provide much of the inspiration for the great trans-Atlantic migration of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Many diverse reasons hardened men and women of Europe to an ocean journey that was then scarcely less than terrifying. Foremost was a fervent hope that they would find in the New World escape from ancient tyrannies imbedded in the Old World’s structure. This purpose expanded and flourished at

amazing speed in the American wilderness, where only individual courage, self-confidence and faith could spell survival. It begot in our fathers a determination to f\reject utterly any political theory that gave one man, or a group of men, an inherent right to dominate others - a determination so eloquently expressed and reaffirmed in our most treasured historical documents.

In the simple living of that day the application of this resolve to social and political problems, while difficult, did not involve such complexities and confusions that our forefathers were led to deny the validity of their principles. But, since the day of Columbia's founders, a mighty upsurge in the gathering of knowledge and the development of machines has many times over complicated human relations. Technologically, we - who are gathered here - and our predecessors of Columbia's first Commencement are separated by the chasm between the ox-cart and the jet engine, between the grist mill and the cyclotron, between a man wrestling his own living out of a wilderness farm and the citizen whose livelihood depends on the successful functioning of an entire and complex national economy.

The impact on us of every international fact and crisis is immediate. We are seldom free from anxiety as each day's events crowd instantly upon our attention. Pressure groups often pretend to a moral purpose that examination proves to be false. The vote-seeker rarely hesitates to appeal to all that is selfish in humankind. Ruthless individuals, whether they classify themselves as capitalists, spokesmen of labor, social reformers or politicians, glibly promise us prosperity for our support of their personal but carefully concealed ambitions. False teachers, who magnify acknowledged errors in the practice of democracy, attempt to destroy our faith in man's right to self-government. As we seek to conserve what is good and sound, even while we boldly explore and test new ways, we are belabored by the demagogues of right and left; both of whom would turn back the clock of history to the days of regimented humanity. In such a maelstrom of facts and crises and false counsel, the guideposts to individual duty and action become obscured.

Infallible counsel for each of us is to be found within our valid hopes and aspirations and ideals as human beings, so clearly understood by our colonial forebears. The simple faith, the unshakeable conviction they held in man's individual rights and his equality before the law and God, is the most priceless jewel in all the vast spiritual and material heritage those men and women bequeathed to us. We cannot afford to lose their sharp sense of basic values - expressed by Patrick Henry in one imperishable sentence.

Many of us, today, seem to fear that individual freedom is leading us toward social chaos; that individual opportunity has forever disappeared; that no person can have rightful title to property; that we have reached the point where the individual is far too small to cope with his circumstances; that his lifelong physical security against every risk is all that matters. More than this, we hear that such security must be attained by surrendering to centralized control the management of our society. In short, to these fearful men, the free human individual is a social anachronism.

On every count, the fearful men are wrong. More than ever before, in our country, this is the age of the individual. Endowed with the accumulated knowledge of centuries, armed with all the instruments of modern science, he is still assured personal freedom and wide avenues of expression so that he may win for himself, his family and his country greater material comfort, ease and happiness; greater spiritual satisfaction and contentment.

When even the rudiments of knowledge were possessed by only a privileged few, when man's appalling ignorance handicapped his participation in government, there was ground to believe that an all-powerful state had to rule each subject's life from the cradle to the grave. That ground has diminished with each year of our Republic's existence. None remains today. The free individual has been justified as his own master; the state as his servant.

In World War II, we Americans welded into a cooperative unit the enterprise, initiative, spirit and will of many million free men and women; we crossed the oceans and, joined with our Allies, crushed two regimented tyrannies whose power was frightening; at the same time, we rescued from industrial disaster an ally whose communist economy, we are now told, is the only means to a world of plenty. This class graduates almost on the 5th anniversary eve of the greatest tactical operation in that war. D-Day was possible only through the cooperative outpouring of strength and spirit and resolution by 140 million Americans and their free Allies.

If in the tragic waste of war, we could so magnificently prove the strength of our system, founded on human freedom, what challenge is there in the future that we cannot meet? The worker of miracles is team

work.

Every American is a free member of a mighty partnership that has at its command all the pooled strength of Western Civilization - spiritual ideals, political experience, social purpose, scientific wealth, industrial prowess. There is no limit, other than our own resolve, to the temporal goals we set before ourselves - as free individuals joined in a team with our fellows; as a free nation in the community of nations.

The modern preachers of the paternalistic state permit themselves to be intimidated by circumstances. Blinding themselves to the inevitable growth of despotism, they - craven-like - seek, through government, assurance that they can forever count upon a full stomach and warm cloak or - perhaps - the sinister-minded among them think, by playing upon our fears, to become masters of our lives.

In the years ahead of you graduates, the fundamental struggle of our time may be decided - between those who would further apply to our daily lives the concept of individual freedom and equality; and those who would subordinate the individual to the dictates of the state. You will participate in the fight.

We believe that Columbia has effectively trained you for the practice of your chosen profession - your diplomas are evidence of our confidence in that training and your successful completion of it. But beyond the purely academic or professional - and more important to humanity - is your readiness for responsible citizenship.

We trust that Columbia has strengthened within you the conviction that human freedom must be treasured beyond all else - even life itself - for any diminishment of it is a tragic backward step. We hope that this school has inspired within you a resolution to live the full lives of American citizens, good neighbors in every community task and in your aid to those less fortunate than yourselves; forever building a stouter team work within our people. We hope, too, you will always be sharply conscious that the great rights you possess are accompanied by inescapable obligations; that you can most surely preserve your own rights by defending the rights of others.

As we hope that your faith has been strengthened in the wealth of opportunity our country and civilization spread before the individual; that you have grown in courage to defend the old when it is good, to move forward fearlessly on the path of proved principal, undaunted by the pitfalls to left and right - today our stark need is courageous and wise men and women, who conserve their goodly heritage while they add new richness to it.

If it has done these things, if it has helped you to both wisdom and understanding as well as to knowledge and techniques, then Columbia University has accomplished its mission toward this class and toward the free democracy of which you are a part.

• Address to National War College, June 17, 1949

In these days, gentlemen, when a man has to get used to finding himself quoted and misquoted in the papers on every subject from baby sitting to bartending, it is almost a physical pleasure to get back among people of his own kind. It is a pleasure to realize that there are no reporters present, except those who will make a record for the school to prove that you did have a talk on such a day at such and such an hour. In such a situation a man feels free to go back into his own experiences and pull out little ideas, little subjects, and discuss them frankly with the group he is talking to - no pretense of any kind has a place in this kind of family conference. Today I should like to feel that you and I are having a conversation. However, since I have the dominant physical position in the room, you will have to keep still while I do my part.

I think a good place to start a rambling discourse on the subject of combined command is to consider what kind of quarrel could cause a war today. It is difficult for us to find anything, other than great ideological differences, which can finally lead us into a situation from which the only out is war. I don’t believe people today would fight for a province, for trade, or for the right of any to wear a crown or sit on the throne - causes that have brought about some of the wars of the past. People won’t fight for such things. The cause has to be something very deep. It must involve, you might say, the concepts by which we live; our own concept of the dignity of man, the political freedom of the individual and his worthwhileness in the state. We will go to war when we are convinced that such things as this are in danger.

What I am leading up to is this: We mustn’t think of wars of the future as just breaking out between two

single countries which have some economic or political quarrel. If wars will be caused only by great differences in ideas and ideals - by danger to basic spiritual values and political concepts - the countries that find those ideas worthy of fighting for will be arrayed on one side, and on the other will be those who militantly believe in opposing ideas.

Now, the next thing we have to think about, from our own viewpoint, is that we are a democracy; we believe in freedom for the individual as well as for countries. The only way we can join our efforts to those of other nations is through cooperation with allies. We cannot be the dominant member of a family that is ruled by dictatorship. In two wars Germany had allies, but in both of those wars Germany was so powerful, at least in her own sphere of operations, that she did not have to cooperate with anyone else; she was the dominant dictating member. You cannot apply any such idea as that in planning for the kind of joint effort that will be conducted by the United States and her allies in the event of a future war. You must think strictly in terms of cooperation with teammates. That is where the difficulty of allied operations comes in, because all civilization has been trained in the idea that its basic loyalties go to a group we call the nation. We have proceeded through family, tribe, and small city state organization and loyalty, on upward into the national scale in our thinking. But we have not gotten to the point, any of us, where we could give to some theoretical overall state the same loyalty that we can give to America. So, we are sovereign states, composed of nationalistically inspired humans, trying to get together to work out our destiny in the event of such a war.

Now, we know we have to have common purposes and common objectives which must be translated, eventually, into single command on the battlefield. Therefore, we have to take necessary procedures step by step. How do we start with an association of sovereign states and get to single command on the battlefield? I should say the first thing to remember, and particularly for members of the armed forces, is that when you get into the allied field it is more than ever necessary that the political objectives of the war, and the political considerations that lead to war, must on no account be allowed to conflict with, or to become the concern of, the military. These political problems must be solved by different bodies. They belong to the political leaders of the state. If these are not kept out of the operational field - out of the theater where the war is going to be carried on - you have not only another influence to pull armies and services apart, but you have one that in the long run is certain to be disastrous. In the late war it was our President and Prime Minister in Britain (who was also Defense Minister) who decided the political problems of the war to include the great political objectives - what we were trying to do as nations. I believe that was not always done in as clean-cut and complete fashion as it might have been.

I will bring to your attention one example that has always raised some question in my mind. In the summer of 1944 the Prime Minister was very anxious to avoid using any part of the Mediterranean Command for an attack on the south coast of France. He wanted to continue the battle in Italy through the Ljubljana gap and on into the Balkans. Now, there were two problems presented in a consideration of that idea as opposed to the supporting operation for Overlord. One problem was this: What would be the postwar political effect of marshalling allied military forces so as to hold a great portion of the Balkans, possibly all of them? With our left flank thus somewhat weakened we would be slower getting into Germany, and maybe we wouldn’t get into Germany at all. The strict military problem was: What was the quickest way to defeat Germany? What was the quickest way to quit killing allied soldiers, sailors and airmen, and quit spending money on the fighting of a war?

If the leader in the field is given any part of such a political problem to solve, he must assume prerogatives that should belong to cabinets, to parliaments and to congresses. If he has them on his shoulders, he can have as many different views as are expressed daily in a congress and parliament and he could never get an unqualified answer. Divergent political opinions and objectives would paralyze military action. He and his own staff must stick absolutely to the military. He must insist that the political problem be solved by his own political superiors.

In the case I have just mentioned, I suggested to the Prime Minister that he take up the question with our President, if he was concerned about the possible political situation. He insisted he was arguing on military grounds. I believe he felt he had to, because he knew the word “Balkans” was anathema in the United States. Therefore, I think he felt it would get him nowhere if he took the matter up on the political basis. Nevertheless, I still believe his argument had a great deal of validity for those who were responsible with political results. But

it was wholly false if based solely on military factors. However, the incident does illustrate, particularly for military men, how we must differentiate between the two types of questions and keep our own business to ourselves and insist that others retain theirs.

Now, I know you people are familiar with this, and I am not going to belabor you with an explanation of the Combined Chiefs of Staff and how they work, but I do merely want to point this out: Since it is impossible for the Combined Chiefs of Staff to meet continuously or even daily, they have to make their decisions in big gobs, and on a global basis. They have to allot troops, all kinds of forces and supplies and maintenance facilities on a long-term basis and in great amounts. Having made these decisions, the Combined Chiefs of Staff must let the man in the field alone.

I have talked to all the principal commanders of this war, and I am certain that each of them felt the Combined Chiefs of Staff did operate in that fashion, and did observe this procedure in this war. No matter how much any of the commanders may have found to criticize in the operations of the Combined Chiefs of Staff in terms of specific decisions, they never criticized the methods they followed.

Therefore, in my discussion of this subject of Combined Allied Command, I would have very little to offer in the way of constructive criticism on the Combined Chiefs of Staff and their operation in the late war. Of course, in the techniques, the methods, and possibly in the system of communications, you will always find room for improvement. However, I believe the basic principle was sound, and they did give the men in the field ample authority. They notified him in ample time as to when he was going to get his increments of forces and supplies, and then they let him pretty much alone.

Now, we get down into that part of the problem in which I was more specifically interested for the greater part of the war. In the first few months, I was in the War Department and in a position where I had to deal largely with the Combined Chiefs of Staff. But from the summer of 1942 onward, I was always in what we call the “theater command.” Last year, I think I told the preceding class something of the experiences we had in the war in trying to write a charter for ABDA. I don’t know whether this class looked up the history of ABDA, and to my mind it is not particularly important. We tried to save the Southwest Pacific and the Dutch East Indies from the flood of Japanese aggression, and we couldn’t. We did try to bolster up our shaky defenses there by bringing in Field Marshal Wavell and making him the single commander in the theater. It was our first experience in that line.

This is interesting to me for only one reason. For days and nights staff officers of the Army, Navy and Air on the American side, and the Army, Navy and Air on the British side worked at the job of drawing up a charter of command for Field Marshal Wavell. Of course, we felt he should be kept out of logistic matters, because we knew he couldn’t cut across nationalistic lines in the matter of supply and administration. We also had sense enough to realize you couldn’t separate strategy from logistics - strategic decisions depend upon location of ports of debarkation and of main lines of communications. Therefore, he did have clear interest in logistics. We spent days sweating over this problem, insuring authority but limiting its amplitude. We tried to lay out channels of appeal for nationalistic commanders. What we didn’t know then was this: It is impossible to write a charter for an allied commander. You must get that thoroughly in your head. No man can foresee all of the accidents of war, including the accidents of new and unexpected types of administrative, strategic and tactical problems. I believe that a little thought will convince us all that there is nothing in an Allied Command that can substitute for, or can take the place of mutual confidence. That is an easy generalization to make, and instantly your question should be, “How in the world do you produce it?” Again, I don’t believe there is any single answer. I can go back to historical incidents and maybe, by telling you a little of what I saw happening, I can give you some ideas which you might apply in the future.

In the first place, our President and the Prime Minister were great friends. In the second place, I think they saw the major problems of the war through identical eyes. There is no question about the fact that they liked to work together. Generally, they reached common answers to common problems. They were both strong enough men not to be constantly swayed from the course that they themselves had agreed to follow. Therefore, they did not respond noticeably to new and attractive opportunities which were arrayed on one side, or to great risks which were suddenly exposed on the other side. They had the strength to pursue a predetermined objective, which is the first requisite in the development of confidence in a great organization. If the highest commanders - in this instance the President and the Prime Minister - have the courage to pick a course of action and stick to

it, their example creates confidence through the subordinate structure of control.

Then, the next thing is this: The Combined Chiefs of Staff must understand there is no such thing as a separate land, sea and air war. Likewise, in such a problem there is no such thing as a separate nationalistic war. If you are going to make the most economical and effective use of all your resources, they must be pooled and used under a particular authoritative group. In this case it was the Combined Chiefs of Staff. Since they were not a single person, they could not make instant day-by-day tactical decisions. The Combined Chiefs of Staff, as I mentioned before, dealt in policy and in great terms involving time, space and strength. The applicable generalization is that bodies can argue on and promulgate policy - but single direction (by one man) is essential to day-by-day execution.

Now, when we examine Theater organization, I am still unable to offer you anything in the way of a panacea. When Torch Command was set up in July of 1942, it was a brand new experience for everybody engaged in it. Old friends of mine, who had learned that I had been designated an allied commander, came to see me and begged me not to have anything to do with it. They went over the history of allied warfare from the Delphic League onward, and tried to show me how it could not succeed. They felt it was merely suicide of a reputation and disgrace for the rest of my life.

Actually, the organizing method that was used was a very simple one. No attempt was made to organize too specifically at first. The problem of attacking Africa was thrown in front of a group of officers who were exactly like this class. When your faculty here gives you a problem, (if you follow the system we did 25 years ago) you are divided up into committees, there is named a chairman for the committee, you are given different sectors of the problem to solve, and finally you come out with a combined answer. That is all we did; we apportioned responsibility to a number of groups. In dividing up we were careful to include in each group officers of the British services and officers of our services. We paid very little attention to who was going to be the head, because at that time we didn't know who we would want as out chief staff officers; we needed a start on solving the problem.

This informality and objectivity gave birth to mutual confidence. Each man had to depend upon his comrade, be he Britisher, be he Navy, be he Air, be he Army, or whatever he was. It wasn't long until friendships began to develop, and out of these grew a very powerful, strong and splendid staff. This promoted confidence throughout the Headquarters. It promoted a confidence that our staffs could handle the problems. This slowly, but certainly, and always progressively, kept penetrating down and down until there was a real confidence developed everywhere in the Allied Command.

There is one phase of this thing which must never be forgotten. This is that the governments themselves as well as the Combined Chiefs of Staff must have confidence in the Theater Command. Political and military superiors have got to have confidence in you. They not only have to watch the thing developing, they have to help develop it. If they don't believe in the field organization, then when the first little setback comes along they will eliminate the head, bust up the staff and try somebody and something else.

When you have a group of political leaders sitting a long way off, make certain that your problem is put before them logically. Don't let them get too many reports out of the newspapers. Attention to this detail will do a great deal to develop the confidence I am talking about.

I shall give you an example of this, by showing you where we violated one day. Before we landed in Italy, we decided we wanted to move our airfields forward. At that time we were bombing Italy very heavily in an effort to get the Italians out of the war. Because of this, we found we had to move our air bases up a little closer. So we announced that there would be no bombing for a few days. Now, we thought we were very smart when we made a broadcast over our radio saying we were doing this to give the Italians time to surrender. (Mussolini had been thrown out and Badoglio was in power). We said, "We don't want to destroy you. We will be most considerate and give you time to surrender." All we were really doing was moving the bases. We hoped to make a virtue out of necessity. That little broadcast evoked bitter criticism from one of our capitals. It was the bitterest I heard all during the war. Here were soldiers in the field thinking they knew something about the political aspects of war - about the political representations we should make to populations. When our superiors found out why we did it they were perfectly content. If we had furnished them complete information 48 hours earlier, we would have saved a lot of anguish, and a lot of transatlantic essay contests.

What I am trying to get over very earnestly, gentlemen, is that the development of mutual confidence

among you and your associates, among you and your superiors, among you and the people below you is a job that demands thought and effort. You must work at it, and you cannot just assume that it is going to grow. You may say, “Well, I am a good fellow, and they ought to know I am honest.” When people once give their confidence in a thing as critical as war, they don’t easily destroy it.

I have already mentioned that there is no separate land, sea and air war. I am not going to take time to discuss at length, because it seems to me to be arguing obvious. I am going to mention one thing here, because just a little later, without imposing too much on your time, I want to take up another aspect of it. When I was in Europe and Africa during the war, I was not conscious of real struggles between Army, Navy and Air. Once in a while there would be some arguments on administrative things. For instance - Are you going to bring forward tonnages of perforated metal landing strip of ammunition when you cannot bring both? Are you or are you not going to order the air to knock out this battery which the Navy says it cannot reach? Generally speaking, there will always be arguments, but argument without heat. Coordination seems to challenge the interest and enthusiasm of everybody, and there is no great trouble about it on a service basis!

Now, I am amazed at the difficulty we encounter in developing a deep understanding between the Army, Navy and Air in our own country today. Progress is slow; we see the evidence in the papers and everywhere else. I sometimes wonder why this is so difficult for people with common backgrounds and common conceptions of democratic government. I wonder why we find it so difficult to meet on a common and objective basis for the solution of a common problem. During the war that seemed to be the easiest of all. Once in a while our meeting of “equals” would develop something funny. The British Navy is her senior service, and we always had to be very, very careful in whatever we attempted to do to assure that procedures and methods recognized the senior position of the Navy in Britain.

The methods of cooperation that you are going to use in each case are going to be your own. I would plead here only for a readiness to eliminate from your mind concern about details. I remember a staff officer who came to me and asked me to issue an arbitrary order forcing the British to conform to our staff methods. Well, to my mind that is a detail; it doesn’t make any difference what staff procedures you use. The reason American soldiers use the same methods is because we are all trained in them. The common use in our Army of identical procedures has proved to be a very great asset. This particular officer thought we were going to lose the war if we didn’t compel the British to use American staff procedures, or - as a very, very poor second solution - force all Americans to use British staff procedures. As a matter of fact, before the war was over Alexander and Montgomery - two very senior commanders - were using our methods.

If you are going to produce understanding and cooperation, you have got to be ready to ignore minute details. Kick them out the window. If the details have to be fought out, then try to get them down into the hands of people who should fight on that level. Then if you have to sit as judge, do it with a grin and offer the loser a drink. But I know nothing that will upset a group quite as much as the belief that the senior staff officers, the heads of divisions, the senior commanders are going to make a point out of details.

Don’t confuse strength of character with arbitrary deportment. There is no identity of relationship whatsoever. The strong man is the one who knows the thing he wants, and he will hang on to that until death. All other things become unimportant and he is perfectly ready to concede them in the knowledge that by winning his main point he has the essential fruits of victory. He does not compromise principles (he is not giving away anything that is valuable to the winning of the war or to the problem he has to solve) but he doesn’t sit up, for example, and insist on the way his subordinates and associates address him, or any of the other petty details of military deportment that are intended to establish his position. I urge you gentlemen, when you run into a job of this kind, to fix your minds on the main thing you think must be done and then let the other fellow have all the rest.

I think I have expressed my ideas of what you have to do in war. Now, I am going to take a few minutes to talk about what we are doing now. It would be idle to say I am not often distressed but what I feel is a lack of sufficient progress.

Of course, the staffs of the Army, Navy and Air are not as separated as we were in the days of the 20's. Now, we can at least get a very fine problem worked up in theory, but when we begin to translate it into the practical field we run into every kind of difficulty. Much of this comes from pride of service, and the confidence that we ourselves can do something better than the other service can. There is an unreadiness to

depend upon the other fellow to do his share of the job. We run into an impasse, and finally all decisions, including strictly professional ones, are thrown into the hands of civilians who really don't want to make them. They are not prepared, by a lifetime of study, to make these decisions. I must also point out, gentlemen, that in such a case these decisions have to be made on a basis of guesswork - but they must be made and obeyed.

Let me explain the problem in this way: Let's say we have $10 to spend this year. The Navy says it has to have $8.00, the Air says it has to have $7.00 and the Army says it has to have the whole thing. No one will give one single bit on that $10. All right, what are the bases then that a civilian head or a Congressional committee can find on which to solve this problem? Every service proves it has to have this or the United States will be at the bottom of the Pacific. We won't yield an inch, and we say we won't attempt to share in making the best combined use of the $10. But we know that $10 is all we have to spend. So we disagree – that's that!

Regardless of our own convictions of how much Army, Navy or Air we need, when the President of the United States tells us that we cannot reasonably have more than a certain amount to security forces, then we have got to be big enough to find a composite answer under the ceiling established by proper authority. Each of us simply cannot say we have to have so much or the country will be destroyed. We have got to work out the answer together.

I am talking about this, because I want to establish the basis for what I consider to be the overriding importance of this College. I believe that in this College - its past, present and future classes - lies the answer to the type of problem which is not now being solved. It is not being solved correctly, and it is no one's fault except the fault of a training that extends way back into the dim past. It is a belief in each particular service that it can do a job better than any other. Therefore, it must have everything that is related to that job, rather than depending upon its sister services for everything that is possible and feasible.

If we constantly put problems before this College in the sense that we put them before the early Torch Staff, then I think this situation will change. We gave that staff a problem to solve, and we told them they were not marked as Army men, as Navy men, as Air men, but they were marked as a servant of the Allied Force. We told the Americans that when they were doing combined planning they were teammates of the British group. Incidentally, let's pray to God that we are always going to have the British on our side.

I believe that this school, with all its opportunities, offers each of you a chance to discover that the men of the other services don't wear tails and horns, that they are definitely interested in the safety of this country, and that the attitude they are taking today is a reflection of their honest convictions as to what the safety of the country needs. Then, the only thing we have to do is to develop our confidence in teammates, which was the whole theme of my talk today. When a man gradually sees that he doesn't have to do a hard job alone, he will let two other fellows help do it. The more we can get each of us thinking in terms of "how much can I get the other two to do; how far can I make them do it; how can I relieve my own service of expenditures of moneys, of deaths in war, of casualties," the closer we will come to solving this problem.

I realize all the practical difficulties in the way, because a man goes to a joint meeting feeling he is a representative of his service. This man is thinking in terms of the size of his service and the influence of size upon opportunities for promotions for the individual. Therefore he is a lawyer representing his service. Now, he is suddenly asked to sit around with the other service representatives to make impartial decisions.

I believe, as I said before, that the simple rule to follow is: The good of the whole is all important! So - how much can I make the other fellow do? If we ever adopt this simple formula, I believe the rest of it is going to be easy. We did it in the war, and I don't think it is a sufficient answer to say: Of course, you had unity because you had a common enemy, and there is no unifying influence like a common danger. Of course, that is true. However, I don't believe we are stupid enough or simple enough that we have to have a great military threat sitting on the borders of the Atlantic in order to make us use logic; good common sense.

Above all things, gentlemen, we must not attempt to prove that national security cannot be obtained except at the cost of national bankruptcy. You must remember that the armed services are protecting a way of life. You are not here merely to protect property - to protect Maine or Florida - not even merely to protect families and hearthstones; you are protecting a way of life that had some of its early birth pains in 1215. If you destroy that life by bankruptcy from within, then we ought to be spending the money we now devote to armed forces to buy something from which we gain pleasure and profit - because we've acknowledged in advance the futility of democracy, freedom and competitive enterprise.

What I see, therefore, is this College amalgamating the service brains of the future. You will increase the quality of the brains. In the past we have had an unusual set of men in the services, and we have today. I am thankful they are smarter than when I was in school. And this school has not only to amalgamate brains; but it has to amalgamate spirit. If it can do that, then the future of this country, and the future of the free world is secure.

I don't say, gentlemen, that you are going to do it all. I believe in starting unification the day a boy walks into Annapolis, into West Point or into the Air Academy, when it gets started. We have got to start early. We have to train and think in terms of the security and welfare of the United States. We will not say, "What is good for this particular service is good for the United States," but we will say, "What is good for the United States is good for the Army, good for the Navy and good for the Air." That is what we have to think about.

I have tried to bring up a few little incidents of war and of peace to show that mere readiness to cooperate intellectually, mentally, physically is not enough; you have got to amalgamate the very souls of men. If you do that you will never lose a war. Thank you very much.

• Junior Chamber of Commerce Banquet, Topeka, Kansas, September 2, 1949

As I sat here this evening I noticed that the necessity for making a speech seems to affect people a bit differently. I noticed that your chairman, Mr. Murphy, could eat no dinner. He seemed to be tense, and when he was offered the delightful dinner that was served to the rest of us, he impatiently shook it away and said, "I couldn't eat a bite." As far as I am concerned, I enjoy eating and I like to put off the evil moment as long as I can, and I see no reason for denying myself the pleasure of eating, because I know that that part of the meeting must come to an end and even a Cataclysm may follow.

The subject Education for Citizenship. It implies that we realize problems of the world have become so important that each of us must take thought about them. They are not going to solve themselves, and their potential seriousness for us now and in the future is so great that we cannot afford to neglect them. And yet when we say "education," we think of something over a long period of time, like the growing of a tree; we think of the child in the kindergarten, and we say, "Oh, yes, we will see that our children are trained properly, but they will grow up; they will do a somewhat better job than we did, and the world will be all right." A very safe subject, isn't it? A convenient way to look at it, because it absolves us of the responsibility that is ours. It brings up such aphorisms as, "The boy is father to the man;" "As the twig is bent so will the tree be inclined;" and we remember the old Chinese proverb, "Enjoy yourself, it may be later than you think." It's not that simple; it's not that nice and it's not that easy. These problems are not only serious, they are urgent; and Education to meet them, education to exercise the price of citizenship in this country, doesn't mean merely the child in kindergarten - it means me, and it means you.

How are we going to learn what to do? How each of us can exert his own influence to see that the things that we have enjoyed, the country that we so dearly love, can be passed on in its essential character to our children and to our grandchildren? So I repeat this education is not merely something that we are going to teach the youngsters of today, the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts; it is something that we are going to teach ourselves, and we must not think of education either in terms of the professor in a cloistered laboratory somewhere working out the facts that he will give to us in homeopathic doses through the medium of some lecture or some written article; no, indeed, it is a fitting subject for the Chamber of Commerce and every other public spirited organization of this country to take up, because what we need is not education in the obscure; in nuclear fission; we need education in the obvious. The speaker this evening mentioned, Governor Carlson said, that these freedoms of ours that we prize so highly were gained by the sacrifices, by the love, by the deaths of our forefathers, of our own. They are going to be preserved the same way. It is true now, the same as it was when the statement was first said, "The price of liberty is eternal vigilance."

The first point I would like to make about the problems that concern us so deeply is this: The central core is, how to preserve these freedoms that we value as a race at least, above life itself. Perhaps Patrick Henry overstated the case for any one of us as an individual when he said, "Give me liberty or give me death," but for the race he did not. Those people that have been born and raised under the American flag, under the American

tradition, who have had the priceless privileges we have enjoyed, and will not as a race, submit to anything, even to dictatorships that would spring up among themselves; before they submit to that there will be again bloody revolution. Our job then is how to prevent the growth of such a thing, or the imposition of it from without, and so continue to enjoy that great and priceless privilege of individual political liberty - the right to do as we please, to earn what we please, and to worship as we please and express ourselves as we please. Incidentally and as an aside, how many nations are there left in the world today, where a meeting could gather such as this, where each speaker could express his own thoughts without danger of being arrested and hanged tomorrow morning? So when you are inclined to scoff at the seriousness of the problem, remember, for one second, how many areas, how much of the world, has now been foreclosed to that great privilege, just meeting like we are this evening.

I should like to point out that these problems, of course, are comprehensive, complex, and inter-related; and this problem of freedom as opposed to compulsory regimentation is merely the core. It seems to be the characteristic of each of the problems that causes in great concern one relationship that we must not forget is this: Our great domestic problems are inescapably attuned to, and a part of, our foreign problems. We are trying to project abroad a respect for human dignity, for a type of government that gives every man equality before the law. We can do so only if that system has been successful at home, successful not only in its academic, or governmental, or mechanical success, but as it brings to every citizen of this country, 140 million people, a greater chance and opportunity for happiness. I do not say “security” because as much as we have talked about the word “security” today, I do not believe it is the deepest desire we have in our hearts; if I wanted only security and nothing else, I can get it very easily; I can go out this evening and commit a crime, and the courts of this state would commit me to the penitentiary where I would be well fed, my room well heated, I will be cared for, the Doctors will look after me, and I’ll have security, but I won’t do it and none of the rest of us will. We are not looking merely for security, we are preserving freedom and the opportunities that go with freedom. Let us please, therefore, in considering these problems, never forget to emphasize opportunity when we speak of mere security. If we don’t have what we want - the basic freedoms that have made America great - then we don’t want security as a race; we would rather perish, we approved it ever since 1215 certainly.

Then the relationship between the central, or the domestic, problem and the foreign problem is merely this, if we are successful and strong at home we can project our ideas and our influence abroad. We have attempted to do it immediately following the World War in terms of the United Nations - certainly the greatest concept, the greatest chance for eliminating from the world the scourge of war that has yet been devised. It was superior to the old League of Nations, in that the strongest and the greatest power of the world joined, the United States. In all of the foreign problems that we have, let us never forget the final, ultimate aim, the goal is to make the United Nations a truly workable thing; something that can adjust and adjudicate the problems of the world and keep us from slaughtering each other in every clime, in every zone, and in every ocean.

We must never forget that America’s foreign policy always has as its basic and highest tenet the success of the United Nations and that means strength at home; it means the abolition of international strife; it means giving thought to what we are doing here each to doing his part to make a system work where the individual is free; therefore group problems may be done and performed only through voluntary cooperation. If we ask the government to do it, we say, “Let the federal government do it” - then we have regimentation, and we are certainly a long step closer to the very thing that we are fighting against, the thing that you sent your sons, your brothers, your husbands, and your sweethearts to every continent in the world to fight against in this last World War. We cannot by any means ever forget that basic fact. Within and under the United Nations, and where we want to influence people who seem to be of the same attitude as ourselves, we have begun the Atlantic Pact. We have inspired it, and we have worked for it. It is not contrary to the United Nations. It is merely the realization that there is one power in the world today, inspired by a doctrine called Communism that is dedicated to the destruction of all forms of government that recognize the dignity of man. The destruction of any form of government that does not put the state above and the master of the individual. This country has proved that government’s proper place is the servant of the individual. We believe that; now if there is any doctrine, any state, committed to the destruction of this great system which in our own sense of values occupies the highest place, then it certainly behooves us to awaken in all others who think somewhat as we do, with that sense of community of interest, that we must hang together, or, as Franklin said, we must all certainly hang separately.

The Atlantic Pact is merely one expression of that desire to bring to all nations of the globe who want to live under free institutions, a means and method by which they can cooperate to that end. And under that same process, that same concept, that same idea is the reason that the United States Government is urging a decent rearmament of Western Europe, so that we can give to those people the confidence that they may go ahead and work with the certainty that they can keep the things that they have to work for and produced; that they will not fall prey to outside threat and aggression; that they may be confident that the United States is considering that an attack on freedom anywhere is an attack on freedom here as well as it is elsewhere.

A specific example, or let us say a special case, within the United Nations and the Atlantic Pact is brought to our minds at this particular instant because of the imminence of the new British-American conference, the talks in Washington, and again we must remember the word "education;" it is not enough to over-simplify the problem and either express our prejudice against John Bull and the Red Coats, or to be an Anglophile and say "Oh they are fine people, and just shovel out the money." The United States is not a bottomless pit from which we can constantly and forever pour assets without someday paying the piper. But it is certain, we do have a community of interest with the British Empire and with the United Kingdom; let us consider for a moment that in the past thirty years they have been our allies in two great wars. Both times they have been the outposts that took the shock of the initial onslaught. In this latest conflict for one solid year - from June 1940 to June 1941 they stood absolutely alone against a power which over here even professional soldiers were saying is irresistible; they said there no force or combination of forces in the world that can defeat Hitler, his axis and England stood alone through all that time. There are probably none in that room or certainly very few who do not have some British blood in their veins; they speak the same language - or almost - we are the product of the same kind of development and evolution in the governmental field. While they have in these later years, this decade, gone into an experiment that sort of horrifies us, the fact is that from the time of the Barons' rebellion in 1215 to this date, we are the heirs of and part of the inheritors of the great system of individual freedoms they have set up.

What I am trying to get at is this, from the standpoint of logic, of our common interest in a world that has a very great threat in it, from the standpoint of blood relationships, from the standpoint of common ideals, objectives, purposes, and aspirations, and the standpoint of common language, we are very close to the British empire. If two such nations cannot get together on a cooperative basis, if they cannot work together to use their common resources in the defeat of aggressive dictatorship, and in the preservation of our freedoms, then how are we going into larger fields, among nations who are not so closely related? How are we to preserve peace through cooperative action? It seems to me that the British-American experiment is almost a laboratory; one that has been successful is the American-Canadian effort, and which must be successful here.

And let us remember this. A very famous soldier, Napoleon, said, "In war the moral is to the physical as three is to one," and I assure you that he understated the case. Now today morale, the morale of the British Empire is very important to us, and sympathy, understanding, a desire to know costs us nothing, and it is fully as important as the money we can give them as the help we can give them in the material way to reestablish their economy, and take a place side by side with us to make certain that freedoms shall endure. So none of us needs to be an Anglophile or a worshipper of the British royalty or anything else in order to see that our own self-interest, our own decent respect for our future safety in the world, inclines us to look at their case sympathetically and with the hope that we can inspire them and help them so that they will regain the position that they have held for so long, where they were both our political and military outposts, in a world beset by very great troubles.

So I come back to my original theory, that this business of education is not just for our children. It is primarily, at this moment, for us, and we must teach ourselves. The Junior Chamber of Commerce has adopted for itself a great objective, a great aim.

I have touched most haltingly and briefly on few of the things that beset us today. Think of the others that are related to them and part of them. We have been spending 15 billion dollars a year on security establishments. How long can we continue to pour out that portion of our national revenue for such sterile, negative, and unproductive organization as Army, Navy, and Air Force? I insist that today we must be forehanded in those matters; we must not neglect them; to neglect them would destroy in one stroke all that we have struggled to do since V - J Day; we must be strong, not only economically, morally, spiritually, but also

militarily and it is a pity. It makes all the more important that we tackle all these problems in our educational process sympathetically, intelligently and remembering as we think of the money we pour out.

What is the cost of war? We now look at a great national debt of 250 billions and people tell us of many things about it among others we have to keep prices higher, or we can never carry the debt. They talk about it very gravely, and it is a grave matter, but that's not even a tenth of the cost of that war. We have spread many of the flower of our youth all over the continents of the world; we have poured out our irreplaceable resources, our steel, our copper, our lead; it lines the bottom of the sea; is scattered in fragments over many continents. We have burdened ourselves in the future with man-hours of work that we must perform in order to meet the obligation that we have incurred. Those things must not occur again, but just as certainly as we do not give thought to them, work about, donate our time, our trouble, not just giving five dollars to the Red Cross when it comes around; you must give your own energy, your own mind, and above all your hearts, if the future of America is to be what it can be.

In my opinion there is no temporal force so great as that of 140 million inspired Americans. It is my firm conviction that is the Junior Chamber of Commerce through its affiliates all over the country can get those 140 million people to studying these great problems sufficiently to get a clear understanding of the basic facts involved, there is no danger, no fear of the outcome; because 140 million informed, united American people will not be wrong.

Thank you very much.

• American Bar Association, Kiel Auditorium, St. Louis, Missouri, September 5, 1949

Every gathering of Americans - whether a few on the porch of a crossroads store or massed thousands in a great stadium - is the possessor of a potentially immeasurable influence on the future. Because America has freedom of speech, freedom of communication, the world's highest educational level, and untapped reserves of individual initiative, any group of our people, fired by a common purpose, can generate a decisive strength toward its achievement. Some of the most inspiring chapters in our history were written by a handful of our citizens who, joined to talk out among themselves an idea or a principle, struck a note that revolutionized the world's thinking. That capacity still resides in every gathering in this country.

Those who fear that our people are bogged down in the apathy of regimented thought, have never been privileged to listen in on the talk of a squad of soldiers or a gandy-dancer gang on the railroad. Or - for that matter - to a conference of bankers when there was under discussion a topic of vital interest to the future of this Republic. Readiness to air a grievance, to propose a remedy, to argue the pros and cons of a plan, is an enduring - and priceless - American Trait.

Few groups, however, can have so profound an impact on the course of public affairs as this assembly. Ours is a government of law - not of despotic decree - and you who practice the law have a specialized knowledge and unique influence in human relations. Indeed, without your counsel and advice hardly a single policy decision is reached by any of the forces most potent in the American economy - by labor organizations, by management, by farm groups, by welfare and professional associations, by government agencies. Your attitude today often foreshadows the facts of tomorrow.

As a consequence, a more than ordinary responsibility is on you to remain free from bias and prejudice when you consider broad social problems. If you are true to your profession and to the responsibilities of your citizenship, you view them within a framework of three fundamental principles of American life.

First, that individual freedom is our most precious possession. It is to be guarded as the chief heritage of our people, the wellspring of our spiritual and material greatness, and the central target of all enemies - internal and external - who seek to weaken and destroy the American Republic.

Second, that all our freedoms - personal, economic, social, political - freedom to buy, to work, to hire, to bargain, to save, to vote, to worship, to gather in a convention or join in mutual association; all these freedoms are a single bundle. Each is an indispensable part of a single whole. Destruction of any inevitably leads to the destruction of all.

Third, that freedom to compete vigorously among ourselves, accompanied by a readiness to cooperate

wholeheartedly for the performance of community and national functions, together make our system the most productive on earth.

These three principles express the common faith of loyal Americans - the shining guide that, for the vast majority, points always the straight path to America's future. In the industrialized economy of the 20th century, that path lies down the middle of the road between the unfettered power of concentrated wealth on one flank, and the unbridled power of statism, or partisan interest, on the other. Our agreement in these three great fundamentals provides the setting within which can always be composed any acute difference.

Yet there are some who build out of catch-words and fallacies a testament of inescapable conflict within our economy. Should misguided or vicious persons gull us into acceptance of this false dogma, the fault - criminal and stupid - will be our own. We will have been victimized by the crude technique of the brazen lie, often repeated. You, of the legal profession, are uniquely fitted to expose this fraud, and thereby prevent senseless cleavage and hostility among us.

Labor Day, itself, poses an immediate challenge. In every state of the Union, this day is set aside to honor the men and women who in factories and shops, in transportation and communication, in all the technical areas of our economy, have wrought the material marvel of our time - Industrial America. By their labor - teamed with the know-how of management and the vision of investors - they have produced a wealth of goods and aids to human existence, widely distributed and possessed beyond precedent in history or parallel anywhere.

Because of our productivity and our insistence upon fairness in human relations, we have largely - though not wholly - freed ourselves from the tragic contrast of abject pauperism lying in the shadow of gluttonous luxury. That appalling picture could not be, and never will be, long tolerated by a people who believe in the dignity of man and the legitimate aspirations of all men.

And, let us not forget, our freedom from degrading pauperism is due to America's deep-seated sense of fair play translated into adequate law; to American industrial initiative and courage; to the genius of the American scientist and engineer; and to the sweat, the organizing ability and the product of American labor in a competitive economy. It is not the result of political legerdemain or crackpot fantasies of reward without effort, harvests without planting.

Acknowledged and glaring errors of the past, committed by those who prided themselves as leaders of great industrial empires, have at time justified and compelled drastic action for the preservation of the laborer's dignity - for the welfare of himself and his family.

Selfishness and cupidity - the source of these errors - will never be wholly eradicated from within us. But just as we do not, today, seek to solve international problems in terms of war-time passion, let us not confuse present industrial difficulties with the mistakes and failures of past decades, long since corrected. In the infancy of our modern industrialized society, management and labor and the neutral observer were often equally ignorant of sound practice, of economic trends, of the effect of mass production on human standards of living. However, guided by great principles and lighted by the spirit of fair play, the builders of our industrial economy have achieved success that confounds the prophets of disaster.

A little more than a century ago the Communist Manifesto of Karl Marx was published, preaching the falsehood of an inescapable class warfare that would continue within such a society as ours until by violence the workers erased all traces of traditional government. If Marx were right, this day should be, in all our great country, an annually recurring provocation to riot, physical strife and civil disorder. The factual evidence of his blunder is so clear that it ought not to require emphasis.

Nevertheless, with a full century of contrary proof in our possession and despite our demonstrated capacity for cooperative teamwork, some among us seem to accept the shibboleth of an unbridgeable gap between those who hire and those who are employed. We miserably fail to challenge the lie that what is good for management is necessarily bad for labor; that for one side to profit, the other must be depressed. Such distorted doctrine is false and foreign to the American scene were common ideals and purpose permit us a common approach toward the common good. It must be combatted at every turn by both clear word and effective deed.

Of course, our path in places is still obstructed by unfinished business and the debris of inequities and prejudices, not yet overcome. But, strong in the fundamental principles of American life, we have, in less than two centuries, accomplished more for the community of men than was won in the previous forty.

For us today, those principles still dictate progress down the center, even though there the contest is hottest,

the progress sometimes discouragingly slow. The frightened, the defeated, the coward and the knave run to the flanks, straggling out of the battle under the cover of slogans, false formulas and appeals to passion - a welcome sight to an alert enemy. When the center weakens piece-meal, disintegration and annihilation are only steps away, in a battle of arms or of physical philosophies. The clear-sighted and the courageous, fortunately, keep fighting in the middle of the war. They are determined that we shall not lose our freedoms, either to the unbearable selfishness of vested interest, of through the blindness of those who, protesting devotion to the public welfare, falsely declare that only government can bring us happiness, security and opportunity.

The middle of the road is derided by all of the right and the left. They deliberately misrepresent the central position as a neutral, wishy-washy one. Yet here is the truly creative area within which we may obtain agreement for constructive social action compatible with basic American principles, and with the just aspirations of every sincere American. It is the area in which are rooted the hopes and allegiance of the vast majority of our people.

Thus, the American system in line with its principles can and does, by governmental action, prevent or correct abuses springing from the unregulated practice of a private economy. In specific cases local governments have, with almost unanimous approval, provided needed public services so that extraordinary power over all citizens of the community might not fall into the hands of the few. In all cases we expect the government to be forehanded in establishing the rules that will preserve a practical equality in opportunity.

We, in turn, carefully watch the government - especially the ever-expanding Federal government - to see that in performing the functions obviously falling within governmental responsibility, it does not interfere more than is necessary in our daily lives. We instinctively have greater faith in the counterbalancing effect of many social, philosophic, and economic forces than in arbitrary law. We will not accord to the central government unlimited authority, any more than we will bow our necks to the dictates of the uninhibited seekers after personal power in finance, labor or any other field.

Extremists hope that we lack the stubborn courage, the stamina and the intelligent faith required to sustain the progress of the attack. By appeals to immediate and specialized selfish advantage, they would blind us to the enduring truth that no part of our society may prosper permanently except as the whole of America shall prosper. They use the cloying effect of subsidy as well as the illusory promise of an unearned and indolent existence to win our acceptance of their direction over our lives. They believe that the intricate interdependencies of our highly industrialized economy will drive us to desert principles in favor of expediencies - particularly of governmental intervention.

Thus far the record belies their hopes. Consider the abundance of courage and faith, manifested thousands of times each year in union meetings when working men penetrate the ideological complexities, parliamentary maneuvers, entangled plottings of Communist agitators, exposing and defeating them. Consider also the many thousands of times each year in meetings of management when businessmen - though primarily charged with concern for cost, production, distribution, and profit - subordinate those material things to increasing the welfare of their employees. Were it not for those, in both management and labor, who fight and work to keep us from the ditches on the right and left, then indeed this day would be a symbol of class warfare, and the city of St. Louis - and every other great industrial city - would be a battle ground for what Marx called the proletariat.

But, in public places, soon only the specious promises of the extreme right and the extreme left may make themselves heard. The truth can be lost if the peddlers of lies go unchallenged. To defeat them in their campaign of falsehood, we must first destroy their stock in trade - the shibboleth of an irreconcilable difference between those who manage and those who operate.

Marx appealed to the self-pity, the justifiable resentments of the proletariat in the Europe of his day. He could not imagine a great nation in which there is no proletariat, in which labor is the middle class that he so much despised and hated. He could not foresee that millions of plain people would in two World Wars, stake all they possessed in defense of ideas and ideals that were hardly more than shadowy dreams to most Europeans of a century ago. He could not imagine that one day the grave of an unidentified soldier would become a symbol of our dedication to political, economic and social freedom.

American workingmen are principals in the three-member team of capital, management, labor. Never have they regarded themselves as a service class that could attain freedom only through destruction of the industrial economy. With only rare exceptions, they have striven within the framework of our laws and tradition to

improve their lot through increased production that profited all Americans.

To the achievement of organized labor, my four brothers and I - all of us present at this meeting - can testify, remembering the 84-hour week and skimpy wages of our youth. But we likewise remember with gratitude the opportunities presented to us by the American environment - opportunities so rich, so profuse that we scarcely were aware that the circumstances in which we lived could be classed only as meager. Among these opportunities is that of Education.

By promoting literacy and understanding, our schools have made it impossible for a specially privileged leisure class to prey on those who work. By opening the sciences and professions to all our people, our colleges and universities have destroyed the curse of inherited caste and made our society the most fluid yet attained by man. Though the time has not yet arrived when all men will, as a matter of course, begin their careers in the lowest positions, and from there go upward in accordance with their individual value to society, yet this opportunity today spreads itself before every intelligent, educated and energetic workman of America.

The great body of American teachers daily increases our understanding and appreciation of democracy in economic action. Even the divisions and cleavage that still exist - the unfinished business still before us - are increasingly bridged in our classrooms. Each year education does a little more to promote the efficiency of our system and therefore the opportunities, security and prosperity of our people. My experience as President of Columbia University has fortified my conviction that in the welfare of our teachers, of our whole educational fabric, we find the welfare of future America.

You of the legal profession can likewise be effective in eradicating false, though sometimes persuasive, propaganda from the day to day relations of labor and management. You constitute a unique body of agents and umpires whose counsel is needed - and sometimes heeded - by all members of our industrial team.

You realize that the interests of labor and management in most situations are identical. Differences are centered almost exclusively in the annual bargaining conferences. But even here the true differences are far more apparent than they are real. For intelligent management certainly recognizes the need for maximum income to workers, consistent with reasonable return on investment. With equal clarity, labor cannot fail to recognize the need for increasing amounts of risk capital to provide jobs for our constantly growing population. And - make no mistake about it - no group in our country is more firmly dedicated to the retention and development of our system of private competitive enterprise than is American Labor.

The vast majority of Americans, moreover, respect your historic role in the development of the American way of life and your unique position in relation to its continued progress. For one thing - if you set yourselves to the job - you can clean out the ambush of catchwords, tags and labels in which the plain citizen, including the old soldier, is trapped every time he considers today’s problems. How can we appraise a proposal if the terms hurled at our ears can mean anything or nothing, and change their significance with the inflection of the voice? Welfare state, national socialism, radical, liberal, conservative, reactionary and a regiment of others - these terms in today’s usage, are generally compounds of confusion and prejudice. If our attitudes are muddled, our language is often to blame. A good tonic for clearer thinking is a dose of precise, legal definition.

Above all, we need more economic understanding and working arrangements that will bind labor and management, in every productive enterprise, into a far tighter voluntary cooperative unit than we now have. The purpose of this unity will be - without subordination of one group to the other - the increased productivity that alone can better the position of labor, of management, of all America. No arbitrary or imposed device will work. Beaucratic plans, enforced on both parties by Government, pave the road to despotism. Laws that needlessly impose stifling controls and inflexible rules beyond the codes necessary to fair play may be necessary in a dictatorship - but in a democracy, they are futile at the best and the cause of rebellion at the worst.

You, however, using your recognized position as guardians of the law and counsel to both parties in dispute, can work out voluntary solutions in our industrial relations - that now sometimes appear to be no better than a state of armed truce, punctuated by outbreaks of industrial warfare. Such a condition is a criminal absurdity, since the participants possess a common stake in the prosperity of industry. Moreover, they possess common political concepts, social purpose, economic attitude and, above all, identical aspirations for themselves, their families, their country.

They are Americans - all.

• Dedication of Boys Building, Harlem Branch, YMCA, New York City, September 25, 1949

I assure you that I have a great sense of distinction in the invitation extended to me to come and meet with you on this occasion, which means so much in the life of the community. And first, it is my privilege and very great honor to bring to you the greetings of a neighbor. I do not mean a neighbor merely because I live a few blocks from this spot. I mean a neighbor as defined by the interest and respect one has for a group of people, and in my case, particularly for a group of people who will band themselves together, and by their efforts, their devotion and their sacrifice, make an investment in the future of America, such as is represented in this house across the street, and in the purpose to which it is dedicated.

And it is always a happy privilege for me, when I can meet such a group of Americans, to single out one segment of the gathering, those with whom I was privileged to serve in World War II. In this gathering there are many veterans. Some of you served in the Far Pacific, some on necessary duties here at home. Others of you were with me in Africa, Great Britain, Europe and on the Alps. Indeed, there are among your gathering, two men who well know that to them I will never be able to express the full measure of my appreciation. They were, more than any others, responsible for keeping me in health and strength throughout that war, and it is a very great pleasure to me that these two men should come here today to hear their old boss perform in front of this crowd.

One reason for my great interest in the undertaking that is represented in the Annex of the Y.M.C.A. here in Harlem, is what it represents in our governmental life and in our future, entirely aside from the function that it, itself, will perform, or that will be performed in it. Now, I do not mean to be obscure, I mean this - there is a movement and a trend abroad in the land today, that if there is a difficult job to perform, we say “Let the government do it. What is Washington going to do about it?” And in the measure that that spirit and that habit grows, we are forsaking all the principles - the methods that have made this country great. We are tending toward that time when we will not be our own bosses, and we will not have the privilege to gather together in a meeting like this and dedicate a building to purposes that we, ourselves, decide. So, my congratulations and felicitations to the boys who are going to have the great opportunity of using this building and to the groups that have made it possible. Because to my mind, it is Americanism at its best.

These people who would have us forsake the ancient principles, who would have us forego some of our liberties and our freedoms in return for what they call security from the Federal Government, are aided and abetted by a type of person called the agitator. He hopes, through the unrest that he can engender through class warfare - racial differences, to create a division that will allow him to get into a position of power where he, and his group like him, can tell us what to do. One of the groups that that agitator is always attacking is the Negro section of the population. To my mind, one of the great glories of the American Negro today is that this agitator has had no slightest measure of success. It has been my great privilege more than once to appear before Congressional Committees, and elsewhere, and testify to the loyalty and the value to us of that great ten percent of our population that is Negro in race.

They, like their white brothers, have their representatives lying under the crosses of Tunisia, of Normandy and the Rhine. They have never hesitated to spill their blood for this great country. They have a record that is not merely to be found in that line of generalization. They have their own great individual people to whom they may point as evidences of what they can do, what they are certain to do, what they are certain to do as we come in this country, more and more, to exercise the true principle of democracy. For my own part, in seeking some definition for the word “Democracy,” I believe this one satisfies me more than any other: “Democracy is the political expression of a deeply felt religion.” If, therefore, we are going to exercise the principles of democracy, we are going to remember the great tenets of whatever particular religious philosophy to which we adhere - and they are all wise and good in that they condemn injustice, unfairness, and they do not allow complacency to recall unfairness or inequality of opportunity.

It is not for any man to say today that any of us have erased from our hearts the last vestiges of prejudice. That is not true. We are fallible people and although we may have been created in the image of our Maker, we certainly have not, at this time of world development, attained to that spiritual perfection that we can claim the

virtue that we know that Creator possesses. But we can strive toward it, and what I am trying to say, is the virtue is in the striving.

That is the reason that I think you should be so proud of Booker T. Washington; the man we heard so eloquently described today - Dr. Anderson; Dr. Carver; Dr. Bunche, today one of the greatest statesmen this country has produced. And I assure you I admire Jackie Robinson right along with them. But more than that - more than in those mere special cases, I should like to point one thing out which I fervently believe - there is no race in the history of man - none - going back to the Pharaohs and the Ark - that has, in eighty-five years, come so far on the road to understanding, useful citizenship, satisfaction in its own culture and its own advancement, as the American Negro race. Only eighty-five years ago I suppose, although I have not looked up records, but I suppose it would have been an exaggeration to say that one Negro out of a thousand could read and write - at least with any facility. And yet, look at them today - everywhere - educated along with all the rest of American citizens. And one of the two men that I happened to mention to you a few minutes ago, to whom I owe so much for service all through the war years, today stands at the top three per cent of his class at Teachers' College, and I assure you we don't give out grades up there just because a fellow was as sergeant for the "Old Man" in the war. He earns it.

Now, if you have come all that way in eighty-five years, in terms of history, think of what great moment that is. If you will cast your minds back, how many of you here can quickly tell how many years there were, for example, between the Peloponnesian War and the Phoenician War in Rome? Well, a couple of hundred years. But in eighty-five years you have come that far. Wouldn't it be fun to cast our minds just this far forward - say when the boys, the young boys who are just going into that building - are as old as I am. Well, it's going to be about the year 2000. (Sounds like a long time when you say it that way). They will be up here, probably with another renovation of this building, and extension, a building bigger and better than ever. What will they be saying about the Negro race? I rather doubt, ladies and gentlemen, at that time if it will occur to us to mention those words. We will just say Americans, because that is what we all are. And if this great country, with those institutions to keep you and me free; that allows us to do as we please; to take a job where we want to; to think what we please; to worship as we please is going to endure, then we must practice democracy which means that we are all merely, but proudly, Americans.

• Remarks at Exercises Opening 196th Academic Year, September 28, 1949

For the first time at one of these opening exercises, I have the privilege of helping to make welcome one class that is definitely junior to myself. Among college presidents I have now entered my sophomore year and, while that fact may not impress the upperclassmen here at Columbia, I hope it is not without some effect upon the new class, because to their representatives I should like to say a word. I hasten to assure you that this experience does not qualify me in my own mind to offer advice, but possibly there are one or two points I can bring up that may prove valuable to you - possibly even some of the older classmen may find something worth considering.

In these times when we hear so much of security, security for everything we do - when so many of us want to be sure that we shall never be cold, or hungry, or out in the rain, or have a leaky roof - I must tell you that you have come to the wrong place if you are seeking complete fulfillment of any ambition that deals with perfect security. In fact, I am quite certain that the human being could not continue to exist if he had perfect security. Life is certainly worthwhile only as it represents struggle for worthy causes, and there is no struggle in perfect security. I should think that the best example of it would be a man serving a lifetime in a federal prison. But you are going to meet here at every turn, every day, all the time, opportunity. You are going to meet it by rubbing elbows with distinguished scholars in the faculty, and among your own student body, and from them you will learn, and you will grow in understanding, and you will grow to love the fight that opportunity brings. And I hope that by the end of the year and more especially by the end of the course, the word "opportunity" will be one that you nail to the masthead of your lifetime flag and follow forever.

So Columbia, in attempting to make you welcome, simply says: Here, we believe, is opportunity for those who seek it, and if you enjoy your opportunities to the full you will have a lifetime of satisfaction and value to

your nation, to yourself, and to your God.

• Opening Convocation at Barnard College, September 29, 1949

I think that it is probably true that no man could have gone through the same experiences that I have for the past number of years without experiencing his moments of anxiety, not to say actual fright, but I can remember none of them which at the moment of its experiencing was more acute than when I am faced with the necessity of addressing 1200 young ladies. If, of course, you were a group of young men, it would be appropriate if I could attempt to recall from past years some experiences on which I could base a word of advice. In this case we have today, if I were foolish enough to offer advice, I would certainly hope you would be wise enough not to accept it. I have no basis of past experience on which I could devise anything like advice.

But possibly we might get together - go over in our minds a few of the things which are going on around us. I believe that the greatest concern of America today is - what is the future of our country? What is the future of the system that has brought us to the point that all of you young ladies may go to the college of your choice, that you can study the subjects you please, and form your own opinions and express them? There are thousands of privileges we could call to our minds that this country has given us. But I think that around this one - great personal freedom, personal liberty - all the rest of them can be grouped.

The question I should like to raise is this: can we go on indefinitely with that kind of system, particularly when one of the greatest powers in the world today says that any attempt to exercise a democratic form of government is madness - a sign of political immaturity. In short, that a group, by some method seizing power, must control our government and direct our lives.

There are many ways in which you will find yourself brought up directly against this problem. The one that most concerns us today is this: Education.

You have entered and are now experiencing the privilege of going to one of the finest colleges in the country, working with great scholars and teachers, asking questions, absorbing ideas and in general going forward toward years of maturity with the idea that you have had the right and opportunity to profit from the judgments of these great teachers. Now this is what we call a privately endowed college and what I want to bring up is related to the point of government doing everything itself.

It is quite clear to all of us that the state university and other publicly supported institutions of education have their function in our country. For the certainty that there will be an education available to all that want to work hard enough for it, our state, municipal, and federal institutions are wonderful and necessary.

Then we might say to ourselves: “Why Barnard?” or any other privately endowed institution. Because of this: it is in the educational years that we are trained to think. Those of you who have had the misfortune to be in Germany just before, during, or since World War II, will have seen the effect of education which is centered completely in the hands of a central government that wanted to promote one idea. There was developed a fanatical devotion to wickedness that was almost incomprehensible to us.

In this country, as long as there are fine privately endowed institutions to establish the standards, and as long as public education is supported by diffused governments - that is by cities and states rather than the Federal government - we are in no danger of any such thing. The second that all privately endowed institutions disappear from our country I would say that you have a very certain indication that radical measures are instantaneously indicated or you are going to live, not according to your own choice, but according to the man or government that wields the whips.

There was never a truer thing said than that “the price of liberty is eternal vigilance,” and in no other direction must you be more vigilant than in supporting private educational institutions. If you are going to live the lives you hope to, you must devotedly guard your liberty - especially in regard to the educational freedom that is found in the private institutions.

I think that one of the greatest reasons for school is that it gives a person time to think. We grow so busy in our other pursuits, in the necessity of keeping the wolf from the door and of earning a living, that we don’t think. In trying to make a living, we forget to exercise our minds. But when you are in school, veritable pastures of knowledge are laid in front of you, and you are just invited into them.

So, if you think about these things and bring them to the attention of those closest to you - your friends, your parents you will be doing your part to make certain that this great country, to say nothing of the great school to which you belong - is going to continue on the same principles no matter how rapidly they change for the better in method and procedures as the years go on.

There is nothing I despise so much as an alarmist - never become an alarmist, never forget that there is no temporal power for good so great as the united will of 140,000,000 Americans. We have given the world examples of the good use of moral, intellectual, industrial, and financial power that I think I may say almost no other race has ever afforded. The question is can we maintain that position and exercise our power for the good, upholding not only our country but the world. The moral of my little story is: if you profit by every opportunity you have here, if in doing so you achieve a thorough understanding of what this school is for, and do your utmost to insure its perpetuity then, in your own way, and very specifically, you will help your country and the world.

Unidentified speech, probably remarks at alumni day function, October 8, 1949

Because our guest of honor today two or three times made the observation that he was getting old, I want to pass on to you an observation about age that I recently heard: a man of some years was receiving a bit of commiseration from his friend because of the fact they were getting grey haired or bald headed, and the man addressed thought a moment and he said, “Well, my feeling is this: Thank God I am old considering when I was born, if I weren’t old, I’d be dead.”

I should certainly like to make the observation before I leave that particular point - that it is not only the undergraduate that Columbia needs today in her army, but it is every last one of us, no matter how many years - winters and summers, have passed over our benign heads.

There are to be guests of ours today, two men who were associates of mine in the war - one of them a Britisher, one an American - leaders in the Air Forces. They come back to my mind today for a very special reason that has nothing to do with the circumstances that they are going to see us beat our friends from New Haven.

We went into Africa in 1942 - from the air viewpoint - we had nothing. The enemy had two splendid air fields down at the eastern end of the theatre and we were literally battered to pieces - we learned what it was to fight without this thing called air superiority. These men moved in - they were undaunted by circumstances. They hauled together rocks and they put brush on top of that, on top of that they put gravel - they found ways and means in which they could get their planes off the ground. They pushed these home-made fields further and further to the front. Finally with a little cooperation of a little weather we got to the point we could whip the German Air Forces and our success in Africa was assured and it presaged the success that we were bound later to experience in the whole war. The point of the thing is this: They were confronted by circumstances in the early stages of that campaign that had been accepted by professionals as impossible - impossible if you were to achieve victory - you had to have all-weather fields - you had to have a chance to fly your ships or you could not win - but they did win.

Here is Columbia in the center of a great city. We are imbued with a desire to gather together at times, to exchange views, assistance and help with respect to Columbia today and reminiscences concerning Columbia of the past. We have had no really suitable place; we have not had any great auditorium down on Morningside Heights or anywhere else where the great body of Columbia alumni and undergraduates and their friends could get together, and so a year ago someone conceived the idea of a homecoming day to be held early in the fall when the weather was good and maybe it would cooperate with us as well as it did so long ago in Africa. And they thought if we could make a success of this day in the opportunities it would offer Columbia’s people to come back, to exchange views, to mingle again with old friends, to relive the days for a brief moment when they were not baldheaded or grey headed, that would be a very wonderful thing.

Now it started last year and success was sufficiently great and it was repeated, thanks, as Mr. Hogan said, to the indispensable assistance of one of our trustees, my great friend, Mr. Watson.

Now if this is going to be a day already starting to become a tradition, let’s get out here. There are certain things we can do regardless of buildings, regardless of conventions, regardless of the start we have. One thing

we can do is next year each one of us bring two friends. Columbia's friends possibly by preference, but bring two friends, and let's continue that geometric progression. With some of my mathematical professors here I wonder if I used the right word. Anyway, I mean the faster way. If we get too many, we will have so many we can dig out the well on that side and fill up the river in this one. What I am trying to get over - nothing need defeat Columbia. If we would get every day - if we would set aside one day next fall now, on our calendars, say that Columbia, we are going - I don't think we would even be stopped by rain and hail and sleet - the postman says he isn't - we ought to have that much brains, and determination.

I'll tell you what I will do. Last year I made a pledge that was read to me this morning. I'll pledge that if you will come out in that crowd that I'll get these people - lot of speaking. We won't take up your time with all this talk. We will simply have the guest of honor get his award, give his impression of Columbia and the years through which he has lived and the rest of the time we will have to do as we please around in these tents. And I'll tell you frankly for myself - I have been told a lot of things by different people heading committees what I must say today. Well, as far as I am concerned, nothing but a struggle between my obligation to do that and my prodigious appetite – I'd like to be back by the hot dogs. But one particular feature of this day that I want to point out that it is giving us an opportunity very hard to achieve elsewhere or in any other way. It is the mingling of the undergraduate including the freshmen who have just come here with the older alumni. All of them to include the last man that can wobble his way up here and on a very informal basis because a man does not have to stay at the table which says the number of his class. Everybody is welcome on every spot of the place - the youngsters just coming here from Abilene, Kansas or San Antonio, Texas, of the middle of Brooklyn, can find out instantly that he belongs to a family that is animated by a great purpose - a purpose that certainly at the very least brings us up here once a year again to meet together and to pledge anew our devotion to the greatest University of the United States. That is what Alumni Day is for. It is opportunity for every man who can claim Columbia, and you will notice that in one short year I am claiming to be a hot shot Columbian fellow myself.

So what I want to leave with you then is this idea: It is a day of opportunity for each of us and let's not miss it, because we will exemplify, and this is the land of opportunity where we do things by cooperation and we don't wait for someone to order it.

Here comes my opponent - Goodbye. Thank you.

• Dedication of Columbia University's new field house at Baker Field, New York City, October 8, 1949

It is true that I come from a profession whose accomplishments and where the reputation of the individual are measured in deeds rather than words, and for that I have always considered myself fortunate. Today, for example, they were very careful to give me no place really on the speech making as to do the work, and I am sure that they have made provision for possible accidents or not to say inefficiency on my part, by marking a spot where there are to be no rocks under the grass.

But relating this effort that is culminating today in the turning of this first spade of ground for the new field house, to my old profession, I should first like to point out this: A soldier could find nothing to criticize in the fact that you have had to plan long and carefully before you undertook action. In the reading of military history too many people are apt to jump clear down to "who won and what were the losses?" The months of painstaking planning that goes ahead of the first actual step in military operations is where the real ability is displayed, and because it is displayed there, the people that do it never find their names in print. And so it will be with this. There are going to be many workers, many people whose efforts will contribute and it will be very significant to the development of Baker Field into the great place that it must be, whose names will never see print, whose satisfaction will be largely in a conscience that tells them "I have done well," by an organization to which I owe much. I have done well by the future lads of this country who are going to utilize this place, and by the many future people who will get great enjoyment by coming to witness those boys in their athletic games.

There are a few names, however, today, that of course can never be forgotten when we thing of such an accomplishment, as is here represented - such a beginning rather, as is here represented. Some of them have been introduced to you from this platform - their work has been most fruitful - it will be more so in the future.

But there is also all the way back, we go to the name Mr. Baker, who originally made their whole dream possible; and then more lately we have the names of Sarah of Eliza and Samuel Valentine, whose gift to this University is now applied to the actual physical accomplishments of the first part of this great development.

(elevated passed) Many things in New York defeat me - one of them is the elevated.

And then there are other donors, substantial donors, who have chosen to remain anonymous, and they have requested your Committees and the trustees that they remain anonymous. But that does not make our gratitude to them any less - any less lasting. They will know if no one else will of what they have done to make this possible.

After it is too late, I suddenly remind myself that I promised you I wasn't making a speech - I was going to wield the shovel and now as I start to do that, I want to say only this, and leave you with this one thought: May we all look upon it as the beginning of a job, the beginning of a job that is never going to cease until it reaches completion right down to the edge of the river and the tempo of action is going to increase every single day because we are united so - and if we do so, we can accomplish it.

Now I am ready to take this shovel.

• Statement to Committee on Armed Forces, House of Representatives, Washington, DC, October 20, 1949

First of all, Mr. Chairman, it is a compliment to be asked before this committee. If there is anything I can do to throw any single bit of light on the grave questions that you are now trying to get to the bottom of, all the trouble I have taken will be as nothing.

As I have examined the testimony in the papers, the questions that have been discussed, I have come to this conclusion:

Here before this body my friends have appeared, men that I consider distinguished Americans. They have presented in certain cases what you would have to label as complaints. Those complaints other individuals have answered. There has been argument and counterargument. Now, remembering that I have great admiration for all of these men, I see little use for my going through their testimony, trying to pick it to pieces, and saying "No, I do not quite agree with this but I do agree with that."

With your indulgence, therefore, I am going to try to cast my mind ahead. Where is this country going and where is the security establishment going? To do this, I shall have to review a few circumstances and incidents of the past. If, in the fashion of old soldiers I should grow too garrulous, I would take it as a very great favor if the chairman would bring me back to the point.

Immediately after Pearl Harbor I was called into Washington and within a very short time I, as a principal assistant to General Marshall, agreed with him that our arrangements for getting along with the adoption of a general war policy were not good. We were stumbling and fumbling and reaching no decisions and General Marshall devised the idea that we should bet a chairman for the Joint Staff then organized. In order to remove from his suggestion any thought of service or self-interest, he recommended to the President specifically that Admiral Leahy should be brought in as the chairman. We wanted no part of this suggestion if it was going to be interpreted as partisan in character.

I recite that early incident because it partially influenced me when I came back after the war with the experience of 3 or 4 years of trying to battle not only the services but different countries into one single line of action. I believed that since all of us had accepted as a truism that in the field single action among all the services was mandatory, at the very least, unification in our form of control here at the seat of government should be an example to all.

But remembering that early example of general Marshall I went to the President of the United States, because I learned that there were certain oppositions developing, I told him before I appeared before the first public body in this city to advocate unification that, if it were passed, I recommended urgently that Secretary Forrestal be the first chief of the Defense Department and Admiral Nimitz be the Chief of Staff, and that if he could not agree to that almost in advance, I could not fight for it because I wanted to stand absolutely on principle and with no thought at all of advancing the interests of any particular service.

During the war - and I want to make a very flat and definite statement - it fell to me to be responsible for some of the greatest operations in the field that America has ever undertaken. In all of those operations, the absolute cooperation, devotion, loyalty, patriotism, and efficiency of all three services were mandatory. I had them from each in full measure. I cannot believe that there was any single time when the Army, although I had been raised with them, for 35 years we had been buddies, or the Air, which up to that moment had been part of our organization, gave me one slightest bit more of loyalty or efficient cooperation than did the Navy - and, I might add, subordination. I never had in my command an order of mine questioned by any one of my American subordinates.

So I come now to the very thing that is bothering us - the latest differences, the complaints on the part of one service, answered on the part of the other, that have become the heart of this controversy.

The first observation I should make, I believe, is this: We are expecting perfection too quickly. It is just exactly, gentlemen, as when we were waging a great war in Europe. Three million Americans were fighting for their lives. They were part of a great allied force of 5,000,000. We get a set-back, deliberately risked in order to get ahead with this war and get it stopped and get the killing over. Everybody becomes panicky. Oh, we had better do something very drastic right away. These set-backs are an inescapable part of all group activity when people are trying to get together, particularly, Mr. Chairman, when you try to put them together as coequals. The human is not so constituted that he bows his neck quickly and easily and without a lot of fuss to someone else whom he does not recognize as his boss, unless he is making out his efficiency report.

So, as I say, there is very little to add on my part because, as I said, able men have presented their viewpoints.

Now I come to the reason that I was brought into this thing in the first place. As these arguments began to develop and grow a bit acute, about last September - a year ago - Mr. Forrestal realized that he did not have quite the amount of help that he needed. He considered first taking one of the chiefs of staff and bringing them up to sit by his side and to advise him from time to time. Well, he thought that would not work out and there were grave objections, so he called me back.

Now, here I should pause to say that this Congress has done me, along with some few others, a very great honor. They have made me an active officer of the Army for as long as I shall live, so whenever anybody who is my civilian superior in Government calls me back, I am here. I don’t care whom it may be. If he is my superior and he calls me to duty, I come.

Mr. Forrestal asked me to listen to the arguments, never to make a decision. The most he asked was for me to make a recommendation to him after listening. After I listened to his story I went to the Chiefs of Staff and I think they would all recite this story to you if you would ask them. I, of course, did not want to be spending my life sleeping on night trains between here and New York City so I tried to get out of it - I tried to lay before the Chiefs of Staff formula that I thought would make it unnecessary for me to come down. They were not accepted and when they were not accepted I went along with Secretary Forrestal to do what I could, but I must assure you that so far as I know there was never, on the part of anyone in that Chiefs of Staff committee, from the time I got there until my last meeting with them I suppose some 2 or 3 months ago - at least just before General Bradley was appointed - that smacked of coercion, not in the slightest.

As far as I knew, and as far as my part of it was concerned, it was a desperate attempt to reach a decision, and when we could not reach a decision, the great problem was to get just as close to decision as we possibly could, so that what was left in the hands of the Secretary of Defense would be - you might say - the minimum area in which he had to act and to oppose part of the Chiefs of Staff.

I always insisted to the Secretary that whenever he ruled against anyone, he include in his directive a request the immediate requirement and request for anybody who felt himself abused to come instantly and see him. I have always done that and so far as I know, the Secretaries have done that.

Probably we are not going to accomplish too much by going back over the particular discussions, divisions of opinion and all the rest of it to which I was witness, but as I consider what lies ahead for us I should like to recall something that I have said twice before.

We are dealing with distinguished Americans, people who have their country’s good at heart and, therefore, we should not be too critical or too ready to call names on either side; above all, we should not be too ready to question motives.

Then I have a very definite suggestion for this committee. I will not be quite so modest as some of the others. Let me tell you what happens. The quarrel arises about the division of the dollar. The President tells the services that there is a dollar ceiling on what they are going to get and so the fight starts because each one goes into that pile with his shovel.

Now remember this: You are always in a democracy dealing with deficits. There is not enough money to go around. We raise and support armies, navies, and air forces on the basis of competition with private industry. We insist upon decent and high standards of living. All our expenses are high. Our job of keeping a decent defense establishment as opposed to the Russians is enormous, but there must be some point beyond which we do not go, because our armed forces are defending a way of life, not merely territory, and we dare not destroy that way of life from inside by demanding such unconscionable appropriations that they cannot be met.

Now the fight starts to divide this dollar. So how do we do it?

It is absolutely false to say that there has never been any agreed concepts for strategic action against the only enemy we can possibly have. There has been a very great measure of agreement. When it comes down to who will do the task, Mr. Chairman, it has not been quite so easy, but there is a very great area of agreement of what we are to do.

But here is what I should like to point out: Based on an agreement that they reach, let us say in the professional field, they work out the budget. Probably about now - I haven't checked the time of year with them - but about now they are going to work on the 1952 budget.

Mr. Chairman, somewhere in late 1951 you people will begin to examine what they are doing and very properly will be critical about some of it. I would suggest this to this committee: That before we start in the armed services - pardon my "we;" I am no longer actively in that group - before the Joint Chiefs of Staff start laying our the great pattern for the division of this money, I say why doesn't this committee invite them down here, or you go there long before this long and torturous 2-year process of beating this thing into shape is started?

Then you will know the plan for which you are working. They will tell it to you in general terms because actual, tactical assignments will change from time to time but they can keep in the closest possible coordination, so that as this process develops it is done in the democratic way. I assure you that this can be done without being careless of military secrets. Of course it can, since the armed services are dealing with a specific body, that bears responsibility in the end result, and there is no reason for their not telling you the full story.

Now, as it goes along you will know why they ask for this much money or not for that much, why they ask for this type of machine and not that type of weapon. You realize that since we are dealing in deficits everybody is going to get hurt some. The question is: Where do you think the least damage to this country will be done? It is no different, Mr. Chairman, than it was in the early days of the war when I was brought in to be the operations officer, War Department. All we had to distribute was a lot of deficits. Who should have to take the biggest licking; that was all there was to it.

Now, I am not even going to indulge in observations about the character and price and kind of the Russian military machine or exactly what we should have with respect to it. I just believe that from this moment onward we can actually make unification work and I know that the old, old parable still holds - I believe brought out in a Roman court - that when they put the entire bunch of sticks together and tried to break them, they could not, but they could do it one by one. In unity there is strength and this country unified can whip the world, and the ability to do that, if necessary, is what we want.

I think in this day and time - and I am going a little afield making this observation but I am talking from the standpoint of reading my daily newspaper - that a few men, because they cannot agree upon particular items in our economic set-up, cannot arrive at some particular, specific decision, can almost paralyze the economy of this country. I imagine that there are certain general staffs in this world that are shouting with glee about it. I don't want to see the same thing happen with our security establishment and I say, therefore, I will be no party to either side. I am going to be no party to anything that I think gives aid and comfort to any potential enemy.

That is my statement, sir.

• 18th annual New York Herald Tribune Forum, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, October 24,

1949

"What kind of government ahead? The responsibility of every citizen." There, in ten words, is the most important question of our day and the nub of the American political philosophy.

We believe in human dignity, in human rights not subject to arbitrary forfeiture or curtailment. We believe that these rights can be fully possessed and effectively exercised only so long as man asserts and maintains himself the master, not the serf of institutions he creates. Unless he is free to use his birthright, it is worthless - in fact, does not exist. Freedom, however, is not unbridled license. Nor is it merely the expression of the jungle instinct to survive and dominate.

Free men, consequently, agree upon certain rules - which we call laws - and maintain political agents, or governments, to codify and enforce upon up all these self-imposed rules. In free countries, the agent may never become the master; if human rights and freedoms are to flourish, government must operate with its powers sharply defined and limited by the governed.

And unless we understand this, the American Dream may become the American Nightmare.

For us Americans, the original limits on the authority conceded to the federal government are in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. But, the dividing line between government's functions, on the one hand, and the individual's rights, privileges and inescapable responsibilities never is completely fixed; never is static. It oscillates constantly, in a middle area between centralized authority and individual liberty, as economic, social and political conditions require more, or less, action by government. War certainly demands a mass control intolerable in peace. Even peacetime crisis may argue for a temporary surrender of some personal liberties for the alleged good of the public.

Today, internally and externally, our affairs seem framed in an unending series of crises. We hear that "We live on a high plateau of tension" - a tension that adds importance to the question: "What Kind of Government Ahead?"

Under the atomic shadow, the world dwells in two hostile camps. The one is dedicated to human freedom and human rights, founded in the dignity of man. The other is committed to a dictatorship of the proletariat where the state decided what rights, what freedom the individual may enjoy. This basic cleavage, of itself, would apparently involve no irreconcilable antagonisms. But communistic leaders openly declare that individual freedom and free enterprise, as we practice them, cannot long exist in the same world with communism. They leave us no doubt on this point. In their declaration is a kind of tragic and continuing threat to our kind of government – "The Kind of Government Ahead." In view of the dynamic force with which those leaders are prosecuting their aims, we scarcely need further incentive to concentrate our thinking, our planning, and our actions toward preservation of freedom against threats from without.

At home, we face the complex social, economic and political problems that have been highly complicated for democracy by the industrial revolution. We have had to adjust precepts, doctrine, and methods developed in an agrarian frontier age to the industrialized economy and civilization of the 20th century. This has not been easy. Perfection has not been attained, but we will continue to seek it, using every available means to us.

A century ago, the year of the discovery of gold in California, the average American citizen typified a sturdy independence. He had faith and confidence in himself and in the limitless potential of his country's resources, readily available to his use. While vaguely aware of his government's existence, it had little to do, either good or bad, with his day-to-day living. With a mite of help, the citizen built his own house from materials at hand. He raised his family's food - and good land was to be had cheaply. His clothing was made by his wife; his transport was his horse. Given health, initiative and stamina, he could always find for himself and his dependents sustenance - even abundance. Taxes were low, opportunity was everywhere, life was good - even if frequently filled with risk and danger to life and limb. In a sense, the aims of the framers of our Constitution seemed to be almost perfectly achieved.

Nevertheless, the essential dignity of man and the mastery of man over his institutions were less expressed in the facts of American life in 1849 than they are in 1949. Then, luxuries were for the very few, and grinding hardship was, in some season of every year, the lot of most. Recurrent epidemics scourged alike our cities and our frontiers. A few men of industrial power could throw a region into a panic; a single person could, on a whim, shut down the mills of a community and self-righteously judge himself guiltless of the suffering imposed

on workmen and their families. The moral crime of human slavery was legalized. Millions of human beings were subject to barter and sale. In 1849 we practiced democracy somewhat in the fashion of the ancient Athenian experiment and woe to him who was born of black or red skin. For him there was only the master's whip or the sword of the exterminator.

Americans in the century just past have used the power of self-government to the progressive advantage of our people. Our fathers, and we, have fought disease, suffering, injustice, and license in all its forms so that all of us might win larger freedoms, including from economic calamity with its consequences of wide-spread want and human misery. In doing all this we have used, whenever necessary, the government as our servant and laws as our instrument. But so far as possible, we have depended upon the force of public opinion, without direct government intervention, to bring about reform and progress - responding to our instinct that "The best government is the least government."

Certainly the American Dream demands that we continue the search for betterment in the cultural and material standards of our people, using where absolutely necessary, specific powers of law and government. Because of the complexity of the problems involved, it may be impossible for any individual to define accurately the line dividing governmental and individual responsibility in this quest. This is typical of collective activity. Two great American industries are today shut down because a few men cannot see eye to eye on specific items of employee and employer responsibility. If they - of undoubted loyalty to America - can dare calamity by their failure to agree in a far more simple decision, how can the plain citizen determine the dividing line between his own and the government's responsibilities?

To help us, I believe that nothing could be more effective than a convocation of leaders in every field with the faculties of some of our great universities. I should be proud to see Columbia cooperating in such an effort, its purpose to develop a clear and authentic chart of this dividing line. The result might not satisfy the mind and conscience of each of us, yet the question would be rescued from the domain of prejudice, emotion, partisan politics and selfish-interest and be subjected to logical analysis and enlightened judgment.

The task is to promote social and economic welfare without jeopardy to individual freedom and right. The conclusions of any such convocation would be transitory in their application, but based upon principles with which we are all familiar. The first of these is the American conviction that men are created equal; that governments are instituted to secure to man their rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Another is the danger inherent in concentration of too much of any kind of power in too few hands.

The leaders in our convocation would be guided also by the truth that the American Dream implies the fullest possible exploitation of American resources for the good of all. They would so locate the dividing line between government and citizen as to provide full play to the American qualities of initiative, courage, inventiveness, which, in their sum, have won us a productivity without parallel in the world. The need for economy in government would require guards against excess of bureaus at the seat of government. Their conclusions would certainly emphasize the truth, "More and more bureaus, more and more taxes, few and fewer producers; the final result is financial collapse and the end of freedom."

The basic difference between the obviously important external and internal factors affecting "What Kind of Government Ahead?" is that the former is a threat, the second a trend. But when freedom is threatened from without, it is more than ever necessary that we, here at home, watch with a critical eye every slightest reason or excuse for moving the line that separates governmental from individual responsibility. Moreover, highly intensifying the need for alertness, is the communistic practice of boring from within. Communistic agents, within our own borders, seize upon any difficulty in our constant process of adjustment and particularly upon every sign of failure and of weakness to lead us further astray in our own thinking - exploiting every excuse to claim that "the government ahead" must conform to their creed. How they must be congratulating themselves when they read that one of our cabinet officers foresees, because of current industrial deadlocks, 5,000,000 will be out of work by December 1 - for them, confirmation of their predictions that free enterprise will disintegrate.

Our foremost need is strength - and proof of strength: moral, intellectual and material strength. We must cling ever more closely to the fundamentals of the American belief in human dignity and rights. So - as we consider measures designed to affect the status of the security of the workingman, we must ask these specific questions: "Does the proposal push the worker one step closer to regimented labor? Does it ease the way to governmental control over his life and his livelihood?" As we strive to devise measures intended to lessen the

shocks and privations incident to old age, to sickness, to unemployment, to natural disaster, let us choose among the several proposals that which best protects our heritage of freedom.

In revising the governmental structure, in approving new appropriations and new governmental ventures, in reforming tax laws, in considering a multitude of glittering proposals - each of which is held by its author to promise eternal happiness and prosperity - let us hold ever before our eyes the simple truth that to men who have lived in freedom there is nothing in life so valuable as freedom - not even life itself.

If today, we never give up the effort to determine - so far as each of us can - the probably effect of every new governmental proposal upon our personal freedom, we will be discharging one of our most acute responsibilities as American citizens. But thereafter it is still necessary to act, to use all the detailed political machinery, including the two-party system, intended to give each of us a voice in his own government. In precinct or district caucuses, in party councils, in all the ways that are open to us, we must act decisively and within the limits established by our own understanding of freedom's requirements. Only thus will be answered wisely - each day – "What Kind of Government Ahead?"

Put all of this into the language of practical action and we would say to ourselves: Our American heritage is threatened as much by our own indifference as it is by the most unscrupulous office-seeker or by the most powerful foreign threat. The future of this Republic is in the hands of the American voter. And we would further advise ourselves: Stop shrugging off politics as only the politicians' business; stop banking on American luck to get us good government and good policy - sometime it will run out. Stop using the alibi "one vote doesn't count." It won't, only if not used! And our neighbor's won't, unless we make him use it. Dishonest political promises to selfish groups - not rebuffed at the ballot box - can make a nightmare of the American Dream. But wise and determined performance of our civic duties can make that dream come true.

• Freedom's Foundation, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania, November 21, 1949

Meeting on this spot to rededicate ourselves to the dream that is America, it is difficult to avoid giving away to emotion so intense as to still the tongue and to leave any American silently grateful, humble, reverent!

Here Washington waged and won the greatest fight of a fighting career. For, in war, it is not the clash and danger of the battle that demands the utmost from the soul of the soldier, or of his leader. For the one, it is the enduring of cold that all but freezes courage, or privation that paralyzes memory, of living midst mud and disease, of striving to understand a seemingly futile wastage that strikes down comrades and drains strength from the body.

For the commander, the sternest test is the holding together of a suffering army; the resisting of his own sympathies and compassion for his faithful followers because devotion to a cause so demands.

Here Washington triumphantly met this test - the long winter of the Valley Forge encampment brought to his army the last ounce of endurable suffering, while Washington was called upon to bear the additional burden of discounting seeming collapse in his rear, desertion in his ranks, hostility in his associates. In its one and three-quarter centuries, the freedom of the American people here experienced its greatest danger of extinction, here met its sternest challenge! Here also it fell heir to its finest example of courage and selflessness, of faith and conviction, of leadership and character!

You recipients of these awards will always be rightfully proud that a jury of your peers marked some effort of yours as useful in perpetuating the vision that sustained Washington in Valley Forge. But medals will disappear, money will go to serve some purpose, written and spoken words will evaporate - but for you, and others to come to this same spot, will always live a priceless realization - the truth that the American dream with worthy disciples, can and will survive every threat, every challenge!

Here in this spiritual temple of the greatest of all Americans, you winners of these awards, become marked as among America's disciples. You have issued your defiance to all who would destroy the American dream, to whose who in our day and time are trying to bring America back again into crisis, out of which she can emerge only through clear thinking, loyalty, courage and stamina.

Your work will never end until all people, everywhere, come to believe in justice, in freedom, in equality among men, in peace for all the world.

• St. Andrew's Society, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, November 30, 1949

In the South, I have a very dear friend who has a darky servant who has been with him for many years. One day, we were playing golf, and the darky seemed to be a little bit slower than usual, but it turned out he had always been slow. His master finally, in some irritation, said, "Sam, don't you ever do anything quick?"

He said, "Yassah, ah gets tired quick."

I understand that after-dinner audiences can get tired sometimes quick. I am going to do my best this evening not to prolong for too great a period the time what you have to wait to take your cars and go home.

When I received the invitation to come here - an invitation in which I took very great pride not to say a distinct feeling of flattery - I called upon the greatest historical body of which I know in the world, the historical section of Columbia University's faculty [applause] (Thank you very much! A little commercial isn't too bad) and I said, "Please find a trace of Scot in the Eisenhower ancestry." No soap! As a matter of fact, when I turned the problem over to the geographers, they said, "There is not a single Loch MacIke in the whole country."

They did uncover, in fact, that my paternal ancestors were driven out of Germany, just escaping death I think by a whisker, in 1630, so as an exile at least I can say to the Reverend Lindsay, "Your younger organization of 1639."

But in spite of that failure to establish any direct Scotch connection, I shall defend with my life, or preferably, let us say, with a claymore, my right to be here. I am a freeman of the City of Edinburgh (I wonder whether you knew that, my Lord Provost), a burgher of the town of Maybole, and, as your President ahs told you, I am now a member of the Royal and Ancient St. Andrews; I am a doctor from Edinburgh, but, more important to a soldier, I have been privileged to be the comrade on battlefields of the 15th, the 51st and the 52nd Scottish Divisions. And finally, in the intimacy of a little home ceremony, I was made an Honorary Member of the Pipers' Band of Ayrshire.

Every night, during the time that my wife and my son and I were staying at Culzean, the band showed up to play the traditional Pipers March as the dessert was served. Each evening, as many of you would know, it became my duty, after the dining table had been circled several times and the piece was ended and all of them left except the pipe major who came to my place, to pour him a quaich of good Scotch whiskey; and every night that little pipe major (a man who, I believe, told me he was a tailor down in Maybole) drank the same toast, and it was this: "Here's to the land that all peoples of the earth place first after their own - America!"

I have thought a long time for a way of expressing the position I should like America to hold in all the world, to express it better than those simple words from that simple pipe major – "The land that all peoples of the earth place after their own - America!"

I wondered why this Scotsman - a man who the next morning would turn out and insist upon his right to chase through the woods to see if he could scare me up a few pheasants (which I couldn't even eat but he didn't even act annoyed about that) - should sense a relationship between him, between his background, his environment, the principles by which he had been raised, and this great land of ours.

Of course, there were in our early days many Scotsmen who came to America. The fact that we have much Scotch blood in the country would scarcely be needed to be argued here at this meeting this evening, but I think more important than the blood that was brought were those elements of courage, the spirit that has been implicit in the songs which we have heard this great artist sing this evening, a defiance of oppression, a readiness to die for what you believe right, frugality, a readiness to face Nature and wrest from it a living, and, above all, simplicity, simplicity of character which means truth, a denial of the virtue of duplicity, of pretense in order to secure a claim for popularity. That was America long before even the writing of the Declaration or the writing of the Constitution. It was almost inherent in the blood.

In response to the toast of "The Land in which we Live," I am not going to attempt a long dissertation on our historical province and the impact of the industrial age and what it has meant, but I should venture to say this: As we face our problems today and consider their nature and their kind, I suggest that the severity of those problems we measure in the degree to which we have drifted away from the simple spirit and the simple principles of way back when we were one with the Scotsman from that time immemorial has battled his living

out of a bleak countryside but a countryside which was to him dear and precious and for which he was ready to fight.

Seemingly somewhere along the line we have lost some respect for mere thrift and independence. The Reverend Lindsay paid a tribute to our great Jefferson, a man we recognize as the great liberal of his time, a man who could say “The best government is the least government.” Now we recognize the degree to which we have changed when we come to see that the definition of a liberal is a man who, in Washington, wants to play the Almighty with our money.

We seek an illusory thing called “security,” and I wonder what Scotsman born any time in historical times, at least after the melting of the several races the previous speakers have told you finally made the Scotsman, has the word “security” in his adventures. Think of the wars they had with England, think of the record they have established in the later wars when wedded to England. They have in every one of them won a renown that has excited the admiration of soldiers throughout the world. Where is security in such a record?

From whence does that thought of security spring? Possibly the basic instinct of self-preservation, and if there is anyone that can show me how we can finally defeat the attack of the “Grim Reaper,” then I will say possibly security is attainable. But until that can be shown, I do not believe that security, in the sense that we may live in slothful indolence and ease and stagnation, can ever be achieved, unless we do it, gentlemen, as slaves of someone who directs us, the one thing that the Scot has never accepted, and let’s pray God he never will.

Possibly we have become too regardful of things that we call luxuries. Possibly we like to wear “fried” shirts too well - I don’t know. Maybe we like caviar and champagne when we ought to be out working on beer and hot dogs. Whatever it is, the thing that has happened to us, gentlemen, is of the spirit.

This country still has broad acres, and, in spite of all the waste and all the exploitation, we have great forests, great mineral resources. We still have more land per capita, more fertile land per capita, than is discoverable almost any place else in the world. We have the greatest industrial fabric.

There is no reason in this country for despair. What we need to do is to take our hearts and minds and lead them back to the kind of thinking and the kind of emotion that has stirred the Scot and all over the world today still makes him on this day meet together to pay a tribute to his native land.

Incidentally, I can’t help remarking that when I heard our Secretary reading messages from various societies in the world, I listened carefully for the society where I first attended a St. Andrew’s dinner, but I think it was missing. It was Manila, Philippine Islands.

I believe that I found in the dinner this evening just a bit of symbolic courage, let us say. We had haggis. I understand it is made from liver and lights and oats. Now, we have much in common with people who speak our language, and, although I admit that sometimes I might have some difficulty in understanding the Scotch, nevertheless we are all of the same breed, we believe in the same things, and that whole group, wherever it appears in the world - in Manila, Shanghai, Glasgow or here - has a sense of value that places one thing above all else, the freedom of the individual, the dignity of the human, his mastery over the state and nor his subservience to it. If, to preserve that, we have to eat nothing but liver and lights and oats, let’s do it gladly.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have seen around the world many, many white crosses under which lie people of all our races of the Western Allies and of our own beloved country. They are there because they believed there was something more than merely assuring ourselves that we weren’t going to be hungry when we were sixty-seven. They are there because they had the concept of liberalism as Jefferson understood liberalism; because they believed man is the master of his fate and should be given opportunity, economically and in every other way, to carve out his own future for himself and his family, and that is the best way to live. That is why they are under those crosses!

To attempt to express my devotion toward, my obligation to, a country to which we all belong would be as difficult as it would be possibly out of taste. But I should like to say this, as I sit down and attempt to keep my promise that I will not hold you too long: If we can return to these songs, if we can believe these songs in this country, if we will live by them, there is no danger for America. The foundations laid by our forefathers, the framework, is sturdy. All we have to do is to remember that we, with the Scots, have inherited the earth because we have inherited freedom and never for one second accept anything that places a mortgage on that priceless heritage of ours. Thank you!

• Chamber of Commerce, Houston, Texas, December 7, 1949

Texas, and its men and women, contributed their full share to the mustering of American might, to the air armadas that destroyed the war sinews of the German, to victory in every ground campaign from North Africa to the Elbe. In fact, I understand, there is a school of thought that attributes victory in equal measure to Texas, Brooklyn and the Allied Forces!

I need not stress the specific part played by the City of Houston. But I do know that it is customary and even expected of a speaker when he addresses a gathering anywhere in the United States, that he pay tribute to the community in which he is a guest - if no more than a factual recital of its size, its industries, its position on the roll of American towns. As a Texan-born, I am no stranger to the Houston story. But to arm myself with adequate factual knowledge for a fitting tribute, I drew from the Columbia University library a book on Texas and this is what I read therein:

"Houston, the county seat of Harris County, is a hustling, bustling community, second to none in the enterprise of its citizens and is the great railroad centre of Texas. Eight different lines of railroads radiate from it. Houston has a grain elevator, a flooring mill, two cotton compresses, several foundries and machine shops, a number of banks, churches and institutions of learning, the Masonic temple for the State, a new and splendid market-house, breweries, soap factories and other industries of which want of space will not permit mention. The city has 18,646 inhabitants. Unimproved prairie land in Harris County can be bought at $1 to $2 per acre."

That book was published in 1881 when our friend Jesse Jones, then a seven-year old boy in Tennessee, had not yet heard of the opportunity and challenge named "Houston." Reading this report of your city as it was less than 70 years ago and looking at it today, the need of a laudatory tribute disappears - the facts speak for themselves.

This amazing growth, this multiplication of buildings and institutions and wealth, this capacity to take nature by the nape of the neck and make of sparsely settled inland prairie a teeming industrial center and a seaport whence ships sail across the world - this stupendous achievement is not unique in American history, although no Houston enthusiast will ever admit that in any other instance has so much been accomplished in so short a space of time. This development of modern Houston is one of a long series of American achievements which, in the space of less than two centuries, transformed three million square miles of wilderness into a nation whose might in war and in the production of material goods is paralleled by its global leadership in things of the mind and the spirit.

This transformation was not the work of chance or the inevitable result of fate. In every generation of our history, there were a multitude of forces and conflicting interests that might have halted the transformation or even reversed it - had it not been for a spiritual drive, an attitude that was and is peculiarly American on the position and capacity of men as free human beings living in human society.

If this American attitude toward the business of men living together in a social structure were to be expressed in terms of a formula, I think it would read something like this: Individual Freedom plus General Education plus National Unity equals A Stable, Progressive, Secure Society.

In that formula, freedom is the energizing fuel; education is the balance wheel or gyroscope which assures stability and forward movement, however buffeted the society may be by the stresses of a changing world; unity provides the system of links and couplers that harnesses into one team the efforts of 150 million people. No other social formula - and men have been working on this since the beginning of time - has ever been devised that matches ours in the benefits to the individual, the group, the nation - for that matter, the world of men.

Of course, in the growth of America, there have been other and mighty contributing elements; half a continent for expansion; a continuing transfusion from the Old World of ideas, skills and population; a varied climate and a wide range of crops; a richness in natural resources that until our generation made this country independent economically; above all, we have always been blessed with men and women, venturesome in their own betterment, forever seeking new and surer ways of doing the things that add up to a good and comfortable life.

Nevertheless, all these other contributory elements in some measure have been the possession of other

nations. Nowhere have they been used to such advantage, because nowhere else has the formula - the result of deliberate choice, based on the experience of ages - comprised those social elements that best foster the sometimes mutually incompatible qualities of enterprise, wisdom and material strength.

There are many critics who will denounce each element as a pious fraud, crying out times and places where there has been no evidence of a progressive dynamic spring out of freedom; no evidence of a stabilizing balance founded in a sound education for all citizens; no evidence of spiritual or material strength rooted in cooperative unity. And we, on our part, do not claim that always and everywhere we have clung closely to both the spirit and the letter of our formula - perfection and eternal consistency of both principles and application are not inherent in human works. The just man and the good society are alike in their proneness to lapse and fall.

But we do contend that never before and nowhere else has there been, generation after generation, so persistent and manifold and embracing an effort to live up to great ideals, greatly expressed. The documents of American purpose have always mirrored the will and intent of the American people. Take education.

Education is a foundation stone in the American system. There were colleges in this land before there were States; there were schools on the Plains and in the mountains before there was government or even law. In America, the school marm has always followed the explorer. No community on the frontier felt itself a worthy place for the business of living until a school house had been built. Wherever men and women of a like faith gathered together in adequate numbers a denominational college was established. Vast grants of land were made by the Congress to the states that a system of schools, now grown into a network of great universities, might be established. The landmarks of our pioneers are schools, libraries, educational foundations - not factories.

Admitted that today there is still ignorance and even illiteracy in the United States - although no nation comparable in size has reached our standard - we have sacrificed and worked for education and we have used our educational system. The school house is still the community center of the American people. The college and university equip us for intellectual and scientific leadership. When we have a job that must be done - a survey of our hospitals or the construction of an atomic bomb - we call on the learned faculties for guidance and direction. When we want specific answers we ask specific questions; and they have not failed us.

I think we can advance one step further. We must continue to use the educational system for its primary purpose the education of youth and for its secondary purpose the solution of specific problems. There is a third purpose - general orientation, the establishment of guide posts and lines of demarcation in a time of change and sweeping tides - social, economic and political.

Where a hundred - and even fifty years ago - we were compelled to conduct an aggressive and tireless campaign that every child might have the benefit of the three R’s, our critical need today is to assure every citizen some means by which he can interpret and judge the mass of information that he possesses and that grows daily.

Illiterate ignorance, involving a deadly inertia and inability to meet the obligations of a free society, was once the principal target of our schools. Today, a wealth of knowledge - beyond digestion - is rained on us by valid and honest sources of information. And by a multitude of propaganda agencies interested in only their own ends. Confusion, confused thinking, is the end-product. Many of us can no longer tell the difference between means to an end and the end itself, between fantastic promises and eternal principles.

Security, for instance, is not a goal; it is a by-product of doing each day’s job well, of using every opportunity to the best of our ability, of applying the Golden Rule in all our relationships with others. Yet a torrent of propaganda has swept millions of us into the error that man, who in the midst of life forever walks in the valley of death, can be freed of risk by a bureau of government.

If we stop to consider, we know that individual security is the result of a productive economy; we know that individual security can never be found in a bankrupt economy. But the din of propaganda leaves most of us no quiet leisure for the exercise of common sense.

We need guide posts and lines of demarcation so that we shall not be led astray or of our own heedlessness abandon the principles which in the days of the simplest pioneer life and in these most complex days of the atomic age have been proved, beyond doubt of cavail, the surest means for all of us to use in the maintenance of life and the pursuit of happiness.

Individual freedom is endangered on the one hand by unscrupulous or stupid men who would turn back the

clock of progress and restore to government the omnipotent control of the individual from which it was dispossessed through centuries of struggle by our forefathers. On the other hand, individual freedom is endangered by our own heedlessness and selfishness which blinds us to the fact that every usurpation by the government of the individual's responsibility for his own well being involves a parallel loss of individual liberty.

General education is threatened by over-emphasis on skills and techniques and specialization that thwart its primary purpose of preparing men and women for the fullness of life in a republic where all are equal partners in a common citizenship. National unity is threatened by the vicious pressure of greedy interests - in every area of our economy - who seek only their own aggrandizement without care for the public good.

We dare not permit any rupture in our national unity or any destruction of our educational ideals. But first things must come first. The chief and foremost internal peril to our system and its social formula is the increasing loss of individual freedom - the energizing fuel.

Here in Texas on your airfields are the finest planes devised and built by men, their engines amazingly complicated and powerful instruments. Across your state roar locomotives, pulling behind them long trains of freight and livestock and passengers at a speed that would have been unbelievable a century ago. But those planes and those locomotives, despite their stupendous power potential, would be fit only for display in museums as curiosities, if all sources of their fuel were to disappear or be shut down. Equally, the American system and our way of life approaches the status of a mere memory and historical curiosity by each loss of individual freedom. A system like a machine cannot operate without its fuel.

Freedom is so fundamental to American life and the American future that I should like to repeat three points that I made some months ago:

First, individual freedom is our most precious possession. It is to be guarded as the chief heritage of our people, the wellspring of our spiritual and material greatness, and the central target of all enemies - internal and external - who seek to weaken and destroy the American Republic.

Second, all our freedoms - personal, economic, social, political - freedom to buy, to work, to hire, to bargain, to save, to vote, to worship, to gather in a convention or to join in mutual association; all these freedoms are a single bundle. Each is an indispensable part of a single whole. Destruction of any inevitably leads to the destruction of all.

Third, freedom to compete vigorously among ourselves, accompanied by a readiness to cooperate wholeheartedly for the performance of community and national functions, together make our system the most productive on earth.

Maintain that sort of freedom and we will have security, true security - not the slothful indolence and ease and stagnation that is the lot of those who abandon freedom to become the slaves of others.

There is no reason for America to fear the future. This country still has broad acres and - in spite of waste and exploitation - we have great forests, great mineral resources; we still have more fertile land per capita than is the fortune of most nations; we have the greatest industrial fabric. There is reason for America to fear the future if we desert our American principles and jettison our formula: Individual Freedom plus General Education plus National Unity equal A Stable, Progressive, Secure Society.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have seen around the world many, many white crosses under which lie men of all the races of the western Allies of our own beloved country. They are there because they believed there was something more than the mere assurance that we are not going to be hungry when we are sixty-seven. They are there because they believed that man is the master of his fate, endowed with freedom, entitled to opportunity that he may carve out his own future for himself and his family - and that that is the best way to live.

The crosses at San Jacinto, on the islands of the Pacific, from Casablanca to the Elbe, are monuments to men who loved freedom above ease of life.

• Chamber of Commerce, Galveston, Texas, December 8, 1949

I must tell you first I am quite overwhelmed by the generosity of the remarks just made by my friend, Clark Thompson. But he leaves me with the very uneasy feeling that this had better be good. And I tell you with all

earnestness that I wish it really could be good.

My particular concern is for those people who are on the second floor who have so patiently watched the animals in the zoo down below. I have had plenty of undeserved compliments paid me in my time but never before that I know of has there been a luncheon that I have attended where so many people sat so quietly, so patiently and so courteously while the others could enjoy their steak and potatoes. I thank you a lot.

I think I had a picture in my mind of a rather large round table where we would sit with our elbows on the edge and sort of talk among ourselves and that would be about the extent of the formality that would be expected. Well, I must say that if Clark calls a crowd like this just a small group of friends, I have no concern about the number of times he's going to come back to Congress.

It was as a member of Congress, as he told you, that I first met him. The problem that he and I were then working on was this - how to get the American Army up to a strength of 165,000. Remember, this was the year that Hitler came to power. The American public did not understand for one second that they were entering a period of crises in world affairs which was going to bring us one day to the cataract of war. But this man, a new and energetic Congressman, coming up to Washington found me a Major and we discovered that we had one thought in common, that something ought to be done about the Nation's security! I believe, unless I am mistaken, that our army at that time numbered 118,750 men including the Air forces, and we wanted to make it at least 165,000.

I do not recall what year that bill was finally passed, but certainly Clark Thompson's efforts in the Military Committee were what got the ball to rolling. By the time of Pearl Harbor, those efforts of his had been re-enforced by efforts of 1,000 other men, notably George Marshall. Finally United States met its supreme test - not naked, forlorn, and alone - but with the beginnings of its armor already forged, the beginnings of its weapons emerging from its factories.

I honestly believe that to the Clark Thompsons of that time we owe far more than we realize, and I for one have always felt that deeply. When he called me in New York only several weeks ago he said "Will you come here the day after you are in Houston." I said, "Yes" and ladies and gentlemen, I would have said "Yes" no matter how big the audience, or how formidable the task. Moreover, I think that even if I had known there was going to be this great gathering of American Texans, I still would not have prepared a formal address.

It is far more precious to me to have the opportunity to come to see people that I know out here in this great rolling Western prairie, where I feel at home, and to talk on the basis of a conversation. I realize that you people can't all talk back at me this moment, and it is my turn to have the floor. But actually it does give a man the priceless privilege of just unburdening his mind. Whereas, if he prepares a talk he has to think of every word. Particularly the misinterpretations that the newspapers are going to make of each word. And as long as you don't get up and you are talking to your friends over their own hearthstones you don't have to think of such things. That's the way I'd like to feel that my wife and I are visiting you today.

If I could believe that I had a message worthy of leaving with you today, it would be merely this - that we owe it to ourselves to attempt to understand the nature of the times in which we live. I believe that the person who attempts to live in 1849 instead of today is making just as serious an error as is that man who wants to discard everything that this County has accomplished since 1849 - who wants to discard the methods and the principles by which we have lived during that time, in favor of some new panacea, some new medicine that he will dish out to us from a bureaucrat's chair in Washington.

And because I mentioned Washington and those who go there, I want to make perfectly clear that we must not confuse bureaucrats with the members of our Congress and our Senate. They have to come back to the people and to know what the people want and think and go back and attempt, so far as they may be able, to represent the composite thoughts of their constituencies. But not the bureaucrat. He parks himself in a nice cushioned chair in some lush office, and there, although I think frequently motivated by the best of ideas, he suddenly decides that if there is a sufficient power centered in his hands, be it in agriculture, in the education of our young, in the hospitalization of our sick, any problem that concerns our society, he will sit there, off in some corner of the Department of Commerce or Agriculture or somewhere else, and he will solve all of our problems for us.

In other words, he will make us kept men and women, and it is the one thing that today I believe we must watch more than all else.

When you stop to think of the things that you admire most, among the men whose names are written large in the history of the United States and Texas, think of the qualities, courage, stamina, readiness to risk everything that they have, including their lives, for that in which they believe; a determination never to be defeated, a readiness to take care of themselves and their families.

Now, as I said a moment ago, I do not believe that the men of today can think in the same terms as you could in 1849, at least so far as mythology, system of governments are concerned, the practice of governments, and organization of governments. But we can think in the same basic principle and we can reverse the same basic virtues, if we will only do that, and therefore if we will watch the things that are held out to us as a neighbor is held out to the young married housewife.

If we will watch and say, “Where does this lead me,” does it lead me into a morass of paternalism and regimentation or does it give me an opportunity with the qualities and qualifications my God gave me to do my best, for those I love and for myself, and in doing so, to do my best for my country.

I believe therefore the more we think in terms let us say in Texas of Crockett and of Travis and of Houston, thinking of them not only by what they did on the battlefields or at the Alamo but of what it was that made them tick, and what did they have in their hearts, and as we nurture, and retain our respect, our admiration and our reverence for that kind of quality we, in our turn, are doing our duty by our country.

I frequently talk about the future of the United States in terms of my grandchildren, of which we now have two. I think that it is not quite suitable today because I notice at least here in the balconies there are some youngsters who are probably not thinking in terms yet of company of grandchildren, but I believe that these basic things of which I have been speaking, apply now in order that we may have a clear conception of where we are going.

That is the point I should like to make. We are not thinking merely in terms of fifty years from now, and I do not believe at this moment we are at a crisis in terms of crossroad, that we either go here, or go there; and that means we either have prosperity or death tomorrow - not by any manner or means. But I believe there are trends today that are marking out for each of us paths for us to follow. Those paths gradually diverge on the one side of the surrender of our responsibilities, or individual and local community problems to central government, and on the other, the desire of any kind of leader who says, “Just let me do it. Don’t you bother yourself. Just let me do it.” We must solve our own problems, locally and individually. Those two paths are going to diverge until one day they will be as far apart as the poles.

The reason then for taking thought today is that we choose the right road; not be tempted by a surface of paternalism, by subsidies by any other manner or means that a self-leader chooses in order to get you to give up your priceless birthright.

I have already talked longer than I meant, so it is too late to make this story short.

However, I do remember that a friend of mine who had a darky servant, down in this region, and this darky was the lowest man that ever lived. One day his master got very annoyed with him, and he said, “Say! Don’t you ever do anything quick?” He said, “Yes sir, I gets tired quick.” I realize that many of you here have full reason to be tired. I shall not keep you much longer. I want to mention only one thought and that is - the sense of value. So frequently we see in the papers words that are translated into personal security, which I think are supposed to mean for us: from this day onward until we are gathered up, each of us, to his Maker, we are going to live without struggle, without great fear and everything is going to be all right.

At least we will have enough to eat and a doctor will look after us at the right time. We won’t be cold in the winter.

Ladies and gentlemen, did you ever stop to think of this? If all you got out of life is security, if that is all you want, why not commit some kind of offense that will put you in prison? You will never have to worry. You will get enough to eat. You will have a pretty fair bed. I have inspected it. You will get along all right, and you will have security, if that is all you want. What I want to leave with you is this thought:

Fundamentally, and whether we realize it or not, our sense of values still puts the human individual, your freedom, your dignity and your equality as a human puts it above all else.

Patrick Henry said, “Give me liberty or give me death.” Maybe I am too weak to get us and say that if faced with a task of either bowing my neck or mounting the Cross, but the race, ladies and gentlemen, the race of which we are all parties, and by race I mean everyone who has ever come in contact regardless of religion or

actual creed or color of skin, who has actually come in contact with the English-speaking people of the world - for the race, that statement is as true today as when it was made. We will not bow our necks to centralized government.

In order therefore, that we will never come to the point where we must rise up and by some revolutionary or drastic means make certain that no central bureaucratic authority may control us, let us today take thought in the exercise of our political franchise, in our voting duties, in our selection of everybody that we have from the School Board or precinct chairman on upward.

Let us do our duty as we understand it, and with the determination to preserve our freedom. And ladies and gentlemen, the American people will never lose them.

• Columbia Associates Luncheon, New York City, February 1, 1950

I sincerely trust that none of you missed the item in the general introductions when reference was made to the Array of Phi Beta Kappa keys beside the Chairman. I trust that none of you will find it necessary to examine the complete accuracy of that statement. In spite of Phi Beta Kappa's staff work here, there was one error made at this luncheon.

I believe that you should talk about food before eating and not after. You don't order tomorrow's dinner when you are full. It would possibly have been better to gather a group like this and give nothing for a week and then, maybe, would be brought home of its points to our guests.

It is idle to talk about world peace in terms of any kind of values you may have in mind when people are so hungry in this world that they are ready to violate any ethics, commit any crime, in order just to supply the needs of their own bodies and, more particularly, those of their own families.

The scientists at Columbia interested in nutrition pointed out how in the development of the various divisions in the sciences there grown up a vertical division in the work they do, brought about by the necessity for specialization. But every so often, and possibly frequently, it becomes necessary to assemble all this in order to do any good.

If we are convinced this business of food and world peace has any relationship then there must be places and means to assemble this science and that is why these scientists speak to you and to me about a dream they call a Nutrition center where scientists of all kinds can meet and through their work do something that will have the most profound effect on us.

To show you how little we really know of this - the American Army in World War II spent literally millions preparing packaged rations; the kind you can stick in your knapsack or jeep and dash off to war and live on. Doctor King has told me that the three we used the most, ten-in-one, "C" and "K," of these three there wasn't a single one that would really keep a rat alive if forced to live on it or, he certainly could not grow on it.

Of course, the question immediately comes to mind: Who would want to keep a rat alive, anyway? But it does seem strange that here, in the Twentieth Century in this War from 1941 to 1945, that we should be feeding American soldiers and sailors and airmen a packaged food that wouldn't keep them alive if they were forced to live on it indefinitely.

I think most of us people who don't wear the Phi Beta Kappa key and who are not scientists - we have to get these things down to what we understand and I am glad that Mr. Chester and I are in agreement with this.

I was on the Kansas plains when Texas long horns were replaced by the short horn and Angus type and people found out that on exactly the same acreage you could raise a 1,600 pound cow instead of a 750 pound one. We also found it wasn't too hard to keep that ground in condition. Increasing the food value of each bushel is preserving the ground to grow it on.

It is estimated that every man required two and one-quarter acres. But there aren't two and one-quarter acres for everyone in the world. If we can reduce that element, we can do much for alleviating distress - promoting Communism and bring a standard of living with which we can attack this world problem.

The great development of this country is in the mind of almost every person I meet. As evidence of this social-consciousness let me point out that in the past if a man felt he was running a successful business that that was enough. People with a social conscience, "do-gooders," were told to go on their way. That is gone.

Everywhere I go I am confronted with this specific question: What can a single individual do? I believe the great concern of the person who asks that question is the future of that system.

People can argue about small things but we must preserve peace or the system won't stand the strain like the one it just went through. We must get busy and give people at least a minimum standard of living. That will make them more concerned with education rather than in murdering just to keep alive.

That is what the Nutrition Center means to me.

• The Moles' Annual Award Dinner, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, February 9, 1950

Whenever a normally modest American is called upon to face a distinguished audience of fellow-citizens such as this before the microphone, he is struck with his own inadequacy, and particularly with the knowledge that he has no assurance that he can speak on any subject which can capture the interest of the group.

Now, there was a favorite trick that used to be used by those who found themselves, occasionally, in such a predicament - which was to talk about the things that they were not allowed to talk about. Of course, if they did so, they were accused either of being politicians, or would-be politicians, or they were reactionaries, or they were Reds, or they were guilty of prophesying at the expense of others, and there were a lot of names called.

But some weeks ago, one of your honored guests this evening made a witty and eloquent speech, by taking advantage of the opportunity to talk about those things which we may not talk about - but should. I think that most of you will remember President Hoover's talk and how significant that was about those things which we may not talk about.

Unfortunately, I seem to have a number of things that I should like to talk about, so much so that I would like to ask those in the front row to hold a stopwatch, and whenever the minutes are over which may have been allowed to me on the program, to stand up and start yelling at the proper time.

First, I feel it is a great distinction to be given an opportunity to greet again many old friends and civilian friends. But what strikes me more especially this evening, is the opportunity to greet friends of World War II, and in some instances, friends of many, many years of service in the armed services of the United States - in the Army and in the Navy.

There is one here, especially, whom I have known since I was a cadet at West Point. One of his favorite diversions at that time was horseback riding, but he figuratively picked me out as a moster, and put me in the saddle and rode me around - a lot more than I thought was necessary. Since that time - that was about 40 years ago - I have learned that Bill Somervell was a very good guy. I will take the word of my informant, rather than my own natural reaction, because he was known at West Point as one of the upper-class men when I was a beast.

But it was some fun, and I have particular remembrance of the early war days, when he and I were working together with the Chief of Staff, George Marshall. It was some fun, even to me. And that goes for all the other Army and Navy officers whom I have had the honor of meeting here this evening.

And then, secondly, I feel a special distinction in being given the opportunity to greet, and speak for a moment to such a distinguished group of scientific people. I have heard much of science since I have been on Morningside Heights. In fact, there is one professor, who, I think, allows no week to go by without coming back to me again and again and pointing out that in the last 30 years the percentage of high executive positions held in American industry by scientifically-trained personnel - particularly the engineers - has more than trebled.

I don't know exactly what lessons he takes from that. But I do know that he has got me fired up with his determination and his enthusiasm to see that Columbia, along with all its other great accomplishments, along with its stand for America, and training of American citizens, for service in a free nation, that it is also going to be the greatest scientific school in this country.

At least we are going to support this theory - that the scientist - the engineer - shall not be trammeled or harnessed, or prohibited in any way in his search for truth, in his search for all the facts, all the information, the results of a civilization, and, more especially, help the United States of America.

I cannot even agree with those who believe that we should hide the horrors of the H-bomb in ignorance. This I cannot see. I believe that since the beginning of time, every appliance that the scientists of any age have

found to assist man, has been capable of either evil or good use. The first man who discovered what he could do with a rock at the end of a club, is still an enemy. It is man's morale as a fighter and his spiritual standards that will determine the use of anything.

And, certainly in this day and time, faced across the seas by an aggressive and a godless ideology, it does not behoove us to believe that we can be protected by sticking our heads in the sand.

There was no greater factor of victory in World War II than the industrial, inventive and scientific genius of the American people. Certainly in these days, in a cold war, it cannot now be stultified with any benefit to the United States.

And, thirdly, I have the reason of coming to pay tribute to a great Columbia graduate, Mr. Dougherty - one of your honored guests this evening. His name stands our glowingly on the list of Columbia graduates. With his accomplishments, you are as well, or even more familiar than am I. But Columbia will forever hope that it can turn out people who, in public service, in public spirit attitudes, are the equal to Mr. Dougherty. If it can do so, then it deserves the high place it has held in the past, and the high place it hopes to hold in the future of your admiration, your respect and esteem.

And, finally, it is my very great honor to participate with you this evening in paying tribute to one of the greatest Americans of our time - Mr. Hoover.

In a pre-dinner conversation, President Hoover and I were talking together, and he said, "Do you know that the only man who seems to have no title in the United States is an Ex-President?" He said, "You are still a General." And I said, "Well, don't people call you 'Mr. President'?" He said, "No, I really think they just don't know what to call me."

Well, in my book, he was a pretty good president. And not only that, but I feel a certain thrill in these days when I listen to his voice, raised to defend all that has made the United States great. I feel particularly thrilled in saying, "Mr. President," when I address Mr. Hoover.

I am not, of course, going to attempt any dissertation of all the great services and accomplishments he has rendered to our citizenship, and to the world, but I should like, for a moment, to speak only of his latest accomplishments - the preparation of the Hoover Report.

Now, one of the things that strikes me is this: Here is a man, who, by all the rules of the game, has every right to sit back and rock himself to sleep in his armchair, or rocking chair, but is working harder, years after he left the Presidency, than many people - many, many years his junior, and working for one purpose only - just for the good of human nature. That is all! He has no hope of any other kind of reward, because whatever niche he finds in history, whatever page or chapter he is going to occupy in American history for the next 2,000 years, it is already made. He is still here and according to my way of thinking, he is the exemplification and symbol of what has made America great.

Speaking, specifically, about that report, there are 19 chapters - 19 different directives - in which he pointed out to us how we may save money.

I mentioned when I stood up, that there were many things you couldn't talk about these days. But certainly we can talk about useless waste of money - whether we be Democrats, Republicans, or, like myself, an old soldier.

Today we should be particularly happy and proud that we have a man who could rally to his side all the fine brains that were needed in these United States - people who rushed down to him, because of their respect for him, and who drew up a blue-print - a blueprint that does not stoop to any kind of partisan arguments whatsoever, but just says to us, "If you will organize this job rightly, no matter what you want to spend your money for; if you will organize it rightly, the overhead of spending it will not break you before you get it spent."

Thank you very much!

• Franklin & Marshall College, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, March 2, 1950

You will understand some of my difficulties when I try to think what there might be in the background and experience of an old soldier that could be of some value to such a body as this, that could warrant the trouble

you have taken to meet here, as a matter of fact, that could warrant the warm welcome that you have extended to me and which I assure you, I most deeply appreciate.

There is going over in my mind today one major subject, one thing which we all might be thinking. I believe it could be best epitomized by the word “peace.” Of all people who should be vitally, directly, and daily interested in the preservation of peace, I should say you are shining examples. Your fathers and your older brothers were taken out of their daily pursuits, some out of college, some out of jobs, and hurried off to war. Your grandfathers, my generation, have been away twice and there are some who have seen even more than that.

So, if each of our generation has to face war as an accustomed phenomenon, you will realize, in view of its cost and, worse than that, its utter stupidity and futility, that we should try to do something about it.

Now we hear all sorts of discussions as to what might be done to eliminate force as a means of adjudicating or settling international disputes and how we can find peaceful ways to enforce a settlement.

There is one school which you might call the atomic school. It is a school that believes in force. It would make the United States so mighty, so strong in its military elements that all nations would be fearful to attack us and peace would be preserved. The theory is that since we are perfectly certain of our own peaceful intent, and know that a democracy cannot launch a surprise war because our own processes are open for the world to see, no one will fear us and our strength will be a stabilizing influence in the world.

Now I think many of us can go along with such an argument to this extent, but only to this extent, that weakness cannot cooperate with anything. If we were utterly weak, we would be laying open great temptation to countries to start war or at least to act aggressively. Possibly it would not have to be war, for they could overrun us without fighting. I think we can also agree that American intellectual, moral and physical strength, physical strength including economic and industrial strength, is necessary if we are to engender a respect and an admiration and a devotion for that type of life which we believe to be best for humans. Our concept of government is based upon human dignity, a belief that man has a soul, and our system, I think, springs out of this. We believe in the man as a dignified entity, the possessor of certain rights, mainly because he is born. We can never forget that men have fought, bled, died, and suffered to establish that truth and hand it down to us.

Now if we are going to project that sort of thing abroad, and I believe that we must project it because there is another ideology that certainly cannot live in the same world with our concept of freedom, and which is dynamic and aggressive, therefore, if we are going to encompass within our camp all people everywhere in that kind of life, we must be strong. I say first the strength that we need is moral, the second is intellectual and the third is physical in all its parts, and that includes a decent portion of military strength.

But we must never concede that there is need of conceiving of the United States as a police state or a garrison state. When we have come to that point, I should like to bring this up: we are a state that encompasses in its whole concept of living, free competitive enterprise. There are all sorts of names, call it capitalism, name it what you wish. If we are then trying to defend a way of living, freedom which is tied up with free competitive enterprise, we cannot bankrupt that system at home by pretending to mobilize forces that are going to protect it. Under the theory that they are going to protect it from threats from without, we break it from bankruptcy within. Obviously, a senseless proceeding, and we must never degenerate into that kind of mistake. Therefore, we must seek some way of promoting and maintaining peace that does not contemplate merely great armies, great navies, great air forces, filling the countryside everywhere, ready to go off to war. That’s silly - we can’t do it.

Then, we hear talk of the conference method. Let’s just go have a talk! Well, the first answer is that we have had a lot of talks and some of them have produced very disappointing results. Most of your history professors will tell you that there has never been a treaty between nations that has held up when either one of the nations believed that its own national existence would be imperiled by reason of adherence. A nation answerable to no one, sovereign in its own power, is always going to be guided by the dictates of its own best interests, or at least when it believes that its own self-preservation is at stake. Therefore, if we use the conference method, and we would hope for a treaty and an understanding that will keep us out of war, we must make certain that that treaty is so strong and so deeply embedded in the hearts, not only of government but of people that the other fellow will respect it in every way that we will. That, in the present stage of world conflict, we cannot believe in at this moment. We cannot believe that the Soviet government, imbued as they are with the belief that they must bring about a world revolution, using every means by boring from within and threatening

from without to bring about the world revolution, would respect a treaty which mainly states that everything is going to be sweetness and light.

An opportunity is provided by the conference method for any government which believes its cause to be just to display that cause before world opinion, and world opinion is still a mighty force. No government, nobody, wants or deliberately desires to flaunt world opinion. A conference does accomplish that occasionally. But I should like to point out that that is one of the functions of the United Nations and that is going on all the time. We don't have to have a conference every six months or so and turn to that in a futile hope that it can bring about peace. Instead, we should establish before the world, our belief in justice, right, honesty and decency among nations. I believe this is where all of us come in. Each of us should do something about it if he wishes to help convince ourselves and let the world see that we are sincere in our purpose of having the United States stand before the world as an honest, moral body of people ready to make every reasonable concession in order that we may abolish force from world relationships.

And now I would say there are a number of things that are important to us as we strive to accomplish such a purpose. The first and most important possibility is knowledge. Knowledge of the economies of these several nations, why they do certain things that they do, why, for example, Russia historically wages war after war and never ceases pushing its ambitions to have a port on the Mediterranean. But every nation has something in its history something in its present economy that provides reasons for living in the way that it does. I would say all of those things are included in a general package of knowledge that we must have if we are going to act effectively in this business of promoting peace.

But more than that, I think of a word I like to call understanding. It is said that America must lead the world. If America is to lead the world each citizen, since we are a democracy, must act as a leader and no one can be a leader unless he understands those he is attempting to lead.

Now I come to a favorite theory of mine about this business. When we say "the people of the United States" we ordinarily think of the man sitting on our left or the man on our right or the gang to which we belong. And particularly in such a group as this that is a very great error. The mass of the people of the United States work with their hands, they make their living in the mines, factories, on the farms; in every conceivable way they are working to support the 140,000,000 people, including all of those like us who can be classed as nothing but "overhead." Now when I say, therefore, we must understand people, we must understand the people who provide the motives for this strongest temporal power on earth. Never forget that 140,000,000 united Americans working for our economy and facing the world is the strongest power there is under the Almighty.

That is the group, the mass, that we must understand, and let me say this; any boy or any young man who has been so situated that in his early life he has never been necessitated nor faced up to the business of going out and getting a job to earn his own living or help pay part of his schooling, any boy who has not had to do that, has a handicap. He has not shoveled coal, nor has he shocked wheat, and he doesn't know what that man wants nor does he know what makes him act the way he does. To show you how easy it is to err in this business of understanding others, I will tell briefly about a very grave error made in the war. Our great shortage as we went into Africa was ships and so it was very important that we unload the ships as fast as we could to chase them back to the United States to bring us more supplies. I did not want to use our meager army for labor so we used Arabs to unload the ships. I thought if we could keep them at work day and night I would pay them overtime, but promptly they quit work one day a week because they were now making more money by working three days than they previously did by working four days. Now the ordinary American faced with that opportunity would try to get in a lot of overtime, try to get this increased wage - not they. We did not understand their aspirations, the long history behind them. That wasn't the way to make them do the work. I believe if I had to do it over again, I would put a bale of white cloth at the bottom of the ship and they would work like the dickens because they always wanted white cloth. What I am trying to get over is that sometimes the keys are very simple. They open up sometimes what otherwise looks like a mystery.

We talk a great deal about prejudice in this country. Has any of you tried to view all of the problems and questions that come up with the obvious practices resulting from prejudice? Have you tried to put yourself in the other fellow's shoes? That is what I call understanding. Prepare yourself to do your own job of leadership, if the United States is going to show the way. I believe that we can work through our schools, through our churches, through every institution open to us, and above all through the family. I believe we can agree on

certain fundamentals that would unify us and assure the world, including those who want to be on our side, that our purposes are lofty and our strength is equal to the occasion. I do not believe that we should confuse the issue on which we accept unity. My own belief is that argument is the life of democracy, but argument as to method, not procedure and the basic purposes and the basic conceptions that have made America great.

We do not believe in slavery; we believe that every man is his own master. Our ancestors have fought and died and a few of them dramatized their feelings in words that are remembered today: “I regret that I have but one life to give for my country;” “As for me, give me liberty or give me death.” The reason we venerate these things is that they are shining examples for us even if you or I might lack the hardihood to so react if our basic concepts of decency and honesty were violated. The Anglo-Saxon will not and all those people that have been amalgamated into the American civilization will not accept slavery; they will fight to the death against it. This is number one on our list of values and behind it we can stand. Unified by that, along with what are certain beliefs and concepts as to what we must do in order to preserve the liberties and rights, we will finally reach an area where we get more and more into detail, where the argument begins, and I say rightly.

How much taxes, how little taxes, where should we tax, what should be the position of government in many forms of things? If we stay down to the basic issues in which all Americans believe, it is sufficient to establish before the world that great position that the United States must always hold if it is to be worthy of world leadership.

Now, continuing my roaming through subjects, gentlemen, I would like to say one more word before we stop and that is this; of course, these great problems that now face the world are serious and sometimes I presume you often ask yourselves; was a generation ever faced with such serious problems before?

Possibly, if you include the global extent of these problems and add volume along to those, possibly no other group has had to contend with as much as yours.

I want to point out a few simple truths. First, you are on this earth, you are born and given a certain space in which to live. I believe each day should be one that adds to your satisfaction in having lived it. This day and tomorrow and the next day, any day that you don’t get some real and positive enjoyment out of life, is a day wasted. It is wicked. I would not see you long-faced in the approach of these problems because, after all, other nations have faced very bitter prospects. Start back with the ancient Greeks when they got news that the mighty Persians were going to swarm down on them. They kept coming year after year. Think how they must have felt in trying to defend Athens. And Sparta always failing them at the critical moment. Now they must have felt their problems just as seriously as you today, but they participated in the Greek games and as late as 435 they gave us the greatest examples we have of sculpture. They must have had some happiness or they couldn’t have produced that kind of literature, that kind of building, that kind of sculpture and I believe you should keep firmly in your mind that this is a great and strong country, that you have the proudest position in the world.

You are going to do your part but you are going to do it boldly, courageously, optimistically and with enjoyment and you are not going to go around with your tails between your legs and saying that those Russians over in Eastern Europe and Western Asia are mightier than we are and can dominate us. It cannot be done as long as we use our intelligence and keep our heads.

You know, men, every time I get up to talk I get on these subjects and I always think I am going to drift along and try to explain a few ideas I have picked up. Then I get too excited and I talk too long, possibly too urgently, I claim nothing except this, I am absolutely sincere in what I say. I believe we must be reasonably strong in every way that strength is recognized by men. First, spiritual strength; next, intellectual strength then physical strength, and above all the understanding - that united we are the greatest nation on earth; divided, like anyone else, we can be very weak - with these things in mind, we are going cheerfully, optimistically, and proudly about our daily jobs, and God grant you fellows don’t have to go to war.

• Gabriel Silver Lecture, McMillin Academic Theater, March 23, 1950

On behalf of Columbia University, I thank Mr. Leo Silver for the generous gift that will make the Gabriel Silver Lecture on Peace a recurring feature of the University calendar. His endowment will permit us at regular intervals to call on selected individuals for reports on peace. Perhaps there will be added new strength to their

philosophical and social foundations of peace, and a stronger light thrown on the hazards within the international economy that endanger its permanence. Possibly there will be launched new attacks on inequities and injustices in which lurk some of the causes of war.

Mr. Silver has established a worthy memorial to his father and we are grateful that he has chosen Columbia University as its home. On my own behalf, I want to thank him for the honor paid me in his request that I deliver this inaugural of the series. Without his intervention, I should not be so presumptuous as to appear in this role before a distinguished gathering of Columbia faculty and graduate students because you are, in our country, part of the great body especially qualified to be the architects of world peace.

To you that classification may seem exaggeration beyond any warrant of fact. Quite the contrary. Any man who underestimates the importance of the American teacher in world affairs is misleading himself. Under our system, high governmental policy expresses the considered will of the people, and the will of the people, in the last analysis, is compounded out of the convictions, the idealisms, the purposes fostered in the classrooms of the nation's schools. What you teach is what the country does.

I come before you solely as a witness of things that have happened and of the impressions those have made upon me.

For some years I was in the thick of war and reconstruction after war. A war that - despite all its terrors, its destruction, its cost - was, for the Allied Nations, a crusade in the best sense of an often misused word, a reconstruction after war that - despite its bickerings, its suppression of freedom in many places and its disheartening cynicism - has established in the political sphere at least a temporary - even if a teetering - balance. These years and these experiences have served to ripen and enlarge my devotion to peace. I trust that they have also served to sharpen my powers of perception and judgment of the factors which seem always to balk man's efforts to close forever the doors of the Temple of Janus.

In discussing war and peace, we incline to paint one all black and the other all white. We like to repeat "There never was a good war or a bad peace." But war has often provided the setting for comradeship and understanding and greatness of spirit - among nations, as well as men - beyond anything in quiet days; while peace may be marked by, or may even be the product of, chicanery, treachery and the temporary triumph of expediency over all spiritual values.

The pact of Munich was a more fell blow to humanity then the atomic bomb at Hiroshima. Suffocation of human freedom among a once free people, however quietly and peacefully accomplished, is more far-reaching in its implications and its effects on their future than the destruction of their homes, industrial centers and transportation facilities. Out of rubble heaps, willing hands can rebuild a better city; but out of freedom lost can stem only generations of hate and bitter struggle and brutal oppression.

Nor can we forget that, as Professor Lyman Bryson of Teachers College recently said: "There are even greater things in the world than peace." By greater things, he meant the ideals, the hopes and aspirations of humanity; those things of the soul and spirit which great men of history have valued far above peace and material wealth and even life itself.

Without these values, peace is an inhuman existence. Far better to risk a war of possible annihilation than grasp a peace which would be the certain extinction of free man's ideas and ideals.

Clearly it was a choice between these two extremes that the British people were forced to make in the dark summer of 1940. Whatever may be history's final judgment on the total war record of that nation, her people in that dire season of fear and foreboding proved themselves heroic and mighty in their spiritual greatness.

Twenty miles beyond their South shore, thinly manned by men - and women - armed with little more than their own courage, there was arrayed an invasion force of stupendous military might, hardened and flushed by sweeps from the Vistula to the Atlantic, from the Arctic to the Alps. Other members of the British Commonwealth of nations, though loyal, could do little to relieve the frightening crisis that suddenly faced the Mother Country.

In all Europe and Asia, from the Bay of Biscay far into the Pacific, men awaited the blow that would destroy the British. The multitude of millions that dwelled in those two continents - even those who lately were allies - had been corrupted into a conviction that material force was unfailingly greater than the spirit of free men.

Throughout most of the rest of the world, there seemed to be an appalling ignorance that the defeat of the

British would mean the eventual extinction of the freedom for ideas and ideals that her people had done so much to win and support for all mankind. So, in her hour of gravest trial she stood largely alone - another David to champion a righteous but apparently hopeless cause.

But the British spurned all offers of peace and their great leader asked for battle - on their beaches, in their towns, along the lanes of England. His faith was rewarded in the final and complete Allied victory of 1945.

Millions of Americans, who saw what the British endured - broken towns, years of austerity, staggering debts and near-destitution - must be witnesses all our lives to the greatness of spirit of that people. Their decision to fight on gave freedom a new lease on life and gave all free peoples more space in time to destroy a vicious dictator and regain an opportunity to work out an enduring peace.

Our memories are short indeed, or we have failed to read the lesson of that experience, if we in 1950 are fearful of the future and allow despair to paralyze our efforts to build a lasting peace.

By this allusion to the British record, I do not in any way belittle the wartime contributions of the other allies, including Russia; nor dull one whit the sharp fact that victory over the enemy could not have been accomplished without the giant strength of a united America. I dwell on the British role in 1940 and thereafter for two reasons. First, there is a tendency among us today to write off our friends in the western nations because they are weak in numbers and weapons. Second, there is a parallel tendency to measure a possible enemy solely by the area he rules and the manpower he controls.

Many of us - even among professional soldiers - too easily accept as unfailingly true Napoleon's cynical statement: "God is on the side of the heaviest battalions." Napoleon, himself, lived and ruled and fought by that dictum - but his reign from coronation to final exile was shorter by months than even Hitler's; his fellow believer in the dominance of force.

Because there is one towering force in the world that often seems bent upon engulfing as much territory and as many people as it can, a great many surrender their hopes for peace as curtly as they write off our friends in Western Europe. Such pessimism invites disaster. Such an attitude, if it were founded on reason, would mean that the handful of men who dictate the policy of the Soviet system also dictate the fate of this globe. To any one ready to study the history of yesterday and the facts of today, that is a repugnant absurdity.

Granted that at any moment some one powerful nation could choose to follow a policy of world conquest by war. Nevertheless, the world has seen so many examples of this that, today, such a war would imply either an incredible stupidity, weakness, disunity and unreadiness on one side or a miscalculation equal to the insanity and moral guilt on the side of the predatory nation. Until war is eliminated from international relations, unpreparedness for it is well nigh as criminal as war itself.

What then is the nature of the peace that we seek? What are the characteristics that distinguish it? These questions must be answered, if we are to know our objective, calculate our distance from it, decide on the measures necessary to its attainment.

Almost certainly, most men would agree that peace, to merit the name, should possess a reasonable assurance of permanence, should be the product of cooperation between all major nations, and should be secure against arbitrary violation by any power or group of powers. It is apparent, however, that we constantly use the word "peace" in two senses which differ sharply. One is the peace of our dreams - a peace founded in noble impulses, universally shared. It is always the ideal, the pole star that guides us on the proper path. The other peace is something of an armed truce; but today a half-loaf is better than none. By the improvisations, expediencies and agreements under which we strive to maintain a peace based as much upon force and power as upon concepts of justice and fair play, we hope to reach the point where this peace becomes the starting point of the real peace we seek.

But permanence, universality, and security cannot be achieved merely by covenant or agreement. Treaties are too often scraps of paper; in our age the signal for two World Wars was the callous repudiation of pacts and pledged word. There must be a universal urge to decency.

This fact compels the observation that they are thinking wishfully who pin their hopes of peace upon a single "high level" conference and a resulting paper that would bear the promise of governmental heads to observe all the rights of others. An agreement, though it should bear the seal and ribbon of every chancellery in the world, is worth no more than the confidence placed by each signer in the good faith and integrity of every other. We must sadly acknowledge that today such world-wide confidence does not exist.

By all means let us continue to confer - especially with the view and purpose of reaching the required level of mutual faith and confidence, or - as a substitute - of developing practical and mutually enforceable measures and reciprocal arrangements calculated to lessen the danger of war. But, equally, let us not delude ourselves that, in 1950, establishment of real peace is merely a matter of Very Important Personages signing papers or "talking tough" in Paris, Geneva, Washington or Tahiti.

It is obvious that an enduring world-wide and secure peace must be founded on justice, opportunity and freedom for all men of good will; be maintained in a climate of international understanding and cooperation; be free from militaristic menace; and be supported by an accepted and respected police power representing all national. Critical factors in the problem of building such a peace are the needs of a human society comprised of individuals; and, further, the needs of a human society that is divided into independent nations; each sovereign within its own borders and competing with all others to promote the interests of its own citizens, often at the expense of others. There are two sides to the coin of peace, the individual and the national; if one is defective the coin is spurious.

On the side of the individual, peace requires an international society that is free from vicious provocations to strife among men. These are rooted in inequities so glaring that, to those who suffer them, they seem to make attractive any alternative. The gamble of war lures the desperate, for even overwhelming defeat can hardly worsen their state; while victory, if it gives the survivors any improvement, will be worth its cost in blood. It is possible, even probably, that hopelessness among a people can be a far more potent cause of war than greed. War - in such case - is a symptom, not the disease.

On the collective side of the coin, peace requires an international society liberated from the threat of aggression by neighbor on neighbor, a threat forever present when one or more nations are committed to the building or maintenance of gigantic military machines. No sane man will challenge, under present circumstances, the need for defensive strength designed to secure against internal or external attack the independence and sovereignty of a free state. But the continued existence of even one purely offensive force - a force for which there is no apparent need based in the logic of self-defense - denies enduring peace to the world. Those who have spawned such a force must either eventually destroy it by demobilization and find justification for the heavy cost already laid on their people; or use it, tacitly or actively, as a threat or as a weapon. There is no middle course.

Always it has been difficult to distinguish between offensive and defensive armaments. Advancing science has obliterated whatever qualitative differences that once existed; today even the atom bomb is included in defensive arsenals. But differences do exist - vital differences. They are found, partially, in the quantitative factor.

The world forms its own sound opinion of a nation's martial purposes, primarily by the size and combinations of armaments supported, and by their geographical disposition and estimated state of readiness. To be considered also is the record of the particular nation - the extent to which it observes the ordinary rules of decency, courtesy, fairness and frankness in dealing with others.

It is by such combinations of standards that we must today classify the world's armaments. For America, with whose professional security I have been intimately associated for almost forty years, I bear witness to peaceful intent. In all those years, I have never heard an officer of the Army, the Navy or the Air Force, or any responsible official of government, advocate, urge, discuss or even hint at the use of force by this country in the settlement of any actual or potential international problems.

And here it seems appropriate, in view of my insistent belief that the world must finally disarm or suffer catastrophic consequences, to assert my conviction that America has already disarmed to the extent - in some directions even beyond the extent - that I, with deep concern for her present safety, could possibly advise, until we have certain knowledge that all nations, in concerted action, are doing likewise.

I might state here also that the Baruch plan for the control of the atomic bomb was not only evidence of our peaceful intent, but was the most generous action ever made by any nation, equivalent in its field to the Marshall Plan.

Moreover, without American leadership in the search, the pursuit of a just and enduring peace is hopeless. Nowhere in the world - outside this land - is there the richness of resources, stamina and will needed to lead what at times may be a costly and exhausting effort. But leadership cannot be exercised by the weak. It

demands strength - the strength of this great nation when its people are united in purpose, united in a common fundamental faith, united in their readiness to work for human freedom and peace; this spiritual and economic strength, in turn, must be reinforced in a still armed world by the physical strength necessary for the defense of ourselves and our friends.

Only by deliberate lies can the propagandist - foreign or domestic - stretch our arms program into more than the reasonable posture for defense that General Washington urged on his countrymen. And the heads of state everywhere, even the most suspicious and fearful, know that it is below even that level. Our processes are open to the inspection of all - we spend hardly a dollar or add a platoon to the military establishment without long and public debate.

Out 20th Century international record, the statistics of our military forces, and the open procedures of our political system - all provide proof of our peaceful purposes; the prove also that our support of programs, in which universal peace will be secure, is as honest as it is sturdy.

The two requisites to an enduring peace - the elimination of deep-seated incitements to strife and hopelessness, and the elimination of armament for aggression - are, or should be, within the realm of feasible attainment. But man can remake the face of his physical environment and can harness all the powers of the universe more easily, it seems, than he can learn control of his temper as a member of the international community. Nevertheless, those who term these twin requisites utopian and visionary are cut from the same bolt of cloth as those of an earlier day who claimed that epidemics were an inescapable companion to human existence and denounced the preachers of sanitation as balkers of God’s will.

To prevent the crime of war, all nations and all ideologies can unite without sacrifice of principle. But lest self-interest in minor matters breed a carelessness toward the gravity of this problem, there is required unity of understanding concerning the facts of modern war. After the world-wide devastation that grows daily more possible, none may be able to distinguish between the victor and the vanquished of a future conflict. Confronted by that outcome to another World War, all of us - East and West - are in the same boat. The boat can be swamped in a series of atomic blasts; but, sustained by understanding of a common peril, it can also carry us through to final peace. Thus, the possibility of total destruction, terrible though it is, could be a blessing as all nations, great and small, for the first time in human history, are confronted by an inescapable physical proof of their common lot. Franklin’s “If we don’t all hang together, we shall each hang separately,” has its international application today. There is no prod so effective as a common dread; there is no binder so unifying.

And we know the formula of success: First, justice, freedom and opportunity for all men; Second, international understanding; Third, disarmament; Fourth, a respected United Nations.

First of all, justice among men can be attained only by the universal and equitable satisfaction of human hungers that are threefold in their nature because man is at once a physical creature who must be clothed and fed and sheltered; a thinking being who is forever questioning and must be answered or given the opportunity to find the answers; a spiritual being within whom burns longing and aspirations that cannot be quenched by all the goods of this world. Starvation and hardship, ignorance and its evils, oppression and discrimination are the fuel of war - the raw materials of strife.

So far as the world’s food is concerned, all peoples must learn together to make proper use of the earth on which we live. Hovering even now over our shoulders is a specter as sinister as the atomic bomb because it could depopulate the earth and destroy our cities. This creeping terror is the wastage of the world’s natural resources and, particularly, the criminal exploitation of the soil. What will it profit us to achieve the H-bomb and survive that tragedy or triumph, if the generations that succeed us must starve in a world, because of our misuse, grown barren as the mountains of the moon?

By every step that the nations take toward more productive and efficient use of land, toward better production and distribution of food, toward raising the living standards of even the least of the world’s tribes; by every school house that is built where none was before; by every plague spot that is cleansed and made healthful; by every increase in the sum of universally shared knowledge and the consequent increase in each man’s mastery of his environment; by every measure that enlarges men’s opportunity to develop all their talents and capacities - by that much we reduce the stockpile of grievance, injustice and discontent on which war feeds.

You say in objection: “Those are fine words, but all history proves that as man has advanced in material and intellectual strength, wars have not lessened in frequency but have grown in the tragedy and terror of their

impact."

To that objection I retort: The unrest that has gripped the world is, at least partially, due to the failure of the more fortunate to realize that their own self-interest requires them to teach others the techniques of raising human standards of existence. Thus, ostentatious wealth in fortunate areas has occasioned bitterness and envy in other localities where these could have been eliminated at no greater cost than that involved in teaching man to make the best use of the material resources surrounding him.

By no means do I believe that the wealthy of this world can solve this great problem of disparity merely be sharing what they now possess with the less fortunate. What is needed is the knowledge and understanding - the technical progress - that will allow all men to make the best use of nature's bounty. Progress in this direction is already an announced American purpose. Past failures to do more in this line have provided the demagogues and the propagandists of history with much of the ammunition they have used; and the war-maker is first of all a propagandist.

The nations now have the technical knowledge and skill to end some flagrant disparities. The same measures that banished the scourge of cholera or of typhus or malaria from the American city can largely banish all pestilence from all the continents of the earth. The machines that have released the peoples of the West from the age-old drudgeries of a hand-to-mouth existence can liberate the peoples of all lands whose bitter bread is earned in exhausted bodies and shortened lives. And, certainly, there is no need for starvation at any spot in a world that is glutted in so many places with crops, great beyond domestic needs, that must rot or be destroyed.

Here again we must not be discouraged by the inescapable slowness of world progress. However disappointing may be the lack of speed, every new evidence of advance brings immediate hope of a brighter tomorrow to millions; and peoples hopeful of their domestic future do not use war as a solution to their problems. Hope spurs humans everywhere to work harder, to endure more now that the future may be better; but despair is the climate of war and death. Even America, without American optimism, can accomplish nothing beyond the needs of each day.

Now, while we attack the physical evils, we must battle the ignorance which permits them. And I mean not only ignorance in the individual human being, but those attitudes, policies and prejudices which balk the free exchange between the nations of information and knowledge that will make human living a more full expression of man's dignity. No scrap of knowledge, whose only effect is to make life better, should be denied any nation by any other nation. Even the Soviets, living behind a curtain woven from fear, could afford to work with the rest of us, now, for this decent and human objective. Though we may be generous, we can still expect rebuffs and gibes. But there is always the chance and the hope that hostile governments will understand, over the years, the honesty of our motives and join with us in their realization. If or when they do, we will all profit and we - both West and East - will sleep easier of nights.

Another thing - the stresses and strains of fear are intensified in our day because everywhere the superstitions of materialism are increasing their holds on the minds of men. Hundreds of millions live within the Communist orbit where the official doctrine makes mankind the helpless pawn of economic forces.

But man's spiritual side is still the dominant one. No human, whatever his position in the social hierarchy or his job in the working economy, merits more respect than any other animal of the woods or fields unless we accept without reservation the brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God. If men are not creatures of soul, as well as of body, they are not better than the field mule, harnessed to the plough, whipped and goaded to work, cared for in the measure of his cost and value. But too often, today, we incline to describe the ultimate in human welfare as a mule's sort of heaven - a tight roof overhead, plenty of food, a minimum of work and no worries or responsibilities. So far have we strayed in our sense of values. Unless we rekindle our own understanding, can we hope to make Marxist devotees see that things of the spirit - justice, freedom, equality - are the elements that make important the satisfaction of man's creative needs? If I doubted that man is something more than mere educated animal I should personally be little concerned in the question of war or peace.

Even under the most propitious of circumstances, the obstacles to growth of understanding are legion in number and staggering in their mass. Hundreds of millions behind the Iron Curtain are daily drilled in the slogan: "There is no God, and religion is an opiate." But not all the people within the Soviet accept this fallacy; and some day they will educate their rulers - or change them. True enough, too, there are many places where

men of one color seem bent on degrading men of another color, shearing them of their dignity and standing as fellow-beings. But the human conscience comes gradually to recognize this injustice and men of good purpose will grasp at any reasonable solution to eliminate it.

We cannot, of course, attain perfection in human relations even within the smallest community, no matter how many laws we pass or policemen we hire. The rogue and villain skulk on dark corners. But as we put street lamps on these corners so that decent folk may walk abroad after dark, so we can re-light the lamps of brotherhood where they have been extinguished among men. Again we can see that the fortunate will serve their own best interests by eliminating injustice and its consequent urge toward strife.

While we strive in this effort which is primarily concerned with the living standards of individual human beings, we can break down at the same time many of the barriers of misunderstanding that exist among the nations. Misunderstanding among neighbors is perilous in the atomic age. Unreadiness by free nations for joint defensive action against an aggressor is only one of the evils that stem from it. Through these same misunderstandings there is certain to be suffered economic loss and therefore ineffectiveness in the satisfaction of human hungers. Worst of all, even the slightest misunderstanding among the nations not committed to communism is another chink in the defenses against an aggressive ideology which overlooks no opportunity to subvert and destroy. In the situation of 1950 it is crystal clear that self-interest and the common interests of free nations go hand in hand.

There is no need to remake the world, outside the Soviet system, in the likeness of the United States or any other country. What I do suggest is that we recognize that every culture developed in the world has been worked out by its possessors to meet the circumstances of their own environment. Each race and each nation can learn from every other. There is none so close to self-sufficiency that it can do without the help and cooperation of others; none so primitive that it has not amassed a wisdom that can possibly enlighten even the most advanced.

The free world has already committed itself to attainment of our two basic conditions for permanent peace - the satisfaction of human hungers and a climate of international understanding and good will. Much has been done toward their achievement. The transformation of the world thus far accomplished is at least half a miracle. Moreover, the spokesmen of the Soviets declare that they too are dedicated to the same purpose. Parenthetically, I might add, if their methods succeed, it would be, to us, a complete miracle.

Nevertheless, all governments pay an equal lip service to the common purpose of satisfying human hungers and promoting international understanding. Everyone of them, if challenged, can point to laws and policies that are noble beyond criticism. Why, then, is not world peace automatically ours?

Simply because the positive elements in the construction of peace can be nullified by any powerfully armed nation, whose motives are suspect, unless all are committed to disarmament and there is some means of enforcing peace among them. All the sanitary safeguards ever designed will not secure a community against disease if the residents of one block flaunt them; and the violators will not be persuaded to amend their ways until health officers, backed by the police and the laws, enforce the ordinances.

When even one major power, surreptitiously or flagrantly, builds and maintains a military machine beyond the recognized needs of reasonable security, a war of aggression is a constant threat to peaceful nations. At the very least, these armaments become the gangster’s gun - a notice that might and might alone shall serve as judge and jury and sheriff in the settling of international dispute. That is the only realistic interpretation, since no government otherwise would squander its revenue or exhaust its economy on so sterile an enterprise. It is clear that international disarmament is essential to a stable, enduring peace.

In a disarmed world - should it be attained - there must be an effective United Nations, with a police power universally recognized and strong enough to earn universal respect. In it the individual nations can pool the power for policing the continents and the seas against international lawlessness - those acts which involve two or more nations in their external relations.

I do not subscribe to any idea that a world police force or a world organization should be permitted entrance to any nation for the purpose of settling disputes among its citizens, or for exercising any authority not specifically and voluntarily accorded by the affected nation. At this stage of civilization’s progress any effort to push to this extreme the purpose of international law enforcement will defeat legitimate objectives. National sovereignty and independence have been won by most at too great cost to surrender to an external agency such

powers. But by the establishment of a United Nations police of properly defined and restricted but effective powers, no nation would surrender one iota of its current national functions or authority, for none, by itself, now possess a shred of responsibility to police the world. To an international peace organization, a nation would give up nothing beyond its equitable share in men and money. How this organization is to be constituted or how it is to be controlled, has yet to be worked out, but with the principles honestly accepted, the procedural problems would be easy of solution.

I have spoken thus briefly of these two elements in world peace - disarmament and United Nations authority - because they are in a manner corollaries or sequels to the other two - justice and freedom, opportunity for all men of good will; and a climate of mutual understanding and cooperation among the nations. Progress is bound to come from slow, evolutionary process rather than from violent revolution in national and individual thinking.

But it is especially important that we do not fall prey to pessimism and defeatism. To describe the attitudes of many of us toward the current international scene, I give you the following quotation:

"It is a gloomy moment in history. Not for many years, not in the lifetime of most men who read this paper has there been so much grave and deep apprehension; never has the future seemed so incalculable as at this time.

"In France the political cauldron seethes and bubbles with uncertainty; Russia hangs as usual a cloud, dark and silent upon the horizon of Europe; while all the energies, resources and influences of the British Empire are sorely tried and are yet to be tried more sorely.

"It is a solemn moment and no man can feel indifference - which happily no man pretends to feel - in the issue of events.

"Of our own troubles no man can see the end."

That, ladies and gentlemen, though so vividly descriptive of today, appeared in Harpers Weekly, Saturday, October 10, 1857. Possibly we are wrong when we fearfully conclude that for the first time in history the governments regard each other with fear and suspicion.

What, actually, is the outlook today? In my opinion, far better than most of us normally judge; the world of 1950 is a far brighter and better place than the world of 1850. Starvation is no longer endemic among many millions on every continent - China is the one tragic exception. Illiteracy has vastly diminished in the masses of almost every nation. In the west, at least, there is a new and increased appreciation of spiritual values. Even Russia, despite its all-powerful police and purges, is for the average Russian a vast improvement compared to the Russia of 1850.

As to those countries outside the Curtain, I doubt that we can point to any era or any decade when there was as much intelligent comprehension of each other's purposes as now characterizes their relationships. And in the broader scope, the United Nations, however halting its progress may be, however much its sessions are torn by the jeers and vetoes from one sector, is a visible and working entity - substantial evidence of developing hopes and purposes, an earnest of better things to come.

All of us have come a long way in the past century; none of us should despair when we think of what our situation was, and our prospects, as recently as the summer of 1940. What then can be done now - by this University, by the United States, by the free peoples - to further the cause of peace?

The University, since its removal to Morningside Heights, has become an international center whose graduates can be found on every continent and whose influence has been a leaven for physical progress, intellectual fellowship and spiritual growth among all peoples. The purpose of this University, without over-simplification, can be epitomized in one phrase - the good of humanity.

We hope to build here on the campus a Nutrition center in which the world's scientists will find concentrated all the knowledge, the tools, the facilities that will enable them to devise better, more productive and more effective techniques for the use of physical resources and the satisfaction of man's physical needs. We already have - and in every recent term we have further amplified - an Institute of International Affairs where we hope the political and social leaders of the world will find concentrated the materials, the information, the masses of data that will enable them to adjust the stresses and needs of one area to the strains and surpluses of another.

We hope to establish here a Chair for Peace, possibly an Institute. The purpose will be to study war as a

tragic social phenomenon - its origins, its conduct, its impact, and particularly its disastrous consequences upon man's spiritual, intellectual and material progress. All this we should study in a scholarly atmosphere, free from emotional bias and the daily crises of public life. No American university , I am told, has ever undertaken this comprehensive task. For me, there is something almost shocking in the realization that, though millions have been voluntarily donated for research in cancer of the individual body, nothing similar has been done with respect to the most malignant cancer of the world body - war.

We are presently engaged in a study of the Conservation of Human Resources - restricted, as of now, to the United States - but which will be of immeasurable benefit to all the world in furthering the dignity of man as a human being. Another hope is to conduct an exhaustive study into the ways and means of applying to every man's good, in today's intricate economy, all the resources of America, in such way as to maintain and enlarge every freedom that the individual has enjoyed under our system. There are other projects, under way or under discussion, that will take their places beside or even in front of these. Each of them will help Columbia University a little better to fulfill its purpose - the peace, freedom and good of America, and, therefore, of humanity.

As citizens of the United States, you and I - and all Americans in every corner of our land - must be forever mindful that the heritage of America and the strength of America are expressed in three fundamental principles: First, that individual freedom is our most precious possession; Second, that all our freedoms are a single bundle, all must be secure if any is to be preserved; Third, that freedom to compete and readiness to cooperate make our system the most productive on earth. Only within the framework of these principles can we hope to continue the growth that has marked our history. Only thus can our millions reach the fullness of intellectual, moral and physical welfare that is justly ours - and avoid any risk of submission to the all-powerful state. Moreover, only thus can the world have any hope of reaching the millennium of world peace - for without the example of strength, prosperity and progress in a free America, there is nothing to inspire men to victory in today's struggle between freedom and totalitarianism.

As friends of free people everywhere in the world, we can by our own example - our conduct in every crisis, real or counterfeit; our resistance to propaganda and passion; our readiness to seek adjustment and compromise of difference - we can by our own example ceaselessly expand understanding among the nations. We must never forget that international friendship is achieved through rumors ignored, propaganda challenged and exposed; through patient loyalty to those who have proved themselves worthy of it; through help freely given, where help is needed and merited. In this sense there is no great, no humble among us. In rights and in opportunity, in loyalty and in responsibility to ideals, we are and must remain equal. Peace is more the product of our day-to-day living than of a spectacular program, intermittently executed.

The best foreign policy is to live our daily lives in honesty, decency and integrity; at home, making our own land a more fitting habitation for free men; and, abroad, joining with those of like mind and heart, to make of the world a place where all men can dwell in peace. Neither palsied by fear nor duped by dreams but strong in the rightness of our purpose, we can then place our case and cause before the bar of world opinion – history's final arbiter between nations.

• Commencement Address, Columbia University, New York City, June 8, 1950

In these June days, throughout our land, members of graduating classes are, by the thousands, sitting through ceremonial addresses that concern themselves largely with advice. Much of it is doubtless good for the young graduate, who is presumably just embarking upon his separate journey through productive life. He will enjoy success, it is normally implied, in the exact measure that he observes the precepts generously presented by the orator of the day. But you here have the distinction of graduating from Columbia University - which in itself obviously minimizes any need for last-minute counsel. Beyond this, I pretend to no wisdom which, if given utterance, could establish worthy guideposts for your safe and happy journey through the hazards and obstacles that you may encounter.

Moreover, if you so elect, you will forever have a far wiser counsellor than I - this University itself. Graduation is not separation - rather this ceremony and your diploma are meant to be additional threads in the

ties of affection and understanding between you and your Alma Mater. Disruption of those ties would, I think, be unwise for the individual graduate - certainly it would be a defeat for the University, which can never reach full capacity for service unless each of its graduates is, also, its active and persistent supporter.

On Morningside Heights you leave something of your individual inpress - you carry with you something of Columbia. You continue to be a part of the Columbia family. Just as your faculties have in the past helped you through academic intricacies, so will they always be ready to assist you in the complex decisions required in effective citizenship in a free country. Let me make clear that so far as these decisions involve moral rather than intellectual values - only you, yourselves, can be responsible. But the case is different where the critical factors are of such intellectual complexity as to challenge the capacity even of those who have spent their lives in study. In this latter type of question, help from Columbia's faculties can be important, because in the heritage of your generation is a whole series of disturbing political-social-economic problems.

World Revolution, of which one objective is the elimination of the American system of government, is the announced purpose of powerful forces. But this threat is a no greater danger to the future of our mode of life than would be an accumulation of erroneous answers to currently perplexing questions.

Among these are: How can we faithfully pursue the ideal of world peace and friendship when, with discouraging frequency, we see rejected and scorned proposals that seem to us logical, just and fair? How shall we, in international affairs, assume a firm and unmistakable position in support of freedom and American principles, but without giving to any person a fair basis for the charge that we are truculent or provocative? How shall we maintain the costly military establishments necessary to international stability, yet avoid such stupendous national expenditures that they may dangerously bleed the economy? How can we carry out necessary programs of re-arming potential allies and still avoid fostering the false and dangerous belief that armed might alone can guarantee peaceful security? How shall we protect the nation against insidious and even traitorous corruption in responsible places without endangering or reducing individual freedom or the civil rights of any individual? How shall we escape the unbalanced national budget with its inflationary effects and consequent damage to the wages, savings and security of the average man, and do this without neglecting any of the national functions that are essential to the country's safety and the health of our economy? How shall we preserve as the constitutional purpose of government the welfare of all our citizens but without making those citizens, or any significant part of them, unnecessarily dependent on governmental subsidy or subject to regimentation? Confronted by an ever increasing economic interdependence among all parts of our society, how are we to chart a sane middle course in the conduct of our affairs that will preserve to the individual the fullest measure of freedom and opportunity - to the nation, prosperity and strength and unity?

For none of these questions is there a pat and simple answer, even though the perennial office seeker unceasingly attempts to convince us that his own glib promises provide exceptions to this rule. The honest man must face the fact that the panaceas offered us are more often characterized by surface appeal than by deep-seated logic.

Moreover, by their nature, most of these questions will never be wholly and perfectly answered. But, unless there is constant progress toward solution that is in keeping with the essentials of the American free system, the whole order of things as we know it will pass, and those who come after you will live in a world we of today would never recognize. They could lose the free choice of religion, of occupation and of dwelling place. They would not venerate the same values, respect the same historical figures or even live under the same spiritual and political concepts as prevail today. Educational institutions could, here, as they have in some other places, become mere propaganda machines; libraries would provide priceless treasures for bonfires.

But, tragic as these developments would be, there is no reason to grow hysterical or to despair, if we are alert and determined. In the international arena, where complete isolation would be eventual suicide, we have loyal allies; even the least among them is not to be written off. Indeed, if, with them all, we can reach stronger and stronger unity of effort and dedication, based upon common standards of decency and deep-seated aspirations, confidence in peace can be gradually revitalized, and the greatest fear of mankind steadily reduced. At home, we possess broad acres, a wealth of resources, a mighty material strength, a high level of professional attainment and general culture. These, rightly used, in conformity with the great vision of the Republic's founders, can raise ever higher the standards of living and culture which have already made America unique among the nations.

There is nothing wrong with America that the faith, love of freedom, intelligence and energy of her citizens cannot cure.

Yet, no one man can, within a single lifetime, become fully conversant with all the skills and disciplines that ear upon currently critical questions. None, by himself, can reach wise answers in all. Consequently, you are fortunate in your continuing claim upon the advice of those who have been your teachers in Columbia. But though these selfless, patriotic and dedicated men and women can bring to you counsel - out of wisdom won through study and reflection - the solving of these problems becomes, with each passing day, more and more squarely up to you.

It is well that this is so. Each generation fortunately brings to its own affairs the freshness that is youth. Most profoundly do I believe that your attitude toward human differences in race, in color and in creed is far more generous, far more understanding, than that in which I and my generation were raised. Constantly re-appearing questions involving minorities, discrimination, persecution - all these will be answered better by people who have grown up with them than by those who, looking backward, try to fit the circumstances of today into patterns that they themselves knew when their own world was young. Your decisions in these matters, which are essentially moral - in that they involve right and justice and decency more than they involve material values - will measure the conscience of your generation. Thereby, you will determine whether the world grows loftier and nobler in spirit, or whether it turns toward cynicism, immorality, and self-indulgence. And in this determination alone is probably the real answer to most of the world's troubles; for without constantly improving standards in personal, political and economic morality, standards reflecting an indestructible faith in the Almighty, any other advance will be transitory, if not illusory.

Determination to support and sustain the political and economic freedom of the individual does not make us reactionaries, except in fuzzy minds or among those egoists who seek the right to dominate us - always, of course, for our own good. Americans have never been afraid to adjust procedures and methods to a changing economy. On the contrary, it has been clear from the beginning that our system fosters and requires adjustment to change; it demands growth that is rooted in the vitalizing, unending effort of free individuals to work out for the good of all the problems that confront them. Stagnation would be as disastrous to the Republic as would unwise innovations not rooted in the vital purposes of our national charter.

On the eve of its third century, this school enjoys an enviable prestige among the free universities of the world. Yet, in its heritage, as in that of all other things human, there is not one guarantee of permanence. An institution, like a man, can fall into self-satisfied lethargy, and end its days bankrupt in spirit and in energy. Or again, if like the hermit, it should seek seclusion from the hurly-burly of everyday life, it tends to become ingrown, both in ideas and in product.

Columbia will remain an influential, dynamic, richly informed participant - an active partner - in the life of community, nation and world. In her devotion to upholding the American Creed, she will not be deterred by the carping of self-appointed censors or by the name-calling of jingoist or subversive. Your alma mater takes a vivid interest in all affairs of our time and seeks daily for ways and means to be more helpful to her students, past and present, to the individuals and organizations that support her - to the public at large. The Columbia family is dedicated to the driving out of ignorance, of the lies and half-truths of propaganda. The full truth, we believe, is the chief support of human freedom and of all eternal values.

We hope that for each of you the Columbia faith will be many times refreshed as you return here - to learn; to present problems you have encountered; to consult with your faculty as their partners, adding your practical experience to their intellectual insight; to join with your fellow alumni in renewal of your loyalty. This is why we look upon today as a milestone for you and Columbia; not a day of separation.

I salute you as young people of faith, vigor, virility and intelligence. The single word of advice in which I indulge myself is to urge that you be wary of any who may seem to belittle those shining qualities of youth - who more often urge you to be against something than for something - who timidly advise you to be cautious, sophisticated, safe. Safety is a by-product of human vision and courage and progress; if sought for itself alone, it cannot be found.

The United States of America has been marked to wear the burdensome but glorious mantle of world leadership. Today's great opportunity, in this country, is to make that leadership a moral, intellectual and material model for all time. I am glad the opportunity is in your hands.

• Nassau County Bar Association, June 10, 1950

One of America's great tacticians, Stonewall Jackson, said "Always surprise, mystify and mislead the enemy." Applied in reverse, you will understand it is therefore a military crime ever to be surprised.

It was for me a great distinction to be invited here, and that, because of special significance, it will never disappear from my recollections. But to receive from you the certificate of honorary membership, I think, transcends even the others. It is a symbol of being taken into the family. For me, gentlemen, I hope you will not mind my saying that the significance is increased by the fact that you gave it to me on the same evening that you honored one of the clergy, particularly, one who lives with you, and of you; a man who so obviously occupies a high place in your affections and esteem. I deem it a very single honor, Reverend Peters, to be with you; second to you, on receipt of this honor.

And in passing, I cannot fail to remark that I deem it another honor that one of my seconders was a member of the Navy, because if I have ever at any time, in any public announcement, or any private conference failed to uphold our need for the Navy and to express my admiration for the personnel and its services to our country, then I assure you that it was an oversight merely of the tongue or the head, but never of the heart.

I wish that my reaction to the very fine, commendatory and overgenerous things that have been said about me could be merely that of pleasurable anticipation that was expressed by President Hutchins of Chicago.

With me, I think, the sentiments are almost one of desperation; probably expressed best in the reaction, "This had better be good." And I am sure you could understand how desperately I should want to make a good impression this evening, because with sort of an anxious eye toward a possible appearance in a court in the future, and with the array of judges we have found here this evening, I should like them to have pleasant memories of their first meeting with "the Old Soldier."

There are today so many significant questions and parts of questions concerning and filling our minds that any one, with the temerity to stand even for a few minutes before such an audience as this, is confronted with the very definite - a decision - as to the direction in which he will turn his mind and his words in an effort to leave something that would be not necessarily classed as mere apery or a mere generalization that was completely meaningless, and, because of this array of subjects, I am not greatly different from a chap who was going duck hunting with his partners, and took too much to drink. His partners did not know what to do with him except put him off in the end blind by himself where they figured he couldn't hurt anybody, and they got into position, when down wind, coming about ninety miles an hour, was a little greenwing, and everybody went "bang, bang, bang" and the greenwing went right on until he got in front of Old Bill. One shot, one bird. The people in the next blind wanted to make their peace quickly with Bill, now that he was sober, starved over, but quickly discovered by the raucous sounds coming out of the blind that Bill hadn't sobered up at all, and so, trying to make their get-away, they merely called to him, "Wonderful shot, Bill." He said, "Wonderful shot, Hell, anybody can get one bird out of such a flock as that!"

It is my great hope, therefore, by turning my verbal guns into the air, that I shall succeed in hitting at least one subject that may be of more than passing interest to all of us.

And as I try to think of these various questions and problems in sort of a mass, I am struck by the fact that all of them, if they do not center around, at least involve a feeling toward our international position - our place in the world.

Peace - to derive some confidence in peace. We think of business ventures; we think of our problems at home; or our taxes and everything else, and we inevitably seem to drift back - where are we going in the international field. And, because of this, and with a bow to the No. 1 honorary member of the association, I am going to quote a verse from the Bible. According to St. Luke, our Saviour said, "When a strong man, armed, keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace." If there is any application to our present situation, and I most profoundly believe that there is, let us take a look as to what we would call in this case, "man." From our viewpoint, it is certainly the nation, but is probably not - merely our property and territorial limits, even our commerce at sea, and our rights of our citizens abroad.

Put it all together, and we possibly mean the thing that we are going to defend, or what we must defend - is

our way of life. That way of life based upon the concept of human dignity and human freedom, human rights to develop itself morally, intellectually, physically.

Now, what constitutes that man's strength? If it is merely guns and ships and planes, the case is hopeless. Peace cannot be maintained merely by the naked sword. It is impossible; because, if we merely oppose sword to sword, eventually if nothing else, a sheer nerve will make us start to wheel. That strength as I see it is the first of all moral in its nature. It is the integrity of our purposes; the determination to maintain honesty and justice and decency in our relationships with others if we are going to remain strong. And if we are going to do that, we immediately see the direct application to our own and within our selves because we are not going to convince others that we are going to be fair and just and decent to others, unless we are decent among ourselves, one to the other.

As urgently as I hope and pray that we may find decent means of excluding from positions of responsibility in our Government, anyone that is subversive, anyone who wants to cling to another form of government rather than our own, I still pray with equal fervency that we may do it according to the American ideas of justice and decency. And I say this not merely because I hope that I live with a conviction that we must be fair one to the other because of our own welfare, but because of its significance abroad. But this strength that we must display, that this nation must have, must also be intellectual. We understand, of course, that we must be ahead or at least equal to others in scientific development. Our great scientists must unearth new truths, our research must push ahead so that in weapons, specifically, we are not behind in types, in models, etc. We must be strong economically sop that if ever we're attacked, our industries, as they did in the past, can pour forth great quantities of munitions that make this country so unique in the world - its ability to do that.

But over and beyond such uses of this man's brain must be the understanding of what we are doing, of our objectives, and how we are going to get there.

It is not enough to know, let us say, about the Yugoslav that he merely lives to the northeast of Italy, and it is rather mountainous country, and they have a man named Tito. What are their aspirations as compared with ours? Do we want to take our own patterns of Government, and of thought, and of education, let us say, of culture as a whole, and try to transplant them physically to another country and make then accept them before we say – "You are our friends." Of course we don't! But unless we do understand what they are trying to achieve as humans and as nations there is going to be a very broad gap between what we should like to have as peace in this world, and what is attained.

On the security side, of course - I mean, the military side, of course, the present situation is that we must remain strong. The great sums we pour into the armed services - they are not wasted. They are necessary! But they must all - I call your attention again to the fact that we are defending a way of life and the sums, and let us say the work hours, the energies, the resources of our country, that we divert into that kind of thing must be carefully measured against the possibility that that diversion may finally break the way of life that we are trying to defend.

And we come right back to the need, for intelligent understanding for each man that believes that he has a concern in the future of this country, for studying these things and not treating or making his own delusion merely upon what some office seeker may tell him for example, or what some other partisan may say in an attempt to make the headlines. For example, a question that is so often asked is "Is there going to be war or isn't there going to be war?" Gentlemen, do you remember in the "Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court," and this fellow, the great magician, Merlin, got up and he was regaling the great multitude of his examples of his power, and he told in detail what the emperor of India was doing, and he was going out hunting, but the little old Connecticut Yankee looked, standing in front of them, asked the simple question, "What have I got in my left hand?" And that raised hell with the magician. Now this question as to whether or not there is going to be war is something that no man can tell, but remember that we are struggling and I call your attention again to the Biblical verse I quoted. We are trying to achieve that objective - his goods are peace, meaning - we shall dwell in peace.

Therefore, it is proper for professionals in all lines of action, in industries, economics, politics, and the military, to make their estimates; to combine those estimates in Washington, and we must try to figure out what anyone who announces his antipathy for our system, his aggressive intent with respect to world revolution, we must try to keep alert and alive, but let's don't try to base all of our decisions on some slick answer that

someone tells us, “There isn’t going to be any war,” or the other fellow says, “We’re going to be atom-bombed tomorrow.” That just won’t work, and it isn’t intelligent and I feel that the use of intelligence and what intellectual capacity we have in approaching these problems, and let us try to think what is the man gaining now for our potential enemy. What is he gaining now? How is he trying to do it? What is the reason for his going to war? Where would be the respect to it? An if need be, drop out of your calculations the purely, strictly military and in all of the other fields, gentlemen, I do assure you there is no more reason for your going to some professional or other to make up your own minds than there is for somebody to decide for you any other problem of your own responsibility; family or otherwise. Your own brain, your own experience, your own understanding of things human is what is needed, and then must act accordingly.

And now – “Keepeth his palace.” What is our palace? Again, we know that it isn’t merely the territorial limits of the United States. Matter of fact, people that talk about extreme or complete isolation today - they haven’t used their brains in the slightest degree, because, let us say that freedom, still triumphantly reigning here at home, lived here alone. This was the only place - all the rest of the world was occupied by a force, a doctrine, a people that are inimical to us. Where will you get your rubber, your tin, your manganese? Now we might make synthetic rubber; however, without tin and manganese, we, the greatest exponent of the steel civilization, cannot exist. We’ve got to have friends at other places, so any people begin to talk to you in terms of extreme isolation, just – there’s no argument - because they haven’t thought for twenty seconds. So our palace is not merely bounded by the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, and by Mexico and Canada. Our palace should be all of those peoples of the world who want to live in somewhat the same concepts as we should like to live; who believe that man was created as something more than a merely intelligent mule - to be treated as a mule. There is something a little higher and finer about him. That there is a God and that they are therefore going to maintain some kind of a government that gives recognition to man’s definite and direct responsibility to his own Almighty. Those are the people that we should attempt to include with us in a palace, which does not mean necessarily that we all have to be governed by the same head, but if we live together, there will be a strong palace. If we are bound together by that unifying influence of basic concepts as to how we want to live and then we can defend this great palace against somebody that might choose to move against it; in fact, confront it with such a feeling of solidarity and unity no one will move against it.

We come to the last word - Peace.

We must sadly acknowledge today that peace is no longer definable as a single term. There seems to be two kinds of peace: one came about when the last shot was fired in the Japanese war. We were no longer killing each other, we had no casualty lists, but it was merely a cessation of hostilities or killing and we’ve had to call that “peace” since August 1945. It has been a sorry example of the kind of peace we want, although I, for one, dislike the term “cold war.” I think it is negative thinking and I believe that our efforts should always be to find

START HERE

some way of pushing this type of peace a little bit closer to the kind we want, which I conceive to be that that will allow us to live in confidence. Each to develop himself, each to earn for himself and his family, and, despite the habit of the Government taking away more than we think they should, we still have that glorious right, as one of the human rights in this country, to work for ourselves, our families. We want that right at least to be free in any foreign threat, any aggressive threat from without. I think we can have that as we stand firm and make our decisions upon our ideas of what is honest and just and right and not what is merely slick and expedient for the moment. I reject all ideas that we can attain such things by going and fighting a preventive war, and often men, who at least appear to be otherwise intelligent, come to me and say, “General, why don’t we just go and lick the Russians before he has so and so, etc.” If we wanted to fight a war with Russia, what would be our objective? To try to establish a government that would live in peace with us; in other words, a government in which power could be in the hands of the people? We trust that kind of government. Gentlemen, let us assume, let’s jump all over the horrible difficulties, and the sacrifices, the blood, the treasure, the piling up of the National Debt to four times let us say, that it is now – let’s have a military victory. Now, who here wants the job of going and occupying Russia for how long to make it a democracy so that we gained one single thing out of that war. I am sure that my great friend, my brilliant assistant who did for me in World War II, General Wickersham, wouldn’t want the job. And there is nobody else in the United States who would want it, and furthermore, we wouldn’t make in the long run the sacrifices of men and money necessary to do it. This

thing cannot be solved by preventive war. War must never be followed by any other except as the final, desperate alternative to loss of freedom. And that's the only way we are justified in looking at it. And when we get into it on that basis, then there is no doubt of the conviction with which we will go into it, and win it if we have to.

But to my mind there is no tremendous difficulty about us doing our duty to our beloved country in our own time. If we will merely each follow his own conscience, each try to inform himself about these problems abroad and at home because, as I have so briefly pointed out, there is no separating of these problems. If we are torn by industrial strife at home, if anything that we ourselves are guilty of doing in starting, promoting, or maintaining, or failing to settle industrial strife, by that much we have delivered ourselves into the hands of our potential enemies abroad, because they will certainly consider it a far greater victory to destroy and defeat us economically than they would to sink all of the vessels we have, destroy every soldier, and shoot down every airplane. That would be the greatest victory they could have.

So as we keep our country strong by dealing on every subject with such justice as God gave to each of us, and if we use our brains, my contention is we cannot only maintain a peace that must keep the sword partially drawn from the scabbard, but we can finally win a peace where we can all lay sorts of way, and where we can live in confidence and happiness. I repeat that I have been singly honored by this bidding this evening, and I hope that I have not trespassed too much upon your time and patience.

• Boy Scout Jamboree, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania, July 4, 1950

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Boy Scouts, friends. Simple are the words in the pledge of allegiance to the flag, but within it is the core of the American code - moulded in the fire of revolution, hammered on the anvil of battle, tested and proved through seventeen decades of arduous yet glorious trial. I hope that, as you Scouts repeated its phrases of dedication, you were joined by your parents, sisters, brothers and friends throughout the breadth and length of this land. The times demand that every American be proud to proclaim his loyalty.

Here in Valley Forge, on July Fourth, both day and place join with our voices to fortify us in the allegiance that we declare. We celebrate the anniversary of our Independence Declaration on the spot where the resolution of our nation's founders met and surmounted its sorest trial.

The ideas set forth in that Declaration shattered political shackles as old as humanity. Through the mounting years, since they were written, they have heartened others across the world in defiance of tyranny. They still inspire men to labor and to sacrifice; even to risk the grim tragedy of war in order that human freedom may not be torn from peoples, by themselves, too weak to resist ruthless attack.

The world is now locked in an intense struggle between opposing political systems. One of these is the free system under which we live; the other is the communistic doctrine with its practices of absolute dictatorship. Those who seek to destroy free government use every means to gain their ends - the brute force of weapons; the sneak attack, the brazen lie of propaganda; the infiltration of traitors; the false promises that conceal black designs. They plot to confuse, weaken, divide or cripple those who support the principles so clearly and sharply defined on this day in 1776.

The outcome of this struggle is vital to us and to the future. We, as citizens, either resolutely uphold the purposes our forefathers here defended or we miserably fail to measure yup to and to sustain, our American birthright. Neglect could be as damaging as attack against us. Moreover, I believe that any among us who embraces communism or its purposes thereby becomes an enemy of America. By no juggling of words or twisting of ideas can a citizen of this country justify an alliance with the forces of dictatorship and communistic enslavement.

Because disloyalty is an offense of the most profound import, we must be especially careful to avoid hurling the charge of communist against any who may merely disagree with us. Respect for our own free system requires that we speak and act against others with restraint until factual evidence establishes guilt. But in fighting disloyalty we must not let restraint in conduct degenerate into indifference to the offense.

In the world conflict, national neutrality is futile, if not impossible. Therefore, we must support those with whom our kinship and our friendship are clearly established by common devotion to the freedom of men. The cost of effective help is great and the risks are sometimes fearful. But the alternative is an enslaved world. Even in the mighty United States - if surrounded solely by hostile areas, men could not permanently continue free.

At the moment, a friendly Republic suffers outrageous invasion. The South Koreans' only crime has been the desire to live their own lives as they choose, at peace with the rest of the world. The American decision to assist them was inescapable. The alternative would be another kind of Munich, with all the disastrous consequences that followed in the wake of that fatal error 12 years ago. Now, our decision must be carried to its conclusion by whatever means are necessary. In firmness for decency and readiness for any eventuality lies the only possible route to the peace and friendliness with all the world we so earnestly seek. The end is difficult to see. But, for us in Valley Forge, where every field and hill and stream reminds us of George Washington, how can we doubt eventual success, if we meet these issues firmly?

In our affections and admiration, each of us has his own particular reasons for placing the Father of our Country above all other citizens. Some of us may think of him principally as a battle leader, especially in his moment of triumph at Yorktown. We see him crossing the icy Delaware to initiate a march whose daring thrills us; it stands in military annals as an example of what courage and boldness can do. We respect the wise and firm hand he kept upon the helm of State as he guided the Republic through her first eight years. We hear the words of his farewell to his army, of his Newburgh address. We salute the statesmanship of his final farewell to public life. Yet most of us at the Boy Scout encampment would likely agree that the crowning glory of his whole career was Valley Forge.

To this spot Washington led his defeated and retreating army - to the cold hardships of a bitter winter. Discouragement was his daily ration. He seemed deserted by the Continental Congress and abandoned to bear burdens that were almost unbearable. He lost, from starvation and freezing, during that winter, more than 3,000 out of his tiny army. When we consider how he, singlehanded, kept his forces together during those long days and months, hearing the pitiful cries of the suffering and witnessing the despair in the eyes of the dying, we gain some faint understanding of the greatness of spirit of George Washington. In doing so, we turn to our own problems of today with increased confidence. Here at Valley Forge, every relic, every monument assures us that even hunger, pain, nakedness and indescribable hardship cannot wholly dishearten those whose spirit is steeped in faith and in loyalty to a lofty purpose.

This place is an eternal witness to the worth - and to the cost - of the liberty we possess. Men here proved that they valued it above comfort or safety, as they paid for it in pain and blood and life. We pray that no obligation to our country may ever again demand such a price; but any who dodges the least duty of citizenship nullifies, that much, the heroism of Valley Forge. They shall lose freedom who think it may be preserved without sweat and sacrifice.

But we do not depend upon Valley Forge alone for inspiration. With us every day of our lives, is the flag that stands for more than victory in war or richness in peace. The American flag represents what the multitudes of humanity have yearned for through the ages - friendship among men, liberty for men, justice toward men. America, under God, is a way of life ruled by the eternal truths of human brotherhood, human dignity, human rights. Whatever our frailty, our defects of deed or mind, our errors or our prejudices of the past, no one of us can fail to grow stronger in loyalty, stouter in the performance of duty, richer in good will when he humbly stands before the symbol of free America.

Among ourselves, we do not speak openly and frankly, as often as we should, of patriotism - love of country. It is not that we fear the jeering of the smart-aleck; possibly we forget that men grow in stature only as they daily rededicate themselves to a noble faith. More likely, we thoughtlessly assume our blessings of liberty to be indestructible.

True patriotism places the public good above individual advantage. It is not tainted by false pride in might, in size, in overwhelming power; it never seeks to compel others to a blind obedience to our wishes. It is among the greatest of human virtues. Fortunate are we whose devotion is to a country that seeks the good of all its citizens, without distinction, that firmly champions the cause of human rights, and offers the hand of friendship to every other nation whose purpose is peace and justice.

May none of us be backward in seeking ways to perform our duty to the nation. Let us not be discouraged

if some seem to be slackers, who deride our earnestness and selfishly profit out of our sacrifices. Every society, every crowd has its weaklings, its cowards, its self-centered individuals. We must not be influenced by their actions - if we are to escape the shame that is theirs. You Boy Scouts of this Jamboree, and your comrades in the nation, are growing up in a time of peril, crisis, tension. Few among you can remember a day free from war, rumor of war, fear of war! That you may not, in your young manhood, be sacrificed to war is indeed the primary purpose of our foreign policy today. And you shall not be, if the pledge of allegiance stands always before the world as the guiding light of our national life. You can help make it so. Leadership is measured by example and action and earnestness of spirit - not by years of age.

The glory of this nation is that it was conceived in courage, born in sacrifice and reached its maturity in the unselfish devotion and labor of patriots. So long as time endures, America will need these qualities of her citizens. And so long as these qualities do endure, so long will this country stand free, strong and pre-eminent among the nations. The future is bright when America with one voice, with a stout heart and with utter sincerity, says: “I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.”

• Crusade for Freedom, Denver, Colorado, September 4, 1950

Americans are dying in Korea tonight. They are dying for ideals they have been taught to cherish more than life itself; but it will be written and said tonight in Warsaw - in Prague - in Moscow, that they died for American imperialism.

Unfortunately, millions of people will believe this devilish libel against American soldiers, who have taken up arms in defense of liberty - a second time in a tormented decade. Those millions will hear no other version but a hissing, hating tirade against America. We think it incredible that such poison be swallowed! But those people, behind and beyond the Iron curtain, have seen so much political wickedness and cold blooded betrayal - such Godless depravity in government - that they find it harder to believe in our peaceful intent and decent motives than in the calculated and clever lies that Communism is spreading every hour, every day, through every broadcast and newspaper that it controls.

This slander against our purposes and our men in Korea is merely one example of the campaign of hatred that is being waged against America and freedom around the globe. We face not only ruthless men, but also lies and misconceptions intended to rob us of our resolution and faith within, and of our friends throughout the world. Communists teach that America is a vicious enemy of humanity. They have embarked upon an aggressive campaign to destroy free government - as in the young republic of Korea - because regimentation cannot face the peaceful competition of free enterprise. The Communist leaders believe that, unless they destroy our system, their own subjects, gradually gaining an understanding of the blessings and opportunities of liberty, will repudiate Communism and tear its dictators from their positions of power. They know that free labor and management consistently out-produce Communism in the material things that humans need and want, and hold our a superior appeal to man’s spiritual aspirations. They know that, for the mass of humanity, America has come to symbolize freedom, opportunity, human happiness. They have a mortal fear that this knowledge will penetrate eventually to their own people and others in the world.

Communistic aggression, inspired by fear, carries with it the venom of those who feel themselves to be inferior; this accounts for the depth of their hatred, and the intensity of their thirst for power!

To destroy human liberty and to control the world, the Communists use every conceivable weapon - subversion, bribery, corruption, military attack! Of all these, none is more insidious than propaganda.

Spurred by this threat to our very existence, I speak tonight - as another private citizen, not as an officer of the Army - about the Crusade of freedom. This crusade is a campaign sponsored by private American citizens to fight the big lie with the big truth. It is a program that has been hailed by President Truman and others as an essential step in getting the case for freedom heard by the world’s multitudes. Powerful Communist radio stations incessantly tell the world that we Americans are physically soft and morally corrupt; that we are disunited and confused; that we are selfish and cowardly; that we have nothing to offer the world but imperialism and exploitation.

To combat these broadcasts the government has established a radio program called the “Voice of America” which has brilliantly served the cause of freedom, but the Communist stations overpower it and outflank it with a daily coverage that neglects no wave length of dialect, no prejudice or local aspiration. Weaving a fantastic pattern of lies and twisted fact, they confound the listener into believing that we are war-mongers - that America invaded North Korea - that a Russian invented the airplane - that the Soviets, unaided, won World War II - and that the secret police and slave camps of Communism offer humanity brighter hope for the future than do self government and free enterprise. We need powerful radio stations abroad, operated without government restrictions, to tell in vivid and convincing form about the decency and essential fairness of democracy. These stations must tell of our aspirations for peace, our hatred of war, our support of the United Nations, and our constant readiness to cooperate with all who have these same desires. Only then can we counteract the Communist deceits that are being spread with every weather, crop and news report.

One such private station, Radio Free Europe, is now in operation in western Germany. It daily brings a message of hope and encouragement to a small part of the masses of Europe.

The Crusade for Freedom will provide for the expansion of Radio Free Europe into a network of stations. They will be given the simplest, clearest charter in the world: “Tell the Truth.” For it is certain that all the specious promises of Communism to the needy, the unhappy, the frustrated, the down-trodden, cannot stand against the proven record of democracy and its day-by-day progress in the betterment of all mankind. The tones of the Freedom Bell, symbol of the Crusade, will echo through vast areas now under blackout.

In this Battle for Truth, you and I have a definite part to play. During the Crusade, each of us will have the opportunity to sign the Freedom Scroll. It bears a declaration of our faith in freedom, and of our belief in the dignity of the individual, who derives the right of freedom from God. Each of us, by signing the Scroll, pledges to resist aggression and tyranny wherever they appear on Earth. Its words express what is in all our hearts. Your signature on it will be a blow for liberty.

My friend General Lucius Clay - one of our great Americans - is directing the Crusade for Freedom. Your contribution, great or small, will help him provide the means of bringing the truth to a region vital to our welfare.

Even we, ourselves, sometimes overlook or forget factors of the utmost importance in the global situation, and which have direct bearing on our own security and prosperity.

Most of us have been enjoying a long weekend, terminating in this day dedicated to free American labor. How depressing it is to realize that on this Labor Day, 1950, one third of the human race works in virtual bondage. In the totalitarian countries, the individual has no right that the state is bound to respect. His occupation is selected by his masters; his livelihood is fixed, by decree, at the minimum which will give him strength to work another day; his pleasures and his thoughts are restricted to those of glorifying the bonds that hold him in servitude.

Because representative labor leaders of America know the record of Communism in beating down labor, they have long been in the forefront of those fighting the spread of this vicious doctrine. But Communism goes further than the exploitation of labor. Unless the individual accepts the governmental mastery of his life and soul, he can be convicted without trial; he can be executed without right of appeal; he can be banished to live out his life in a slave camp.

The people behind the Iron curtain have no concept of a free press, or free discussion; or of our right to a church of our own choosing, or any church at all. Their schools and periodicals are little more than propaganda mills. The people know nothing except that which their government says they should know, and, the effort to learn more is punished promptly and without mercy.

This is what the Soviet planners contemplate for all the world, including America.

We must meet this threat with courage and firmness. Unless we look, with clear and understanding eyes, at the World situation of today, and unless we meet, with dynamic purpose the issues confronting us, then we will lose the American birthright. The system of government established by our forefathers will disappear; the sacrifices of American patriots will have been in vain. The world will go back to the days of master and slaves - of darkness, ignorance and savagery. The American record, from Washington to the day of disaster, would be only a blank page in history. We - American citizens - can assure that this will never happen to us if the fervor of our devotion to freedom and country is equal to the seriousness of the threat. Amid these dangers, personal

participation by each in public deliberation and activity is necessary to our safety. Each must make it his responsibility to see that we remain strong - morally, intellectually, materially. Our material strength must comprise a healthy, devoted and prosperous population, high productivity, financial stability, and such military power as can meet aggression on respectable terms.

Young and old - business, labor, professional men - 150 million of us - must rally as one man behind our country and freedom! America is exactly as strong as the initiative, courage, understanding and loyalty of the individual citizen!

The die has been cast in Asia but we are in no limited conflict, Free Europe, struggling for moral and economic recovery, is still a tempting target for predatory military force. We must give real support to all aspects of the military aid program and re-examine, at once, our troop strengths in critical areas.

All this means that we must tighten our belts, both nationally and individually. We must insist upon facing up to the task of paying for the accomplishment of these vital measures, else the Soviets will take heart from their success in bringing us further inflation and closer to economic ruin.

We must have efficiency and economy in all governmental expenditures, and we must concentrate all our resources to assure victory in this bitter, and probably prolonged struggle! Until it is won we must practice Spartan frugality in all nonessential matters, so that we may make the greatest possible contribution to the defense of our way of life. All lesser considerations must wait; we cannot tolerate politics as usual any more than we can tolerate business as usual. We must get tough - tough with ourselves.

Success in such national crises always requires some temporary and partial surrender of individual freedom. But the surrender must be our specific decision, and it must be only partial and only temporary! And it must be insured that when the crisis has passed, each of us will then possess every right, every privilege, every responsibility and every authority that now resides in an American citizen. It would do no good to defend our liberties against Communistic aggression and lose them to our own greed, blindness or shiftless reliance on bureaucracy and the federal Treasury.

In the dangers and trials ahead, our ultimate security lies in the dynamic purpose, the simple courage and unshakable unity of the United States and the free world, a unity that depends upon common understanding of and common veneration of freedom. But these can live only where there is access to the truth. Thus truth becomes our most formidable weapon, a weapon that each of us can help forge through the Crusade for Freedom.

And let us never forget that for those who have lost freedom there is no price or cost or sacrifice that can even faintly reflect its value. But it is still the core of America’s boundless heritage. It will remain so for as long as we, plain American citizens, are ever ready to guard it with vigilance and defend it with fortitude and faith!

Thank you very much.

• Carnegie Institute, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, October 19, 1950

Five years ago, the United States was the mightiest temporal power that had ever existed. There was none then who doubted our strength or the capacity of our people for any effort, and sacrifice. At the moment of victory over the Axis our leading position was unchallenged and our visible power was insurance against slander and libel.

Because we planned no world conquest, no enslavement of a weaker nation, no tyranny to be established by bombs and bullets, we demobilized our armies, our fleets of sea and air. Only later we learned - we sadly learned - that, in our zeal for peace and our confidence in the good faith of all nations, we went too far, and far too fast. We traded the confidence of the strong for the fears of the unready; prestige for abuse.

The enemies of freedom thereafter launched against us a persistent, worldwide campaign of vilification. They strangled all voices friendly to us in the lands that lie under the communist doom. Where they could not stamp out friendship for America, they used every weapon in the totalitarian arsenal - short of war - to nullify our leadership.

For months, lengthening into years, the world has been deafened - and misled - by the charges that America, corrupted by the grossest materialism, the dupe of capitalistic exploitation, staggering into the ruin of

financial exploitation, is attempting to recoup its fortunes by imperialistic expansion.

For the moment the din has somewhat subsided as our prestige has increased in the sacrifices of American fighting men and the victories won by them, joined with the men of the Korean Republic and the United Nations. But we know the pause is temporary. While it lasts, it is opportune to take stock of America, what threatens it, how it can be guarded against collapse or disaster. In this city - symbol of the American economy - such stock-taking is sharply apt.

Across the world, Pittsburgh is known for smoke and steel. But Pittsburgh, too, stands for things that outlast monuments that rust or crumble. Smoke and steel; art and learning; Andrew Carnegie, the opportunities of our country and the great-heartedness of its people - for all of these, Pittsburgh stands. And thereby it stands for America, the America whose leadership in the free world is as much a thing of mind and heart as of material sinew.

How did America attain that position. There is, of course, an immediate allegation, screamed by those of the totalitarian camp. They say America is the product of a capitalist conspiracy against those who toil. That answer is as false as ignorance, compounded with malice, can possibly make it.

In the story of Pittsburgh - symbol of the America that the totalitarians hate and fear even as they attempt to emulate its material achievements - in that story is the true answer to America's world position. It is the story of many men, dedicated to a vision of greatness, each in his generation contributing labor and risk and sacrifice to the furtherance of the vision.

The first of them, one hundred and ninety-two years ago this evening, lay in the forest east of Laurel Hill at the head of this column aimed at Fort Duquesne. Five years before he had recognized in this wedge of land between the two rivers - wind-swept, dreary after the fall rains, uninhabited - the key to the Ohio Valley. And for five years, George Washington had given freely of himself without any assurance of honor or profit, that this triangle of land might be won for the American colonies.

After him to this place came men by the scores and then by the thousands. From every corner of the earth they came. All the skills of humanity were pooled here. Growth was tumultuous. Inequities begot strife; the industrial revolution for a while outmarched the understanding of men. But, underlying all was the ideal of a community where free men might strive for the good life together! This they sought by cooperating among themselves, rewarding effort and enterprise in just measure, seeking to improve the lot of each individual, and guided by the eternal principle that men are created by the Almighty with inalienable rights.

Men of conscience, men of decency, never let the lust for profit or power completely obscure the vision. By their courageous leadership, the community tirelessly worked out measures and plans to raise for all citizens and level of culture, the standard of living, the enjoyment of leisure. That is the telescoped story of Pittsburgh, as it is also of the nation. It is the story of freedom - and the accomplishments of a free people.

By contrast, regimented men, working in sullen silence, never knowing the turmoil of freedom or its hazards can never feel the stimulus of its rewards. Their masters, consequently, must ever increase the punishments visited on the laggard until, for the victim, there is little choice between death and revolt. Consequently, in terms of history, a dictatorship is a government of temporary duration and uneasy operation. It either stagnates or is overthrown.

Because totalitarianism is a system of diminishing returns and increasing penalties that cannot match the achievements of a free system or even survive once men know the fruits thereof, its policy must be to destroy freedom everywhere.

Our problem is to defend freedom against the announced purposes of Communistic fanatics, and to do this in such fashion that we do not ourselves suffocate freedom in its own dwelling place. What are the means to that end?

First and fundamental is such rectitude and probity of purpose that not even the fogs of propaganda can obscure the sincerity and integrity of our aims. Our position in every matter of moment must be made clear to the world, including ourselves. We have nothing to fear from the searching scrutiny of men, even the most critical. We can stand on our past record and present purposes, which were again presented by the President Tuesday night.

Particularly we must not, as permanent policy, embrace a philosophy of force, and we must make certain that the world understands our desire for peace. Always in the past America has armed herself only in crisis.

Today we again face this necessity, but we must assure ourselves, and others, that we regard this circumstances of today as critical. Even though the crisis should last a decade, our faith in eventual peace based upon truth and friendship and decency has not diminished. Never will our sword become so big that it conceals the olive branch.

The second means for assuring our national security is such support for our allies that free Europe shall not become the spoil of pillaging hordes. The Atlantic Pact is recognition that the West must unite - if it is not to risk destruction. Paper plans cannot stop tanks. So the Pact must be translated into ground divisions, armor and planes and guns; and it must rest upon a restored morale of an entire region - the region where are the roots of the vast bulk of America's people.

What the exact contribution of the United States should be, in terms of men and arms, is a decision to be reached by our Government, but certainly it cannot be a mere token or gesture.

Nevertheless, the large-scale permanent commitment of American troops to relatively fixed defensive positions outside the continental limits would be costly beyond the military return. The points where attack could conceivably fall are many. The key to efficient defense is alertness and reasonable strength in the outposts, supported by highly mobile forces of adequate strength in the central reserves. This principle applies to global strategy as clearly as to a tactical battle on a narrow front. The daily cost of a defensive force multiplies and its combat efficiency shrinks with each mile that separates it from its source of supply and replacement.

Each of the Atlantic Pact nations must capitalize on its particular capacity for exertion or endurance, with special reference to the emergency job that it will face at the moment of possible aggression. Our own job is production and the ability to move strong units and destructive power quickly over great distances.

We know that, in the final showdown, even those who seek world domination respect retaliatory power that can punish aggression - swiftly, grievously - at the source of aggression. Predatory force would scarcely hesitate when all it has to fear is a belated attempt at deliverance of captives. But even a reckless marauder would hesitate to venture forth when he knows that he risks being cut off in the midst of well-armed enemies and his own refuge destroyed behind him.

It is because of the great cost of such defensive arrangements and the uncertainties of time and space that some have suggested a plan called preventive war. Possibly my hatred of war blinds me so that I cannot comprehend the arguments they adduce. But, in my opinion, there is no such thing as a preventive war. Although this suggestion is repeatedly made, none has yet explained how war prevents war. Worse than this, no one has been able to explain away the fact that war creates the conditions that beget war. But it is true that the greatest deterrent to aggression is to confront those who plot it with an alert defensive force that can parry the first rush, while a crushing offensive is promptly initiated against the attacker.

The conclusion is inescapable that leadership for peace has, as its third requirement, the armed strength of America in the amount demanded by our position, our obligations and our security. Another way to put it is: we Americans must realize that we cannot buy out, talk away, or ignore, the menace of totalitarian aggression. So long as it persists in its course, we must be ready to stop it. Our future - in duration and content - depends on our present willingness to work, to serve, to sacrifice, to subordinate our ease, our plans, our pleasure to the hard necessities of the country's safety and the world's freedom. This applies to every one of us - capitalist, worker, doctor, lawyer, farmer - every American!

It has been reported that our present purpose is to build an Armed Force of three million men. In these tense times such a figure seems to be entirely reasonable for a nation of 150 million people, the richest on earth, confronted with an array of enemies who have repeatedly ignored every proposal for mutual disarmament and who have, by every action through five years, shown their contempt for the weak and unready.

Yet the maintenance of a force of this size in time of peace is not only a serious departure from our past policy; it poses a problem of vital import.

So serious are the implications of the present and the foreseeable future that many men, representing a cross section of American opinion, have urged universal military service as the only method that will assure us an efficient force of three million men, economically maintained. Numbers of liberal educators, conservative business men, hard-headed professional men have agreed that only some such system can meet the problem of recruitment squarely, efficiently and democratically.

They propose that each young man on reaching the age of eighteen be enrolled in one of the services for a period of not over two years, with no deferments and with every man assigned to the post he is best qualified, physically and mentally, to fill. This service will be performed as an obligation, not as another job in the American competitive economy. The discharge of this obligation demands sacrifice - but can any sacrifice be considered too great if it can guarantee a lifetime of freedom?

On the other side of the coin, the least we would owe to these young men, in advance, is a clear understanding of our nation's problems - history, aims, and plans, with the assurance that their sacrifice will cease the instant the necessity passes. In justice, also, post-service opportunities to be offered the youth should include appropriate educations help and every compensation for disability that a warm-hearted country can support.

And during their service - should the proposal be enacted - we Americans would and should demand that their leaders be of high moral and intellectual stature and purpose. We must never tolerate in this country even a shadow of brutish militarism.

Youth does not interpret patriotism in terms of dollars. Unfortunately, many of us, as we grow older, are corrupted into their worship, and many see, even in a crisis, a chance to profit, to further selfish aims at the expense of the nation. Possibly, the only sacrifice or contribution many of us can make will be to pay our taxes. We should do that gladly, to the last penny, so that the inheritance of our children will not be a debt-ridden land. While we could not help to avoid a temporary national deficit, if the times should demand a sudden and tremendous increase in the budget for defense, reckless extravagance, selfish grabbing, heedless spending of dollars we do not possess, will make American citizenship in the future a mortgaged existence rather than a joyous privilege. If solvency and security are not synonymous, they are so closely related that the difference, if any, is scarcely discernible.

A vigorous devotion to freedom and democracy must underlie all else. Unless our courage, our sturdiness and our comprehension are equal to the demands of our time, unless the complexities of our economy can, with justice for all, be managed without destruction of the fundamental values that brought about the birth of this nation, then despair would be our portion. If we as individuals and as members of groups look on all other individual Americans and American groups as fair prey for higher profits, higher wages and higher prices, we shall end up by plundering each other as thoroughly as any invading enemy could - and only a little less viciously.

We are all in the same boat, whether we farm the soil, manage a steel mill or operate a cab; work in a metropolis or live in a village. There is enough for all of us - and for defense too - within the bounds of common sense and decency. But there is not room in all of America for one exploiter of crisis or piratical gouger of his fellowmen. In our circumstances, the exploiter and gouger differ little from traitors, for we face a conspiracy that can engulf the world. Vigilance, understanding, patriotism, stamina - these are the chief weapons in freedom's arsenal.

World communism aims at world rule. One of its principal methods is the seizure of once free governments by minorities; tiny minorities that infiltrate free institutions and feed upon their own greed and lust for power, and ignorance. To prevent a whole electorate from being taken over by minorities, there is one sure prescription: every citizen to vote.

In that light, every citizen who has failed to register so that he may vote in November or who, having registered, does not vote, is a silent supporter of the Communist aim.

The people who stay away from the polls actually vote for minority rule; and every nation that has gone totalitarian - Communist, Fascist, Nazi - has been taken over by a minority, not by the total electorate. Furthermore, the man who does not vote has forfeited all right to complain about his government's policy in any field. He shirks his own responsibility and throws away the proud privilege of American citizenship.

In recent months, America's greatness in crisis has been demonstrated to all the world; by the magnificent achievement of American infantrymen holding the Korean beachhead against staggering odds; by a tremendous movement of men and arms across the Pacific in a convincing exhibition of American industrial and logistical strength; by the inspired and courageous leadership of General MacArthur who, in the integration of a United Nations force, again has brilliantly proved that men of many nations can work and can fight together; by the world response to the moral leadership of the United States, so overwhelming that it became clear that even our

cynical opponents were impressed by the weight of world opinion.

Whether we now continue forward or lag behind and wither away is up to us and to the individual American - at his work, in his home, as a member of community and nation. There are 150 million of us, but each one of us is the critical key to the future. America is exactly as strong as the average of her individual citizens.

Her future will be free and prosperous if all of us regard and perform our civic duties as a priceless privilege and guard our rights as we would our lives. But if those rights are lightly regarded, and those duties become for the majority a dreary chore to be evaded on any trifling excuse, how can we condemn a system that acknowledges no individual right, and defines duty in terms of unequivocal and brutal order?

Slaves or free men, masters of ourselves or servants of all-powerful state? The right answer has been given us by the founders, the builders of Pittsburgh, and by their contemporaries who, with them, converted this country from a wilderness into the mighty product of human progress that it is today. If we never fail to match their vision, their readiness to risk, their valor and their tireless energy, America need not fear any threat from within or from without, and we shall pass on to those still to come a nation that firmly champions freedom and justice and is humbly grateful to the God of our father and of ourselves! Thank you.

• Command in War, National War College, October 30, 1950

General Bull, gentlemen, I notice that your Commandant gave me a specific subject. He is really far more hopeful than I am that I will stay on it, because I shall probably roam over the waterfront quite a bit in discussing the subject of “Command in War.”

The first thing I would like to mention are the Service school systems, culminating in this one. I think there is no activity more important in a man’s preparation for war than his periodic return to school duty, not so much because of what he learns in mere facts and knowledge as because during that period he is relieved of the ordinary routine duty of courts martial, checking supplies and making accounts, writing letters to the central offices and answering endorsements and that sort of thing. For that period he is given an opportunity to think, to think in terms of war, without limit upon the scope of his ideas.

In this particular school there is an attempt to produce something akin to what we would call soldier-statesmen; in other words, a soldier or a service man, no matter what his branch of the Service, who is not limited in his thinking to mere professional considerations, but who starts out with the statement “The security of the United States is my guiding light,” and then he searches out and thinks upon every possible activity, every possible thing that can affect that security. Not always does he have the responsibility for action, of course, but he still cannot escape the personal responsibility of thinking about those things and adjusting his own professional ideas accordingly.

As an example, there is the budget. You, as individuals may come to one of the various headquarters offices in Washington at a time when the nation is stirred up, and is anxious about its safety. You want to repair the neglect of 175 years with one great splurge of expenditure. The Service man then can easily be criticized if he doesn’t spend enough, although normally he is criticized for asking too much. He runs into arguments with Congressional committees and others. Now at such a time it is just as necessary that Service people do not advise the Government to spend more than can be efficiently and effectively spent, as it is necessary to fight like tigers for more money when they see the indifference of the nation endangering its security.

The reason for this sort of introductory roaming around in this kind of thought is: When you get into command in war, into the type of command that I assume you would like to have me discuss, you can no longer think merely in terms of strictly professional factors. For example, in Algiers one night I remember the staffs sitting in a conference. Shipping was very tight. It was the critical factor in our whole program, and we felt we were in a very tenuous, not to say risky, situation. Therefore every ton on every ship was vastly important to us. Perforated plate, ammunition, tanks and everything else we needed were competing for space. But at the same time, in northern Africa, we had a great area occupied by Arabs who had been denied material goods for a number of years, the things they highly valued. The Arabs were on our lines of communication, and everybody, commanders and staff, was worried, and sensitive to the safety of our lines of communication. Finally, the

problem became not to decide between perforated plate, ammunition, tanks and guns, but whether we had better sacrifice two or three thousand tons of military space to white cloth, sugar and soap for the Arabs. Unless there has been background thinking, preparation and study, how are you going to make that decision? And it might be very, very important. In that case I do remember that the decision was made in favor of the Arabs. The only thing I am trying to say is that you cannot think of problems affecting war, which are as broad as life itself, solely in terms of military equipment and military organization. Your thinking has to be pitched on a much wider plane.

Now let's go into this word "command" for a second. Normally we use command and leadership somewhat synonymously. Purists can get us and argue about distinctions, but at least we believe this: No commander is a real one unless he is also a leader. I do not believe that you should ever think of yourselves as merely being trained as staff officers or as assistants to somebody who is going to be touched by opportunity in war, and who becomes a great leader, thus making you one of the group that through professional competence helps him out in the solution of his tasks. That is not the way you should think of yourselves. You are part of leadership.

The leadership system of a modern fighting force is a beautifully interlocking hierarchy of command and staffs. There is a great composite brain that runs large operations, and that is the reason that you yourselves are not merely the men assisting, in the proper place, toward the proper functioning of a great organization; you are part of that leadership. You bring to the whole your particular specialty, your particular competence, but also remember that over and above competence, you must bring your heart and your soul, your loyalties. Those are the qualities that go to make up great leaders, and you are part of him - I am talking of a system, not of a man. With you and those like you in the system there will be no chance of failure. And that is your reason for living.

Because of this circumstance many people draw a very erroneous conclusion. They believe, because a mass mind must operate on this great problem, that the influence of the individual has been lost in war. Nothing could be more false. If you will go back in your memory to the campaigns you have studied in the distant past when one man could stand on a hill and overlook the whole field, issue his orders through a system of orderlies from this wing to the center, to that wing, you will realize that it didn't make much difference what kind of a man if his tactical competence was equal to the conditions of the time. If he was, in addition, forceful, had the courage of his own convictions, he was probably successful. That kind of control is no longer possible, and because we all form a part of this beautiful interlocking mechanism, personality in war becomes almost more important than anything else.

There was a very wise soldier under whom I served for a number of years - in my opinion the greatest military philosopher and thinker I have known - Fox Conner. One day in a burst of personal enthusiasm I said, "General, what is the first and greatest quality of a good staff officer?" And he had a perfect answer. He said, "A ready grin."

If you will think it over, you will find that regardless of your professional experience, you will agree with his basic thought. How are you going to fit into a machine if everything you do irritates others; if everything you say, if your mannerisms seem to repel them? You have got to have friends around. A good staff is characterized by unshakeable loyalty among its members. You have to be able occasionally to stick your feet in the window, light a cigarette and join with the rest of the gang in damning the authorities, the government and everybody else, well knowing that what you are really saying is "if this were an easy problem they wouldn't have sent such good soldiers here to do it!" You have got to be a family, in which each member knows that his inner thoughts, his thinking aloud is not going to be repeated somewhere else to his own damage.

Now I don't want to be here in terms of advice and exhortation. In my own way I just want to be thinking aloud, and if you gather something from it, I assure you I will be very proud and very happy. But you must not, in your thinking, confuse these great problems with mere semantics. I have attended a number of military schools, and I have heard people arguing about the difference between strategy and tactics, and finally they come to the conclusion there is a shadow field between the two; and so they talk about strategy and tactics and the introduce "grand tactics" in order that they can argue some more about the definition of terms. I have attended schools where instructors have gotten up and given me nine great principles of war, and I was told that if I absorbed them all and applied them all, I would never lose a battle. Gentlemen, that is not war. War is taking any problem exactly as you take a problem of your own life, stripping it down to its essentials, determining for yourself what is important and what you can emphasize to the advantage of your side; what you

can emphasize that will be to the disadvantage of the other; making a plan accordingly - and then fighting just as hard as you know how, never letting anything distract you from the prosecution of that conception.

Gentlemen, that is not much of a definition for strategy, but I will tell you one thing. Every single second of your time that you waste just thinking of these fine shades of differences in terminology is waste. Possibly this applies to everything we do. If, as services we get too critical among ourselves, hunting for exact limiting lines in the shadow land of responsibility as between Navy and Army and Navy and Air or Navy and Marines, hunting for and spending our time arguing about it, we will deserve the very fate we will get in war, which is defeat. We have got to be of one family, and it is more important today than it ever has been.

There are going to be no great theater staffs in the future except as there are Allied Staffs. This is because the great cause of crisis of our time is ideological. Consequently in the struggle, both sides seek friends everywhere. It isn't merely one nation against another, although it is perfectly true that in the struggle one nation on each side is the leading exponent of the ideology. So we are going to have to think in terms of Allied Staffs. Therefore you people who have gained understanding through the years, based upon your own experience and your opportunity to think under good leaders in a place like this - you have to go into those Allied Staffs and by your example, by your own work, make them a success, because here is the first rule of Allied Staffs: There is no charter to apply. There is nothing you can write down that will make them work.

I sometimes shudder to think that the staff records of December 1941 or January 1942 might still be in existence in Washington. I am referring particularly to the records pertaining to the effort of the British and American staffs - and I think a few Dutchmen were with us occasionally - to write a charter for General Wavell who was to take over a command of ABDA in the southwest Pacific. We spent days in the effort; we sweated blood to be fair in defining under what conditions a man could appeal to his own government, and what were the exact limitations on the authority of the Supreme Commander, etc. And the result was just as worthless as the paper it was written on. The only thing of value that possibly came out of it was the realization, by all those who worked on it, of its worthlessness. But it is a lesson that should not be forgotten, because when you sit and struggle and work to try to put all these things down on paper, all you are doing, I assure you, is antagonizing someone or tempting someone to say, "That fellow is so meticulous we had better watch him."

Allied commands depend upon mutual confidence. How is mutual confidence developed? You don't command it. I think the same thing applies in a well-run family. You don't just stand at the door with a buggy whip in your hand when junior comes in at night and try to get proper discipline in the family and the love and affection of the members thereof by asking him the roll of misdeeds for the day and meting out the proper punishment. By development of common understanding of the problems, by approaching these things on the widest possible basis with respect for each other's opinions, and above all, through the development of friendships, this confidence is gained in families and in Allied Staffs.

You know there has been a lot of liquor drunk in war which has had a very good effect, because occasionally there is nothing in the world to do but take a man home with you, sit him down and, even if your thinking gets a bit befuddled, if you win that man around to see there is no nefarious purpose in your heart, to see that you are trying to get along with a job, then you have probably done your best piece of work for the day.

I apologize for coming back to this question of friendship and confidence all the time, but, gentlemen, if you read the papers occasionally, as I do, you will find that lately there is probably more reason for my worrying and thinking about some of these things than there has been for the past year or so. If ever again I am called upon to head an Allied Command, I am quite certain of one thing. This is that the morale, the spirit, the underlying basic purposes and loyalties of that command are going to be far more important to me than all of the records its individuals can show of excellence in everything from engineering to ordnance to tactics to cooking. All these standards are high in our Services. There is no country that has better methods of education and training in all of the tactical, professional technical activities than does America - no other nation could afford what we spend. But we must be careful, as we develop all these things and become confident in our own competence, that we do not lost the foundation of it all. That is what I am trying to say. War is far more of the heart than it is of the head. War is not a science, as you all know, in which you make certain calculations, put the answer on the board and gain victory as all the factors in that equation become satisfied. War is a drama; it is moving every day.

Let me note the difference between a command for which we attempted to set up a charter, as is ABDA,

and one that finally, through long travail and experience, developed the kind of confidence that I believe necessary. At the end of our preparatory period for Overlord one day the Prime Minister and his Chief of Staff for the Army, Sir Alan Brooke heard that I was dissatisfied with a very important member of the British Army. They didn't ask me to come up to London to see them. They knew I was busy and they visited my office. They said, "General, we come for one reason only, so that there may be no mistake concerning one important thing: If any British officer is in your command, he is there because you want him. There is no possibility of any British commander staying with you if you will express to us any dissatisfaction in any terms that you may see fit." Gentlemen, that was a long, long way from the early days of Torch when, sitting in London, the first thing we had to do was put a great group of staff officers in a room like this and provide them with little else but opportunity to know each other. Soon we began to see some friendship developing. Then they began to tackle the problem of preparing the African invasion. But we had a long, long way to go. When I consider the things we argued and quarreled about in those days, I wonder how we got away with Torch. We were immersed in surface values; and you can't afford to do that no matter how important they may seem to be.

I am going on a moment into the organization of an allied staff. There are certain rules or generalizations that I think are applicable, but I think every single man here knows what they are, because they grow out of common sense. Quite naturally if you have a command that involves cooperation between Army, Navy, Air and a great logistic command, you need responsible leaders of those Services right next to you all the time. You must know that the man to whom you are going to give the responsibility for executing a part of the great over-all plan at sea, in the air or on the land, has been fully consulted, has been integrated into the machine making up the plan; else he is never really a true part of it. All such general rules and ideas you men know just as well as I, and it is no use taking up your time to talk about them. But there is one thing I should like to talk about.

I have discovered a distressing number of men in the Service who find in some detail of organization the key to successful operation. Again I come back to my old cry - it is unimportant, it is a detail. Yet, I have seen able officers sit and argue whether a line on an organizational chart should be black or broken, whether it should circle another line or cut across it. Frequently the whole chart was as meaningless as if written in Egyptian hieroglyphics and burned before it reached the light of day. It is easy to diagram confidence and logic and loyalty, because where these are present it doesn't matter in the slightest what the details on the chart look like.

What makes an organization work? It is the men who compose it! The first thing you have to work out is whether or not the people at the top are not only going to be a fine, interlocking mechanism themselves but whether their example is going to go on down through their whole organization, to make for you a successful fighting team. I have been called upon time and again by people who wanted to write books, or people making studies in the Department of the Army, who asked me to please tell them exactly what I thought about this particular way of organizing such and such a thing. And usually I have answered "Bosh!" If you have people who can afford to spend the time on such arguing, you ought to send them out where they can do something useful instead of wasting time sitting at a desk where, in addition, they use up the time of a stenographer and add to unnecessary expense. What you need is to know what people want to make the team work; and out of it soon all of you will agree on a general organization. I would advise you never to try to put its details down on a chart.

I don't mean to say you don't need effective understandings, sometimes orders, as you go down the line, to guide those who may not be in on the inner councils and who may need to know the intentions of the staff if you should have a combined military police in the city of Algiers, you have to give specific orders as to what each service and each nationality is to do. For such purposes, have definite understandings and have your organization diagrammed so far as outsiders may need to know something about it. As a matter of fact, in the E.T.O. we frequently had our governments inquiring from us exactly how we were organized, and we usually would have to sit down and say "How should we show this? How should we tell this in a long cablegram?" And most of the time we were not certain ourselves. The fact is that the organization worked because people developed among themselves the belief that their companions were working for the good of the United States and the only way they could work for the good of the United States was to work for the good of that Allied command.

Your own Commandant was an important and principal member of that command, and I have no doubt he

has told you the same thing time and time again.

I am going to dismiss this subject with very little more except to say there is one particular feature upon which I would insist, even after all this talk. You must always have, as I see it, a Chief of Staff. That statement must strike you as banal and obvious, but there are systems, you know, under which a commander does not have an over-all Chief of Staff. He has a Chief of Staff for Operations and a Chief Administrative Officer. I believe that unless the commander has one man through whom must be sifted all of the various types of information and recommendations and findings and feeling that comes to him through his headquarters staff, he is going to be handicapped, and he himself is going to have to do certain chores in the way of coordination, putting things together, in a sphere in which his Chief of Staff could operate with greater opportunity and efficiency.

As between Army, Navy and Air in the great problem of laying out an operational plan, there is no one else who can take the Commander's place - the Chief of staff or anybody else. The Chief of Staff should sit in on all conferences, the operations officer, the logistics officer, and the intelligence officer should sit in as well; but the commander must make this kind of planning and coordination his own special field of decision. But when it comes down to the myriad of things that are logistic and administrative in character, but which also affect and have their reason for being only in their effect upon the tactical battle, then I think there must be one staff officer, one only, who is responsible to the commander for their coordination, for knowing all about the, for being the alter ego of the commander in dealing with such problems.

In no sense do I condemn - and we never did - the British for their system. If it fits their ideas, I have no objection to it; but I don't believe Americans operate well under it. I don't believe you will be happy if you ever accept it, and I would battle on that one point to the death.

During the war I always had General Smith as my Chief of Staff. He was of the same Service and the same nationality as myself. That came about because we started out together. We knew each other, and it was a matter, almost of a wedding of personalities. I honestly believe that so far as you can shift around in the various Services to fill these important positions in a headquarters, it is good. It creates confidence. And remember one thing: It is not only confidence among yourselves you have to achieve, it is the confidence of the governments that are supporting you. Once you have achieved their confidence, you can do anything, as I indicated in my illustration of Mr. Churchill and Brooks coming to my headquarters. You must gain their confidence, and this will be easier if you distribute these important positions through the various Services and nationalities. But even so, I would not sacrifice the basic things that I believe are necessary - the personality of the human, his ability to develop a true family relationship among that group.

You may have some objections to your selections at first. Some government might say "Where have we got an important post?" I would rather try to solve that problem than to put one of their people into a place where he would create only dissension and trouble.

That brings up another observation. I have heard many lectures, from platforms exactly like this, about the great difference between command and staff. What suggested the thought at this moment that, in the E.T.O. we found we could use men of temperamental character in command positions, but not in staff. I have heard from such platforms as this the comparisons between command and staff, and always to the great detriment of the staff officer.

Except for specialists, I have never met a man I thought was a really fine general staff officer that I didn't believe would make a great commander. But I have seen many, many commanders that I would not have on a staff. When a commander goes to war, who are the first people he picks? The men who are going to be around him, advising him day by day, living with him. He must develop such a confidence in them so that even if he happens to show some unexpected or momentary weakness they will correct the matter at once. You can use your prima donnas and your actors out in command positions. There are senior commanders to supervise and watch them and they develop for themselves a peculiar loyalty from among their men, often based on these personality peculiarities. Go back to the Civil War and read about Jubal Early and Jackson. Sometimes their orders, their treatment of men look absolutely inexcusable, and yet they often develop tremendous loyalty largely out of success, of course. That is the way to develop great morale in an army - be successful and you can do anything.

Such people cannot fit into the staff, and they are not as able as the staff officers you select. So whenever

you listen to one of these lectures and someone who has a lot of stars on his shoulders or braid on his sleeves begins to talk mysteriously about the great qualities that make the commander (but so-and-so is good enough only for a staff officer) you can just say to yourself “Bosh.” I am not trying to over exaggerate my point.

I can conceive of an intelligence officer who has a peculiar quirk which might make him a good intelligence officer but not a good commander; but with special exceptions, it is hard to find a man who, in the highest level can handle logistic problems - not merely because he thinks in terms of boxcars and landing beaches but because he thinks in terms of war, and the daily needs of the battlefront - who is not a potential commander. He thinks as the commander does. So does a good operations officer; so does a good personnel officer.

As to intelligence officers - sometimes they puzzle me, but they so often come up with the right answers that I have learned a great deal of respect for them. I do not believe in generalizations, and I think, like the old Frenchman, that all generalizations are false, including this one. But, having said this I still think the British seem to have a peculiar knack for producing good intelligence officers. I think it may be because of this: During the years of peace - and all of you older officers will remember it - before the war we couldn’t get a fat nickel to establish the groundwork for an intelligence service in the United States. If you tried to go down and talk to a Congressman, he instantly thought of spies and cloaks and daggers and wouldn’t give you anything. We could station a few military attaches at the capitals of the world, and we usually had to pick them because they had an income to support that very exalted position. So, not having the basis, the groundwork, the factual material on which to build a true intelligence service, I think that possibly officers of ability in all our Services shied away from the intelligence branch in the fear that they would be forming dimples in their knees by holding teacups in Buenos Aires or Timbuktu.

But the British have made a great point of training intelligence officers, and I would say this: I am quite certain that in all the first year of operations in the E.T.O. we would have been almost helpless without the British intelligence service, which did act very effectively. I make that one exception because I do admit that there are certain people who have specific and special qualifications in particular groups that would not necessarily make good commanders. But I am talking of the general staff officer of the understanding and the heart that I have been trying to describe to you this morning. He has all the qualifications of a commander or he is not a real staff officer.

Now I never finish a talk without bringing specifically into my text the term “morale.” You have probably read volumes on it. You have read that Napoleon rated it three to one against material. I am going to give you a specific example, as of today, of what I think about morale. I believe that all of our ECA efforts, everything we are trying to do in Western Europe today, have one legitimate, basic purpose, one aim. That is the restoration of the morale of Western Europe. If we can ever make those people believe they can fight, the job is done. Therefore as far as those sophisticated observers who come back and say to you “Admiral” - or General or Colonel or Major – “why pour this money into Europe? The so-and-so’s won’t fight” are concerned, they just don’t understand the reason we are sending support over there. That reason is to get them in the feeling, in the conviction, in the confidence that they will fight.

Put it this way: Most of you are acquainted with your French history of the Revolution. In 1792 the French chopped off the head of their king and all the thrones of Europe saw a great threat arising instantly their own sacred positions. They saw that they had to put down this thing in France or there was going to be a complete revolution in the thinking of men throughout Europe, and they were going to be out of some cushy jobs. So they marshalled their forces and came in.

What did that single nation do, that nation which had killed a king and taken over government for themselves? There were not a lot of brains or genius in the revolutionary government. If you read of Robespierre and Danton you say to yourself: How did they get along? How did they make it go? But the armies of France (raised, by the way, under a national service law that is a model of its kind today because instead of being in the traditional and dry whereases, etc., in true Gallic fashion it says, “The young men will do this; the old men will do that” - it is truly an inspirational document) not only prevented all of these royal armies from entering France; the ill-clad, badly armed revolutionaries drove them back, they kicked them around as though the royal generals didn’t know what war was about. And those generals didn’t know what war was about because they came up to battle with soldiers who didn’t have the fire and the heart that the revolutionary armies

of France in 1794 had. They did not produce morale.

If you could revive in France today one quarter of the morale of 1794, we wouldn't have to be talking about dragging old soldiers out of colleges and sending them over to Europe.

• Texas A&M, College Station, Texas, November 9, 1950

I count it a high honor and privilege to be present today for the inauguration of Dr. Harrington as President of Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College. Under his leadership, I am confident, this great institution of learning, service, and high achievement in so many fields will grow in stature and multiply its contributions to the advancement of learning to citizenship and freedom. For Texas A&M, and for its sister institutions throughout the land, the opportunities and the challenges of the future are as inspiring as the response from the schools is momentous for all Western civilization.

These are years of high and perilous stakes.

The future of democracy is clouded as never before since the July day in Philadelphia when the Founding Fathers pledged - under Providence - their lives, their fortunes, their sacred honor in support of the newly signed declaration of inalienable human rights and human freedom.

No combination of armed enemies has ever menaced the free world so acutely as do the myriad threats that jeopardize it today. By its nature, physical aggression provokes resistance and, in proportion to its intensity, stimulates unity among its intended victims. But the dangers today are cloaked under many guises, are befogged by propaganda and are often written off as the problems of the next generation. We tend to drift apart into our separate recesses of suspicion and prejudice when victory in the struggle depends upon understanding and unity.

In the case of the external threat against America's freedoms, the source is clear and the destructive potential unmistakable. But the totalitarian technique is to prepare the attack by subversion. Cells within our own social body generate falsehood, misunderstanding, fear and defeatist propaganda. Before we can even locate and identify the threats to our freedom and existence as a nation, we must first fight our way through confusion, camouflage and ignorance.

The weight and extremity of the challenge confronting us is great; but America's moral, intellectual and material resources are more than equal to it. Free men, when aware of their straits and possessing the knowledge of how crises may be resolved into triumph, do not falter because of cost to themselves. But an added danger of the present is that the cares of daily life can blind them to a creeping peril. And knowledge of what must be done to defeat it is difficult to obtain by men busy earning their livelihood.

Our educational system, therefore, has a heavier and more immediate responsibility to the country than ever before. It can prod us all into vigilant awareness, and can arm us with the knowledge we desperately need. No other agency of the American people can so effectively do both. That capacity of the schools is a challenge to those concerned with their conduct that should excite any man to supreme effort. More than that it is an ultimatum. Either the schools fit our people for the crises of our times or the freedom and opportunities of the schools will disappear in the ruin of all free institutions and their own reduction to propaganda mills. The ultimatum is sharpest to the colleges and universities of America.

Far more than mere storehouses of scholarly knowledge, they must be in these days; far more, for that matter, than bases of exploration beyond the present frontiers of knowledge in the sciences and disciplines. All that they can offer us in annotated and itemized information, all that they can accomplish for us in the material betterment of our being, whether it is the addition of another week to the average span of life; a new hybrid plant or fowl; a commanding mastery over the elements of nature - all will be bitter fruit, if the colleges and universities fail to keep before us our obligations as Americans and ready us for their discharge.

The central struggle of our times, the contest that encompasses all lesser disputes and conflicts among men, is that of freedom against regimentation. More intense and critical today than ever before, it is no new thing in human experience. This struggle has been at the core of social and political strife since mankind first acknowledged the need for association and organization for the solution of group problems.

Voluntary association among men involves voluntary abdication of some individual freedom, the

acceptance of some subordination to the will of the majority or the decisions of the leader. Each individual may give up only a minute bit of personal liberty but the total adds up to partial mastery over the group for anyone who wants to grab it. Consequently, every group effort, however necessary to the good of its members or praiseworthy in its purposes, has always been open to abuse by those whose lust for power has driven them to seek domination over their fellows. And each successful abuse brings the perpetrator closer to a complete dictatorship.

To guard against that evil our forefathers designed a Republic of limited and dispersed authorities - limited functionally in the various branches of government, dispersed geographically throughout the land. Centralization of power, they feared, because it facilitated usurpation of total power either by violence or the will of a hoodwinked majority.

Even as they established rule by majority decision, they built safeguards against its perversion. Dictatorship, then and now, is still tyranny no matter how large a majority votes it. Servitude is no less degrading to human dignity, even if originally voluntarily assumed.

The control of government for the subjection of the masses has ever been the chief target of power-mad men while their defeat or overthrow has been the continuing purpose of those who stood for freedom. The struggle between tyranny and self-rule for men can be identified and the ups and downs of its progress clearly charted through all the cultures of which we have a political and social record.

In modern times, the American Revolution set in motion political waves that penetrated the far corners of the earth. The industrial revolution fortified their impact on social structures that were founded on and embedded in despotisms. While our Declaration of Independence awakened to political life tribes and races that had for countless decades accepted servitude as the penalty of existence, the machines of Europe and America multiplied the productivity of men's hands everywhere and strengthened their arms against their masters.

Only a few short years ago, it seemed that nothing could stop the triumphant sweep of self-rule among men, the disappearance of despotism. Except in the most barbaric and backward fastnesses of the earth, men eagerly seized the ideas and the tools that would make them free. Mastery of the many by the few seemed impossible in a world made safe for democracy. Then, suddenly and terrifyingly, the trend turned.

The seekers of power no longer depended exclusively upon force as the weapon to control the multitude. Instead they sought the approval and wholehearted support of the people themselves. By bribe and propaganda and glittering promise, they took over whole nations - nations that had won freedom and self-rule through generations of struggle.

Mussolini recalled to Italy the glories of ancient Rome and convinced the Italian people that these could be recaptured - if they surrendered themselves in blind obedience to his will. Hitler corrupted the German nation into idolatrous self-worship of a master race and thereby secured a hold on an entire people that did not relax until the moment of his own destruction. But neither Mussolini nor Hitler dared, at the outset, to avow their final purpose of totalitarian rule. Italy and Germany both were lured into dictatorship.

In this country, we need not fear a Mussolini or a Hitler. No imitator of either would long be tolerated in a nation, so varied in its ancestral roots, so diversified in its economy, so content with its natural boundaries and at peace with its neighbors. Nor need we fear a Lenin. Only among a people shackled in age-old abuse of privilege and position could his like gain unlimited power.

But one thing we must fear - decay of our freedoms through our own neglect. A Mussolini, Hitler or Lenin would not tolerate freedom of the ballot, yet half our people do not choose to exercise it. No dictator would permit free assembly of citizens to discuss public questions; yet how many of us exercise our right - and obligation - to scrutinize and debate proposed legislation? Despotism, whatever its guise, develops when men, losing faith in themselves, surrender bit by bit their own responsibilities to a central authority.

By every flight from our citizenship responsibilities, by that much we endanger the sum of our privileges as citizens. By every act of allegiance to a group whose purpose is its own vicious self-interest and profit, by that much we despoil America of the allegiance which is its life-blood. By every step we take toward making the state the caretaker of our lives, by that much we move toward making the state our master.

In the complexity of our industrial civilization, however, how can the average man know sharply and clearly his responsibilities? How can he draw a clearer dividing line between necessary group cooperation and selfish banding together? By what signs can he distinguish between functions that must be reserved to the

community and those that through compelling circumstances must be assigned to the central government? In a simpler day, the answers could be found in the platforms of our political parties, amplified and developed in our political campaigns. Such answers no longer suffice.

Obviously, we possess in the great American educational system a source of guidance. Every grade school, every high school, every college and university is, in its sphere and area of influence, a community forum, a laboratory, a center of skills and learning where problems can be thrashed out, social ills diagnosed, the walls that separate the citizen from his own self-rule identified and broken down.

The schools can provide an atmosphere free from the acrimony of partisan debate and the bewildered confusion of the average lay group attempting to discuss perplexing problems without competent professional advice. In them, our citizens of every party and pursuit and profession can meet and study and talk out with expert counsel the problems that most immediately concern them. Ways and means to the discharge of each citizen's particular obligation can be made clear.

Of particular interest to this youthful body of students is the question of laws requiring from them military service. What answers will be developed of politicians and statesmen, I do not know. But I do know this. Until every young American comes to look upon prospective military service as a personal obligation to be cheerfully, efficiently and proudly performed; until ever older citizen looks back with pride upon the service he rendered in uniform, regardless of unfortunate contacts with red tape and martinets, until then this nation will not be served well by her citizens who owe everything to her! Until then, she will not be as safe as we can make her. The traditional and justifiable pride of Texas A&M in the devoted, efficient service rendered by its graduates in the military services is a shining example of the pride that is needed everywhere - in every state, city and town of the Union.

In countless ways, the helpful capacity of schools should be exploited. Suppose that in every community schoolhouse this winter, our people were to assemble half a dozen times to discuss jointly with teachers, engineers, police authorities and legislators the question of road safety. I believe that in short space we could end the senseless slaughter of innocents on our highways - that tragic blot on the automotive age. If the American people know clearly and concretely what must be done to end an evil, they will not hesitate at the measures that will wipe it out.

The more abstract and complex problems, those concerned with matters that affect all of us directly yet demanding for their solution specialized knowledge and experience, could be the province of the colleges and universities. These problems are often difficult to state, complicated by hypotheses and predictions, twisted by the acts and attitudes of our enemies, intensified by our own ignorance and negligence. They range from theories and practices in taxation to the determination of the amount of force free enterprise can support in this troubled world to preserve a peaceful security.

No one man, however brilliant his mind or diversified his background, can hope of himself to penetrate the mazes and obscurities of such questions. Yet, if we pool; first, the faculty of a great university, rich in our culture's wisdom and amassed knowledge; second, the leaders of industry, agriculture, labor and the churches; third, members of the professions - law, medicine, military, the social and physical sciences - concerned with the advancement of the nation's well-being; fourth, representatives of government at all its levels, schooled in the political administration of America - we will have an assembly of men who can - given good will and earnestness of purpose - cut through the entanglements of confusion and bring light into the darkest corners.

They need not always arrive at definite pronouncements nor should they attempt to implement decisions - that is the province of government, from the village board of trustees to the Congress and President of the United States. But they could clarify for every citizen the facts that affect the policy of his country and his daily relationships to his fellows and his government. And the product will be legislative action. For, no matter what the peddlers of despair and doubt may say, there is in the world no government more responsive to the informed, expressed opinion of its people than our own!

Those who decry citizenship inertia, neglect of the franchise, indifference to political problems and trends, too often forget that duty cannot be fully and heartily discharged unless it is clearly known and understood.

These are, indeed, years of high and perilous stakes. But with the traditional devotion of American citizens in emergency, we shall emerge, all our freedoms intact, into an age of peace among the nations! The enlightenment, the informed capacity for wise action will be provided, and one of the vital agencies in doing so

will be out schools. Everywhere there is evidence of their aroused awareness to the new responsibilities. And under the guidance of Dr. Harrington, I know Texas A&M will be in their van.

The rest can be left to the will and spirit and patriotism of the American people. They have never failed yet. Under God, they never will fail.

• Lowry Air Force Base ROTC Graduation, August 4, 1950

As all of you know, I have no planned place on your program. Therefore, for every minute that I stand here, you are kept from what you have been planning to do right after these ceremonies are over. But you have no one to blame except me, so don't turn your anger or your irritation toward the staff or your instructors. Yet I think it would have been impossible for me to have passed up such an opportunity as this to meet so many young Americans who by their actions are showing themselves fully aware of one of the greatest problems of today.

By the way, if at any moment I am not heard in the back, I do not object to your yelling "Louder!", but don't say "Funnier!" I am not an entertainer, and I have a lively suspicion as I entered the building that you may have come in under a false impression, because I saw on the front door of this theater that Betty Grable is billed here.

At this moment, any young American who takes it unto himself to secure some preparation for what the world might come to - what our country might come to in terms of military crisis - is doing not only his sheer duty, is not only being fair to himself, but he is doing the one thing that may be the most useful of all things in preserving our way of life, of keeping for himself the same kind of opportunity that his forebears have had. As I told you, I have no real excuse for being here, but you know also that old soldiers are likely to be garrulous, and I don't think I can sit down for a minute or two. I am going to try, with your indulgence, a word or two of advice, coupled with one or two observations.

First, by the fact that you have entered universities and by the fact that you have come here to secure special training, you show that you aspire to positions of leadership - leadership of some specific kind, technical or professional - in civilian life and in the military - possibly actually on the battle field. In all cases, leadership includes and implies this one thing: an understanding of and a respect for humans as such. No matter how highly educated you may become, you can never forget that our whole nation and our whole government is based upon this premise: that all men are equal.

Now, instantly our impulse is to repudiate that thought in our own minds, because we say that we are not equal physically. "My neighbor can run 100 yards in ten seconds, and it takes me two minutes, at my age." Intellectually we are not the same, because one of you wears a key and the other is having trouble in solving trigonometry problems. So where is it that we are equal? It is in that something we recognize in man that separates him from the mule. All men - every man in the world - possesses that something, and the general term we apply is the "soul." Man possesses it, or democracy makes no sense.

Therefore, if you are going to be leaders, you have always to realize that every man with whom you speak - whether he is a man before you accused of the foulest crime (which is cowardice in the face of the enemy), or if he is your superior, or associate, or one of your trusted subordinates - he is the possessor of a soul, and you must never fail to address yourself to that part of that man as you would also address yourself to his physical and mental qualities.

More leadership - morals in our political life, in our everyday life, in our normal domestic life - is more important today than ever before, because through a common appreciation of that fact we achieve a solidarity.

And so I come to an observation - a solid America. A solid America, by which I mean a unified America, is the greatest temporal force there is. Nothing in the world can stand in front of a united America, and don't forget that as the world looks dark and you say, "What the Hell is this fighting about?" Pardon me - I didn't know that we have a lady stenographer, and if you will excuse my barracks room language once in a while, remember I don't mean it that way - it is just an adjective.

The aim of a United America gives you the opportunity to contribute every day your part to keeping it so, and therefore it makes it possible for you to help not only yourself, but as a leader, to keep America standing before the world as a moral force - a moral force for decency, for good, for fairness, and for justice. Just exactly

as we believe in these things at home, we want them abroad, and in that spirit, in that truth, and in that fact, all the world must understand that we cannot be aggressors.

There is, of course, a physical reason why we cannot be aggressors. To be an aggressor militarily, the first thing that is necessary is to prepare toward a special day. If you are preparing for a battle in war, with your air forces and your navy around you, you pick a date and you work toward it, in order to achieve the greatest - the maximum amount of force at the decisive moment at the decisive point. A democracy cannot do that, because if we today decide that we are going to start to prepare this nation for a war to start on January 1, 1952, all the world knows it instantly, so what chance have we to complete our preparation before any prospective enemy is certain to jump us? We cannot prepare deliberately for an aggressive war, and all the world knows it. Further than that, when they say it is American imperialism that is causing trouble in Korea, that is all bologna and they are liars - nothing else.

You can do your part, a very effective part, in keeping the purity of that idea clear before the world, and that is necessary today. We must insist that facts and truth are respected and that they are going to pervade international relationships. If we are to succeed in this, each of us can do our part in making sure that we can afford to have the truth told about us.

Finally I want to speak for one moment in a little more personal terms. For every man who has spent his life as I have, in the uniformed service of his country, there is probably nothing, after the Flag and the Constitution, that is so precious to him - that remains so much a part of him - as the uniform you men are wearing today. It matters not to me that the insignia on your collar separates you from the particular branch in which I was raised - namely the Army. You have dedicated yourself to the service of this nation. Through your own efforts, you will make sure that its history in the next two or three decades is comparable to that of its glorious past.

Therefore, to each of you I would like to get over this idea: that I here want to assure you of my interest in each of you, my affection, and my admiration for what each of you has done. I want to urge that each of you stand not only here - but in doing your job - that you stand before every organization to which you belong as a militant person, not ashamed to say, “America has given me opportunity. America makes it possible for me to speak freely in front of you. America has given me a chance to be a healthy, normal human, working in the paths of my own choosing. Therefore, I do not allow anyone to make me ashamed of my verbal, oral obligation - expressions of loyalty to that country!” Under God, this nation is the greatest accomplishment that has yet been achieved by man.

I did not mean to get started on a 4th of July speech to you, and I apologize for the time I have taken, but it is my sense of great conviction today that you - all of you in your generation - are now the important ones, because it happens that we have come to a crisis in our affairs. My generation draws toward the end of its life. It is not enough to say that you are being trained for leadership twenty years from now. You had better take over as soon as you can, for you are the ones that are going to live with what is now being achieved. And if you push forward with what you have started, the American flag is going to float as proudly on the day, some years from now, that one of you stands up and wishes Godspeed and good luck to a great graduating class, as it does today. You will have as much reason for your heart swelling in pride and thankfulness - that you will feel like getting down on your knees to thank God that He has allowed you to live here - the same then as we do today.

Thank you very much.

• Radio Statement Upon Arrival in Paris, January 7, 1951

Greetings to all our neighbors in the Atlantic community - to Europe and the British Isles.

I return to Europe as a military commander but with no miraculous plans, no display of military force. I return with an unshakable faith in Europe - this land of our ancestors - in the underlying courage of its people, in their willingness to live and sacrifice for a secure peace and the continuance and the progress of civilization.

I approach my present task in full awareness that no amount of outside aid alone could defend Europe. Moreover, although the North Atlantic Treaty nations have now undertaken a great cooperative enterprise for their common security, it is obvious that each must still contribute the hard core of its own defense.

In the great heritage of Europe, in the genius and productivity of its people, must be found the will, the moral strength, and much of the means to build defenses behind which its children may prosper and live in peace. These are the children of Europe not just of Holland, Italy, France, or other nations.

The children of all nations deserve better than we have so far been able to promise them. They bear no hatred, suspicion or distrust. They have earned none against themselves. Let us work for them and put aside all prejudices and past grievances. And let us never shirk from defending their birthright of liberty, even as ours has been cherished and staunchly defended for us.

I cling to the hope that the young lives, the blood and suffering of the last war were not spent as the profligate squanders his inheritance - but that from the common ordeal will now rise up a strong and united Europe, a Europe that can look forward confidently to a future of peace, advancement and mutual security. This is our goal. We must put our hearts and hands to its achievement.

No lesser purpose, no warped nationalism, and above all, no aggressive or predatory design, should be allowed to turn us away from this noble enterprise. In the same degree that we believe danger threatens all, we must meet it together. Our task is to preserve the peace, not to incite war. We approach that task, not in appeasement, but with the clear eyes and stout hearts of men who know that theirs is a righteous cause.

There is power in our union - and resourcefulness on sea, land and air. Aroused and united, there is nothing which the nations of the Atlantic Community cannot achieve. Let those who might be tempted to put this power to the test ponder well the lessons of history. The cause of freedom can never be defeated.

We are committed to a great partnership, and I, in all humility, am proud to serve in one phase of attaining the aspirations of our several peoples. Should mankind, through our solidarity, our prayers for peace, and through the mercy of God, be spared the catastrophe of another war, then this organization will have served a noble purpose. It will have demonstrated that an alliance for peace rather than for war is an entirely practical measure - that the power generated in an alliance of such magnitude can bring confidence - not fear - to the hearts of men.

• Report to the nation from the Pentagon, February 2, 1951

Fellow Americans: As a soldier, I have been given an Allied assignment that directly concerns the security of the free world, with special reference to the countries bordering upon the North Atlantic Ocean. I have approached the task, aiming at the good of the United States of America, conscious that a strong, solvent America is the indispensable foundation for a free world. While I have reached certain conclusions, the subject of the free world's security is so vast and complex that no man could hope to master its elements to the last critical item or, in a quarter hour, to answer all questions in his fellow-citizen's minds. Consequently, though I speak to you out of deep conviction, I do so in all humility, trusting to your sympathetic consideration.

Our hope remains the achievement of peace based on understanding and forbearance, the only sure foundation for peace.

We must never lose faith that such a peace can be ultimately established. We seek such a peace and no one can honestly interpret our current modest preparations otherwise.

But we should examine the current situation fearlessly and clearly, neither shutting our eyes to obvious danger nor permitting fear to warp our judgment. America's record and America's strength certainly should prevent hysterical apprehension of the future.

Today we are faced by an aggressive imperialism that has more than once announced its implacable hostility to free government. Therefore, we strive to erect a wall of security for the free world behind which free institutions can live. That wall must be maintained until Communistic imperialism dies of its own inherent evils.

One of the great questions before us is the ill and capacity of Europe to cooperate effectively in this aim. Unless there exists in Europe a will to defend itself, no amount of outside help can possibly make it secure. A nation's defense must spring from its own soul; and the soul cannot be imported.

For years we have heard that Western Europe is plagued, confused, and divided far more seriously that we

are; we have heard that in their homes, in factories, on the street, millions of honest workmen are daily subjected to Communist bullying; that their days and nights are haunted by the specter of invading hordes whom they cannot hope to equal in numbers of physical strength.

Furthermore, the discouragement, destruction and confusion visited upon the peoples of Europe by two World Wars sapped their productive capacity and, in some instances, reduced them to levels of near-starvation. More than this - their spirit was smothered in war-weariness.

That is a story often told. If it were the whole story, then all I could honestly do would be to recommend that we abandon the NATO Treaty and - by ourselves - attempt, however futilely, to build a separate fortress against threatening aggression. Two striking facts make such a recommendation, for me, impossible.

The first fact is that the utter hopelessness of the alternative requires our participation in European defense. We can all understand that America must be strong in air and sea power. These elements are vitally essential to the defense of the free world and it is through them that we protect the approaches to our homeland and the routes of commerce necessary to our existence.

But this alone is not enough. Our ships will not long sail the seas, nor our planes fly the world airways, if we stand aside in fancied security while an aggressive imperialism sweeps over areas of the earth with which our own future is inseparably linked.

Western Europe is the cradle of our civilization; from her originally we drew our strength, genius, and culture. But our concern in Europe is far more than sentimental. Our own security is directly involved. Europe is a highly developed industrial complex with the largest and most varied pool of skilled labor on earth. This huge potential would be a rich prize for a totalitarian invasion. Its direct importance to us is the stark fact that its possession by Communistic forces would give them opportunity to develop a preponderance of power. Even this disaster would not tell the whole story.

If Western Europe should be overrun by Communism, many economically dependent areas in Africa and the Middle East would be affected by the debacle. Southeastern Asia would probably soon be lost. Thus, we would be cut off from the raw materials of all these regions - materials that we need for existence. World destiny would then be dictated by imperialistic powers whose avowed purpose is the destruction of freedom.

The second fact bearing upon our participation in European defense is that the people of Europe are not spiritually bankrupt, despite the validity of many pessimistic reports. Great sections of its population have for years labored on and fought the creeping paralysis of Communism. Now, the North Atlantic Treaty has brought new fuel to the flames of hope in Europe. It has noticeably lifted morale, the fundamental element in this whole situation - the force which powers all human progress.

In every capital, there is growing a desire to cooperate in this mutual security effort. All the Governments that I have recently visited agreed that their defense programs must be stepped up despite economic and other difficulties - in spite of preoccupations that constitute abnormal drains upon particular nations. For example, France now wages a relentless and costly war against Communism in Indo China. Britain, still existing on an austerity level, shoulders heavy burdens in Malaya. However much those nations may differ from us in their diplomatic thinking with respect to Asiatic States, there is no question concerning their solidarity in opposing Communistic aggression.

They and others on the continent, are taking measures to effect substantial increases in their defense establishments. Within the past few days, Britain has stepped up dramatically its rate of preparation. The new military service program in France bars all exemptions, of every kind whatsoever. The Norwegians impressed me with their unshakable determination that never again will they be victims of occupation. To them, a fighting resistance, even to their own destruction, is preferable. And in Italy, there are unmistakable signs of a stiffening courage and determination. The same is true of Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Portugal, Luxembourg, and Iceland.

In every country, I saw heartening evidence of regeneration in Europe’s spirit. Its morale, its will to fight, will grow with every accretion to physical strength. The arrival in Europe of new American land and air units, though modest in protective influence by themselves will certainly produce added confidence and accelerate the production of military force throughout the member nations.

The European nations must, of course, produce and maintain the great bulk of the land forces necessary to

their defense.

For this purpose the most immediate need of Europe is munitions and equipment. Everyone of the continental nations I visited can rapidly and markedly increase its resistance power if it can be promptly furnished additional supplies of this kind. To fill this need, our loyal neighbor, Canada, with Britain and others, is shouldering part of the load.

In military potential, the free nations have everything they need - natural resources, industrial genius, productive capacity, and great reservoirs of leadership ability. Given the ingredient of morale - the determination to combine for mutual protection - the military strength necessary will be produced at a speedy pace. With every increase in strength, there will be an upward thrust in morale, resulting in an ever-mounting spiral of confidence and security.

With respect to time, no man can know at what hour, if ever, our defensive organization may be put to the ultimate test. Because our purpose is entirely defensive, we must be ready at the earliest possible moment. Only an aggressor could name the day and hour of attack. Our current mobilization, properly adjusted to our peaceful security needs, should be as rapid as any required by the emergency of war.

To you, the people of America, I repeat - as I have to the Congress and to the President - that I believe,

First, the preservation of free America requires our participation in the defense of Western Europe.

Second, success is attainable. Given unity in spirit and action, the job can be done.

Third, while the transfer to Europe of American military units is essential, our major and special contribution should be in the field of munitions and equipment.

By no means do I believe that we Americans can support the world militarily or economically. In our own interest, we must insist upon a working partnership with every nation making the common security its task of first priority. Everyone of the member nations must realize, that the success of this combined effort to preserve the peace rests directly upon America's productive, economic, and political strength as it does on any amount of military force we can develop. Only cooperative effort by all of us can preserve for the free world a position of security, relative peace, and economic stability.

Attainment of this result is largely a matter of morale and the human spirit. The free world must now prove itself worthy of its own past.

If Frenchmen can rise to the heights their fathers achieved at Verdun in 1916; if Italians can recapture the fervor of Vittorio Veneto; if the British can relive the days of 1940 when they stood alone against Hitler; if our other Allies can react to today's threat in the mode of their own revered patriots; if we here in America can match the courage and self-sacrifice of the ragged, freezing members of Washington's Army at Valley Forge; indeed, if each of us now proves himself worthy of his countrymen fighting and dying in Korea, then success is sure - a glorious success that will bring us security, confidence, tranquility.

Each of us must do his part. We cannot delay, nationally or individually, while we suspiciously scrutinize the sacrifices made by our neighbor, and through a weasling logic seek someway to avoid our own duties.

If we Americans seize the lead, we will preserve and be worthy of our own past. Our children will dwell in peace. They will dwell in freedom. They will read the history of this decade with tingling pride and, from their kinship with this generation, they will inherit more than can be expressed in millions, in acres, or in world acclaim.

It is not my place as a soldier to dwell upon the politics, the diplomacy, the particular treaty arrangements that must accompany and go forward with such an effort. But I do conceive it my duty to report from time to time, both to this government and to all others in the coalition, as to progress achieved. Thus our own and all other peoples may constantly review their decisions and plans - and, if necessary, revise them.

This evening, I come back to you only as one with some experience in war and peace, of some acquaintanceship with our friends of Western Europe, to bring you what is in my heart and mind. I shall go about my own task in this undertaking with the unshakable confidence that America will respond fully when the basic issues are understood. We know that 150 million united Americans constitute the greatest temporal force that has ever existed on God's earth. If we join in a common understanding of our country's role today and wholeheartedly devote ourselves to its discharge, the year 1951 may be recorded in our history in letters as bright as is written the year 1776.

• D-Day Commemoration Ceremonies, Bayeux, France, June 6, 1951

Seven years ago, the land and sea and air forces of the Allied Nations launched the final blow against a tyranny entrenched on the European continent. In weapons of war - guns and armor and planes - the Allies were to become within months the most formidable military machine of all time. Yet on the sixth of June, 1944, those who landed on Normandy's beaches were few in number and weak, measured against the defenses that awaited them. But they were strong in the spirit and resolution of the free world.

With them rode the hopes of all who loved freedom. Behind them, in an ever increasing flood of supply and reinforcement, poured forward the might of the West. Ahead of them in every town of France, they were assured a legion of friends whose aid and welcome would fortify their arms and hearts. So armed and supported, they could not fall short of complete victory.

Here in Normandy, it is particularly fitting that we commemorate the glory and the sacrifice of the Liberation. For you were eye-witnesses and your towns bear mute testimony to the tragic cost that must be paid to regain freedom - once freedom has been lost.

The young men of the Allied Force who died in the hedgerows, their wounded fellows, those of your families and your friends who fell in the war, your ravaged homes and fields - all these are the price which we of the West paid.

Today, the West is united to defend freedom - before it is lost. Never again must there be a campaign of liberation fought on these shores. The integrity of all Western Europe must be defended against predatory force. In this endeavor, we seek only peace. But we know - out of tragic experience - that peace can never be the portion of the divided, the fearful, or of those who would stand aside, in the vain hope that the hordes of tyranny might overlook them. We shall be strong only as we are one. And we look to the future knowing that the strength of the free nations can be built into an invincible barrier against aggression.

The free world is strong - spiritually, economically, materially. It has vast resources, technical skill, and productivity. Given the single ingredient of unity - unity in determination, in purpose and in readiness to sacrifice - there is nothing it cannot accomplish.

Those who seek the enslavement of men strive by every means to set one against the other. They attempt, in every free land, to sow discord and dissention, turning neighbor against neighbor, fomenting class warfare that farmer and factory worker and manager alike may more easily be oppressed. Within the community of nations, they use every device of propaganda to separate us so that one by one we may be more easily incorporated into the regimented world. They shall not succeed.

We know that we want only a peace among nations that will permit all men - of East and West alike - to live decent and productive lives. The rulers of the Communistic world say that their purpose is the same.

But how can we believe those who talk of liberty when they permit no liberty at home; who promise benefits to the workers although millions labor in their slave camps; who speak of peasant problems with mock sympathy after wrenching from the peasants at home their land and produce? How can we believe those who talk of peace while they support aggression in the Orient and arm Eastern Germany in the face of no conceivable threat?

The free world's partnership for peace will endure because its high purpose is to assure - for ourselves and for all who in good faith join with us - the freedom demanded by the dignity of man.

Freedom is not won and forever possessed - it must be re-earned every day in every generation. The men who lie in the cemeteries of Normandy died that we, each day of our lives, might prove ourselves worthy of their sacrifice for freedom.

We shall meet the test of our day in the spirit of those whose heroism we here commemorate. We will give our best - even as they, who here gave their all.

• Talk to SHAPE Staff, Hotel Astoria, 1600, June 14, 1951

Ladies and gentlemen I am grateful to you for coming down here so that I might have a chance to say "Help" at least once to every member of the staff. I was chagrined, not to say a bit alarmed, when I found we would have to do it in two batches. You here seem to be a big crowd, but your are only about half the number we have in SHAPE. I have no soul stirring message to bring to you, my purpose is purely and simply to talk for just a minute about some of the little day by day things around our office.

First, I realize that many of you feel very much over-worked and you wonder why we don't make our headquarters larger. I have a very definite reason for keeping the headquarters small. The free world is trying to do a job that is straining its financial resources to the utmost. This headquarters is the only institution formed so far that is headed up into a single personal responsibility and, therefore, it stands as a sort of example before the populations of each of our countries as to the way we should do our business. If we become too large, too luxurious, even if by doing so we might be a bit more effective in turning our paperwork, I think it would be bad. We must remain, so far as we can, on a basis of austerity. This does not mean that I am not ready to approve requests for additional personnel when it is necessary, and particularly if some of you know of another individual who would raise the quality of our work, although I believe that would be very difficult. I have never known staff work to be as well done as it is here, and I am beginning to suspect that all other staffs that I have known have been too big. Possibly because we are small we have to stick to our own business. In any event, I repeat I would not be arbitrary. But we will grow bigger only when you can prove we have to.

Now, there is another point; I meet some of you occasionally as we walk about our home here - temporary home, thank heaven.. We will get out of here pretty soon. And I often notice as I meet you on the steps that you stand aside at rigid attention as I go by. Now, frankly, I don't like that and if it is the custom in your particular country to do it that way, it is one little custom I would ask you to forego. I do like a smile and a good morning and I don't care how you do it. I don't like to be ignored, of course. But to stand there at rigid attention and salute - a man is standing at attention, or woman, and he can be calling you all kinds of names. It doesn't necessarily mean that it is an attitude of respect and affection. It could very easily be – "I am doing the official thing, what are you going to do about it?" If you would cease that habit I would really be much obliged. I assume you are busy. I know that I think I am and we haven't much time to be standing around at attention.

One thing more that I have always said to every staff that I have headed. There is no power of anybody in this staff of stopping any of you down to include the lowest person here - if that's a proper adjective to apply to a man who hasn't yet become a private first class - there is no power that can stop you from getting to me if you have the conviction that there is something you want to see me about. Your next senior must allow you to see his senior if you feel you have a case of injustice or of any other kind of important thing that involves either you as a person or the official business we are trying to perform. That extends all the way up to me and, indeed, if you think that my decision is wrong, and you still have this burning conviction, I will send you right on to the next superior. But if you go that far, of course, it might be that there would be no return ticket. But there is no joking about the fact that everybody in this headquarters can see me if they think they have to. I realize that all the way up the line you are going to find a lot of people wiser than I, but they may not talk more loudly than I and may not be more convincing.

Remember that you are a part of a family. Whatever your grade, whatever your job, you are here because we believe you are necessary. We expect therefore that you will be the most important person in your particular niche that we can get hold of. Therefore, you are not only a member of the family, you are an indispensable member of the family. I hope you will allow me, again, to thank you for coming down. I apologize for taking you away from work you will probably have to stay several minutes later to get done, particularly if you have a boss who is so grouchy about the way his letters are written, as I am. If I have taken your time unjustifiably I am sorry. But at least I am very, very glad indeed to see every last one of you. Thank you.

• Talk to SHAPE Staff, Hotel Astoria, 1630, June 14, 1951

My reason for asking you to come here, ladies and gentlemen, is a very simple one. Since the last time I

tried to see all the members of SHAPE - sometime I think in the middle of February - it seems that we've grown considerably. When I expressed a desire to meet every member of our little Astoria community, I was informed we had no room big enough to hold them all at once. It was a bit alarming and shocking to me because we have been bragging about the small size of our headquarters. Now, I realize that when you are split up among a very great number of sections that you get down to numbers that are not large and that many of you feel over-worked. But let us remember that we are working in the service of nations which are trying to do a job important to civilization. In fact, it's successful performance is vital to the civilization we know and it makes no difference from what country we come. Failure of the project might be felt more quickly in a forward country than it would in America. But it would be felt in America no less firmly and no less conclusively when the full effects finally reached there.

Knowing as we do that the defense effort is straining our economic and financial resources t the utmost, it is up to us to give example of austerity so far as we can. To substitute quality for quantity, to do a little bit more than is expected of us, to be an example everywhere, to be an example in front of the citizenry of this city, in our own countries when we go home, to be showing every minute that we believe wholeheartedly in the conviction that the free world must work together and well or there is going to be no free world. So the effort to keep down our size is not merely one of not being able to stand criticism - it is because I believe we should be an example of economy and efficiency. In that connection, I hope you won't mind my saying that the staff work that has come to me from this headquarters is superior to any that I have had in the past, indicating to me that possibly small staffs are just a bit more efficient. Maybe we don't make quite so much work for each other and don't need so many assistants to answer our comrade across the hall.

Now, on the more personal side, I have a favor to ask of you. When I see you in our hotel accommodations here, or anywhere else, on the sidewalk, or in the building, I am delighted naturally to have your greetings. I would feel very disappointed - I would feel that I was something of a failure if there was anyone here who would rather pass me in silence and not recognize me than to say something on the form of good morning or hello. But I do beg of you on the steps and around the halls of this building, please don't turn aside and stand at attention. It sort of worries me that I ought to stand there also, and if we both started to, I don't know when either of us will get to work. If that's a custom in your country I would be very appreciative if you would let it go in this international place, because there must definitely be a family feeling among us if we are to be successful. We have to be great friends, we have to be convinced, so convinced that each of us is indispensable to this great cause and therefore we are quite busy. We have time to greet a partner but we haven't time to stand around too long in some mistaken idea of formality. I assure you that I don't want to stand in the way of your ability to do your work and get home at the proper time instead of staying here until dark. Now maybe I seem to be violating my own advice by asking you to come here. But at least I can do this - first, I can give myself the opportunity of seeing you collectively and possibly may be able to identify you in the future, or I can make sure of this: that each of you will know which particular bald-headed, round-faced man it is that you are greeting when you happen to run into your commander.

I can't conceive of any more important job that any of you could be doing in your particular sphere, in your particular capacity, in your particular rank than you are doing here today. If I didn't believe this, I certainly wouldn't be here and I am quite sure that none of you would. Now, because I do look upon you as a selected group of highly qualified people, because all of our countries also look on you in the same way, I call again attention to our responsibility for leadership and good example. I am quite certain no other body could meet that test more successfully.

Since the day when I was as young as some of you here and joined the Army as a 2nd Lt., I have had one little practice which I persist in keeping until the end of my days. It is this: there is no one in my organization who doesn't have the right to come to see me if he feels that his problem is not properly dealt with by his own immediate superior and the chain of superiors between him and me. If he has a personal problem that he believes is ignored or not properly handled, if he believes he has an idea with respect to this organization, that is so important that he cannot take no for an answer, he is perfectly justified in coming all the way up. Anybody who gets in your way would be removed. But they won't get in your way, because that is the kind of burning conviction we are looking for. Even if in my great wisdom I decide you are wrong, I can still admire that kind

of determination and that kind of courage. In the meantime, good luck and thank you again for the time you have given me to say “hello.”

• Remarks at Official Opening of SHAPE Headquarters at Marly, July 23, 1951

Mr. President, on behalf of the North Atlantic Treaty Nations, I thank you, your Minister of Defense, Mr. Moch, other governmental officials of France and all your people for providing this Headquarters for the Allied Forces in Europe. Our special thanks to you, Sir, because of your unfailing personal cooperation and assistance, particularly in making available this beautiful spot in the Forest of Marly, for this Headquarters.

In all history this is the first time that an Allied Headquarters has been set up in peace to preserve the peace, and not to wage war. It is our prayer that with high courage, and with the support of our people, and the grace of God, we shall not fail in this purpose. We strive to lift from the hearts of men the fear of the cell block and the slave camp. We strive to establish a “Pax Atlantica” under which all men may push forward to new heights, to new levels of achievement. In a secure peace attained through strength is now the safety and security of the free nations. And now, Mr. President, I declare the Headquarters to be officially opened.

• El Alamein Reunion, Empress Hall, London, England, October 19, 1951

Let me ask you how you would feel if you had to follow on this rostrum, the master of the English language. Two things only would ever have induced me to come up here. First, the overwhelming honor I feel in being asked by the 8th army to meet with it in one of its reunions; and the second is that, after all, my language is not supposed to be exactly that of these Islands. And so, you will have to forgive my errors.

When Monty asked me to come up here this evening, and said I was to talk a bit - and I said about what - and he said about three minutes.

Applause at that moment is just a bit disconcerting, but, after all, both Monty and you know that I am not contesting for any favors next October 25th.

Never have I been more moved then by this symbolic parade this evening of Empire solidarity, strength and devotion to an ideal. No man who even attempts to speak the language of these Islands can ever forget that coming down at least from the year 1215, has been an idea that all of us have followed, and for which we have more than once been called upon to sacrifice, and many of us even seen symbolized and typified here this evening. If I could add one single thought to what has been presented to us, it would be this: Over and above the preservation of the loyalties of the ties you have, let us lift up our hearts so as to encompass a loyalty for all nations that love freedom.

The time has come when a power on earth has decided that a state is more important than a human soul and intends to enforce that idea by the power of arms; by the secret and terrible methods of the Police State; by the dagger and the gun. And if we respond, and if we meet that threat in the same way that the people of this great race and all who have imbibed inspiration from the examples that have been given us down through the centuries, if we meet it in that same way then that kind of tyranny can not prevail.

Ladies and Gentlemen: We have heard the problems of our time defined in many ways. They have been presented to us in terrifying clarity and frequently we have been frightened. The answer for us is simple. Have we today - to meet the plaguing terrible problems of peace - have we the courage of the victors of Alamein? That is all there is too it. Have I the courage to do my problems daily in a way that makes me want to do more than the man alongside me and the country alongside me; rather than to watch them and to see can I do less? The victory of Alamein could not have been won - not with all the brilliancy of the great soldiers that led the Army - not with all the guns, the tanks, the air, everything that was assembled there - could not have won unless there was in the hearts of the soldiery, a determination each to do his part for the sake of his teammates, for the sake of a great cause.

If we today will seek methods to produce more every day - each of us - I don’t care what his position, what

he is doing; if we will, each of us, have the courage just to do that - to do more - then we need have no fear. As for myself, I want to testify, my confidence is complete. You may read in your papers of our troubles in Korea, in Indo-China, in Iran, in Egypt and they are all very real, they are all very terrible, but as a Free World we will rise up and redeem the worthiness of its cause and, in that worthiness, determine, each of us, to do more than his neighbor. The future is prosperous, it is glowing and it is secure, not only in the individual sense, but for all of us, for the great cause for which we have fought in the past and are now living.

Ladies and Gentlemen: Could I repeat again the honor that Mrs. Eisenhower and I feel in our invitation here this evening. A chance to meet again with my old associate of the war, now my trusted associate, Monty - Field Marshal Montgomery; my old Chief, Winston Churchill - then Prime Minister; and with all these old friends, some of whom fought directly in the organization which I had the honor to command. Those were great days Ladies and Gentlemen, but we are living in greater, because we are struggling to preserve the peace for ourselves and our children - we are not striving merely to win a war. Thank you very much.

• Talk to French Statesmen at SHAPE Briefing, Paris, France, November 19, 1951

Gentlemen, it is a very great honor to speak to this distinguished group about the affairs of SHAPE. As a matter of fact, it is more than honor. There is a certain, deep responsibility involved for me, because you gentlemen are inescapably part of the high command that must direct the fortunes of the Free World. The decisions which you must make as members of one of the parliaments of one of the NATO countries are so grave, so significant for the future of all of us that we can afford nothing less than the full truth. We must have the full truth, all the facts, that we can bring to bear upon these complicated questions.

So, it is in an effort to clarify for you, or to present before you, a picture of some of those things in which we here in SHAPE are involved, that I address you this morning. Now, I'm quite certain that General Carpentier has taken you through a series of statistics, factual information, and considerations of the kind applying to our problem, to the point that you probably do not expect of me any further delving into detail of that kind. I shall do my best to stick to principle, to basic truth, as we see it; and then, if there is any question you should like to ask me, I shall attempt to answer it.

The phenomenon of our time that has disarranged the lives and aspirations and purposes of all of us is that a very powerful dictatorship existing in the world has announced, in time of peace, that it cannot live amicably with another form of government in the world. In other words, we not only have the evidence of unsuccessful conferences concerning specific matters to show us that the Iron Curtain countries have no intention of trying to accommodate themselves to any of our purposes or desires - we have their own announced words.

In the face of that, the free countries, or a group of free countries, decided that we must match the unity that dictatorships achieve with a dagger in the back and with secret police, we must match that unity with the kind of unity that free men can develop among equal partners.

Now our first great world war President, Woodrow Wilson, stated that idea; that the highest form of efficiency is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people. That is, of course, a statement of high principle; but it's a truth that has as much application to the affairs of one nation as it does to another nation.

In the gross, or aggregate amount of resources that the Free World has, as compared to the gross or aggregate resources available to the Iron Curtain countries, we are in very good shape indeed. Our productivity; our levels of education; the genius of our scientists; the accessibility we have to the raw materials of the world; the speed with which we can covert them to our own needs. In all these things we are far superior to the Soviets. The one thing they have is this unity. That is the one place where we must achieve equality; in my view, superiority.

Now that unity does not apply merely to the command of some units in the field already produced by the several countries. Indeed, I sometimes thing that the sheer, or mere military functions or phase of this problem is the simplest.

Let us first take a look at the composition of a nation's power - and I mean power in the sense that it can exert influence in the field of force. It is first made up of the spirit of man. All human progress has its source in

man's heart, his spirit. It is made up of his understanding; the products of his brain. It is made up very, very largely of the productivity of his economy; its ability to support whatever purely military force must be placed in the field. Without the capability of an economy to support military force, whatever military force we have is worse than useless; because it's a drain upon the national economy that in the moment of crisis will disappear and be of no use, because there is nothing behind it.

The soldier of today, the soldiers in this headquarters, must study every day, as they try to make up the composition of their recommendations: Where is that balance of power between an economy and an actual force in being or in reserve that makes the greatest sum total of strength we can produce?

Now here is where it comes in again - the spirit of man: That sum total of the economic and military power is not necessarily fixed by the number of men, the amount of money, and the number of factories that we have. Human beings themselves make the variation. If we are dedicated to a purpose, if we fervently support of belief in the dignity and freedom of man, we'll do more than if we say this is just another chore that we must perform because it's to our advantage to do so. How much do we believe it? I would not be bold enough to recall to you some of the glories of your own history. But I could put my question in this way: Are all of us in this thing, in 12 nations, are we ready to attempt to measure up to the spirit that the French showed in Verdun in 1916?

Now, gentlemen, if we can do that there is no question about the answer that we are going to achieve. Now the methods towards which we proceed toward those answers are not simple, because we do have gaps in our economy caused by war's destruction; by discouragement; by the loss of men in your own country - loss of men that reaches back even into World War I, and the absence almost - at least, a great part, of a generation - we have all sorts of factors which make this problem very difficult to solve. The point is, if we are so united in our devotion to freedom, in 12 countries, we are not going to allow any particular difficulty in one to overcome us, because we go back again to our belief in united strength. And if we do our best, we can see our way over any obstacle, any difficulty, that may impede our progress toward this goal of a peaceful security. Remember, that's all the Free World asks. We don't ask for the power; we don't want the power, that would tempt us into military adventure. We want a peaceful security so that, behind this wall the productivity of man's hands and hearts and brain can be devoted to the betterment of humans. In the long run, unless our system provides to the men and women who live under it a better living; betterment in his opportunity to achieve spiritual goals; better in its opportunity to provide material advantages, for themselves and their children, then we will fail.

Now our system is a better one, and this is one of the strongest elements in our whole armament. The Soviets themselves say ours is better, else why do they have to destroy ours in order to live themselves? It is the weakness of their own system that compels them to take an aggressive attitude toward us. Free people are perfectly willing to say: "Why, we don't mind if Russia wants to live that way. Let them go." But they have to say that, "If that free system continues, we'll go down." In the long run, the appeal of the free system to the hearts and minds of men is the crisis of this whole thing.

Now, I wonder whether you would allow me to come just a little bit closer to the affairs of the staffs as we plod along, day by day. We have the job of taking what the Governments give us, organizing it, commanding it, arranging it, so that it can be most effective: first, in giving confidence to our own people; secondly, in order to meet the test of war if it is thrust upon us. The first point I should like to make is a factor concerning this command business that is too often overlooked. As I see it, in an allied command, particularly one of such vast scope as are the NATO commands, the first thing that a nation should think about, if offered the post of command in any place, is not prestige; not any flower in the crown the nation will wear, but rather the terrific national responsibility picked up when it assumes that command. I do not mind telling you that the one question I asked my own Government when they told me to come over here in response to the NATO Council, to command, this last winter. I said, "Have you carefully considered the responsibility that the nation is picking up in the eyes of the world when you ask an American to go to Europe?" Now the mere fact that they did shows that there has been a very great deal of leadership exercised in my country; to get people to accept, at least in promise, the great burdens and responsibilities that go with such a place; the responsibilities to supply munitions; pay the taxes; to help - in short, to be a true partner in such an enterprise, each giving according to his capacities; and only each nation even capable of determining what their capacity is. I can no more tell you what the capacity of France is than you could try to interpret for me the feeling of Abilene, Kansas, a little town

in the center of the United States where I was raised.

So, in this command business, we here at SHAPE constantly emphasize the responsibility that a nation picks up when it is helping, through its own nationals, to direct the affairs of any particular group. I should like to make that point very earnestly and very strongly, because in the long run it cannot be escaped.

Now, I have touched upon a point just now of the leadership that was involved in America to get an acceptance of this kind of responsibility. We talk often of the morale of men; and there is no question about the terrific importance of morale in any struggle of this kind. We too often, I think, talk about the development of morale through sophisticated measures and ideas. We speak of the pocket book as the most sensitive nerve in the body. We talk about a full stomach being necessary to morale, as if hungry men had never fought and fought well. What I'm getting at is this: There is a direct, as well as a material approach to the heart of man. There is needed now, as probably more than anywhere else, leadership in our populations, to explain to them, first, the essentials of this task. That it is freedom against slavery; that is, liberty against regimentation. We must all understand it. We must understand how we are attempting to combine together, to get the strength that is inherent in unity. We must make our people understand that unless each does his best, then there is no safety for anybody. That it is enlightened self-interest that is the keynote to our cling together. The enlightened self-interest of France must be served in NATO, or you will never stay with NATO long. It must be the very same in my country. The enlightened self-interest of each single one of these 12 nations must be served by this clinging together, or it will never cling together. If it does not cling together, we'll fall victim to the kind of thing that one of my country's early statesmen, who made much of his early reputation here in your country, referred to when he said, "We must all hang together, or we will assuredly each hang separately." Now, that's reducing it to a very low order of appeal. But, gentlemen, the solution to NATO's problems lies in the hearts and minds of the millions of people that make up the population of the United States and Britain and all the other North Atlantic Nations to include, of course, at the very foundation of the European complex, this one.

I want to mention, specifically, another subject in which I know each of you take a very great interest. It is the need for the strength of Western Germany in our coalition. Now we can, without Germany, produce, although at some excessive cost. I think - but we can produce a position of military stalemate in the areas where we not exist - where France lives, where Italy lives, where Belgium lives, and so on. But that is not good enough. You aren't going to have the security, the confidence, that comes with some depth in your defense; some greater power in your defense; the serenity and confidence that will allow you to turn more and more of your productivity to the betterment of men instead of the production of useless, sterile and negative formations that we call armies, navies and air forces. You can't do that unless you get this strength of Western Germany into the whole complex.

Now, gentlemen, if there were any one of several courses that would apply to this problem, it might be one for study. But we know that that center of Europe is not going to remain a vacuum. It is not going to remain completely outside of this ideological struggle of freedom on the one hand and regimentation on the other. We must absorb the major part of the European strength, of that German strength or it would assuredly go the other way. There is no one in this headquarters; there is no one in any of the NATO organizations to whom I have spoken who does not clearly realize, and sympathize with, the justifiable apprehension in this corner of the world if we should allow Germany, undeterred, and too independently, to achieve a military force and powers that would begin to let them resort to the military adventures of the kind that they have so often before undertaken. We must not even let them get into a blackmailing position.

Now the job of leadership today, in the NATO, with respect to this one, is how to solve that problem. I've heard many soldiers stand up and give you the sophisticated, obvious, material answers about a force that would be made up of a conglomerate of nations. With respect to that, I don't think that merely because the materialistic view considers a problem to be impossible, we should necessarily shrink from it. It was probably impossible to bring off the great military feat that you people did in the late 18th Century when, alone, because of your resolution you had to stand against the might of Europe. And you not only defended your own, but you drove them back. That is the kind of thing that must be done again.

Now, all the way up and down the line here, I believe that weve got perfectly good, sound answers, if we can have confidence in our partners; if each of us determines this: "I shall do my best." And I mean, when I say

I, I mean a nation; this nation will do its best: whether its mine at home, yours here, Belgium, Denmark, it makes no difference. Each must do its best; and it alone can be the judge of the sights it will set for itself. Frankly, my tendency probably would be to set your sights too low. My belief is that you would do more in the goals I would give to you. Now, on the other hand, in setting those goals, I do not place this same pressure on the time element that some others do. If you're going to buy an insurance policy for your wife, you say "Well, I'd better buy it today, because you might die tomorrow, as well as two years from now." In that sense, this problem is always urgent. If we need security, let's get it now. But there is no man alive who can tell you that you have a point of critical danger in June 1953, June 1954, or any other time. The sole criterion is this: How fast may we go in the attainment of our own goals set in conformity with our own legitimate aspirations? Now that is the only time schedule that I can see applies to this thing. Because, if you are out in the Bay swimming for your life, you don't say, "I must reach the land by evening, or I won't reach it." You'll say, "I bloody well have got to reach the land." That's what you say, and that's what we say now.

Now, I assure you, I've been accused of being an incurable optimist; and I want to make one remark about that – I've even been called naive, I'm so optimistic. When we have determined, gentlemen, that a job must be done; that there's no acceptable alternative - may I ask you, what is the use of pulling a long face about it? Did any of the people that you remember as leaders in history - did they get achieved what they had to do by weeping in front of their followers? By pulling a long face?

Why don't we go at this thing, each of us, each in his own way, as a free citizen of a free country, and say, "Come what may, it will be done?" Now if you do that you're bound to put on your face a look that the world will call optimistic. Because you're not to be defeated by a low order of obstacle; by the material impasses that people bring up to prove that we cannot do it.

I'm going to finish this morning by quoting a little verse I quoted down at the school, so at least one member here has heard it before: There is, in the words of the Prince of Peace, a very, very wise observation. It is recorded in the Bible in the Book of Saint Luke, and reads this way: "When a strong man, armed, keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace."

Gentlemen, that's all we have to do. Thank you very much. You might tell them that during the course of the luncheon, which is going to be very informal, in our room up there, that I could maybe get around and speak to any of them who has a personal question. All right, thank you very much.

• NATO Council, Rome, Italy, November 27, 1951

I shall start by making brief comments on the two presentations you have hears this afternoon, one by my Chief of Staff, the other by Mr. Harriman and Sir Edwin Plowden. With respect to the report rendered to you by the Temporary Council Committee, my observation is that in their work can be found some measure of the progress of NATO. Twelve sovereign nations have met together, through the medium of this committee, and each has there tabled its military programs, its capacity for supporting military programs, its readiness to support a great idea in common security. This has been done freely, willingly, without any thought of being subjected to the processes of the inquisition. Far from it - no one has even thought of this work except in the form of a cooperative, beneficial effort. I submit that if we could get the Soviets to agree, with other nations, to even a partial mutual examination of this kind, there would probably be no necessity for us to be working at the particular jobs in which we are now engaged. This investigation also gives evidence to me of a growing capacity on the part of the NATO machinery to take specific decisions in specific instances, to reach results so that we can get ahead - so that we can get away from mere statements of principle and great hopes and translate these things into the field of concrete action.

The presentation by my Chief of Staff, General Gruenther, gives you some idea of the work that is going on in your SHAPE Headquarters. There, each of our NATO countries has provided accomplished staff officers. They form a unique group: they have no patronage to spread around; they do not make promotions; they cannot increase pay; but they can work - possibly because they are relieved from these routine and customary concerns and preoccupations of normal staff. They can give their entire attention to the real mission that this Council has

set before them, and I assure you that that staff works around the clock, with one idea only, the preservation of the peace through the production of a collective strength. It is zealous; it is efficient.

I appear before you as the leader of the European Command of these twelve nations. You are responsible for issuing instructions to me and other commanders. You are responsible for the major decisions. You can make wise decisions only if you possess the facts, and only if you know the true feelings which animate your subordinates. Our reports to you, therefore, must cover everything in which you might possibly have a responsibility with respect to us, if you are to continue to function in such fashion that the machinery of NATO will be truly effective. It seems scarcely necessary to observe that I have never sought the role of philosopher; most certainly I have never had any reputation as such. But I submit that any man would be completely insensible to the influence of History if he could tread the streets of this city and not feel that he was living in the very midst of the recorded history of our civilization. Reaching far back beyond the beginning of our own era, there is fixed in majestic stone the record of almost every century of man's accomplishments. In this eternal city we are meeting for a brief moment only, but fifty years from now there will probably be some concern as to what we have done in the organization that you gentlemen direct, and in which my staff and I labor.

It seems appropriate to consider, however briefly, how history will look at us; for we cannot escape the consequences of our own words and acts. I believe that if we, now, allow the influence of traditionalism, cautious approach, calculations as to what is politically feasible, and if we are burdened too much by all other deterrent influences that affect men - if we allow these influences to keep us from positive and direct action, there will be nothing in history about us and the organization we represent. We will be nothing more than a feeble ripple, washed away and forgotten. But if the problems that you men have taken upon your shoulders are met with courage and fortitude and confidence; if each in his own niche, can perform the task of leadership that have fallen to his lot to perform, then there will be no monument in history capable really of typifying the grandeur of your accomplishment. For you are not trying to lead any captives in chains down the streets of any NATO city. You are seeking no triumph, except the triumph of giving free men the right and opportunity to live as they desire.

On the shield that each SHAPE man wears appears the motto, "Vigilance is the price of liberty." There is another text that we observe in SHAPE. It is a text spoken by the Prince of Peace. It runs, "When a strong man, armed, keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace." In our case the man is twelve nations. The strength of these nations is a great combination of moral force, integrity of individuals and nations, the scientific and intellectual achievements of our peoples. It includes our capacity for producing arms, for using them effectively and efficiently, if such becomes necessary. The goods of the men of whom we speak comprise many things, but certainly they are not merely property. They are not merely rights or even the lives of nations and individuals. The most precious item among them is a way of life; a way of life that has been won for us through boundless sacrifice and can be preserved in each generation only by further sacrifices from its adherents. Because, therefore, we are defending a way of life, we must be respectful of that way of life as we proceed to the solution of our problem. We must not violate its principles and its precepts, and we must not destroy from within what we are trying to defend from without. The economic fabric of a nation is a part of its way of life; possibly you can make a case for saying the economy is more valuable than the arms it has produced, because, without economic support, any amount of arms is futile in the emergency of war.

We are now engaged in producing the military portion of the strong man's strength, so that he may be sufficiently armed to allow his goods to remain in peace. We are producing, forging, and sharpening the instruments that we require.

There has been much talk of '52 goals, '53 goals, '54 goals, and so on, and I must say to you gentlemen that inflexible dates leave me cold. While such figures and dates are necessary for purposes of planning and putting appropriate sums in the national budgets in order to obtain what we need, our real objective is to gain for our people at the earliest possible moment the tranquility of mind, the peaceful and confident security to which they are entitled. In that sense there is no time to waste.

Why should we sit here and wonder whether or not we are going to be attacked? We are free people. We know our rights. We know our strength, so ably stated a few moments ago by Mr. Harriman and Sir Edwin Plowden. In direct comparison with the dictatorship that has announced its implacable hostility to our way of

life, there is only one thing in which we are inferior. This is the unity, in his case achieved by pistol in the back.

Free men don't have to use such methods. But we must, each of us, see that the enlightened self-interest of each of our countries is served by the progress we make in producing collective security. It is stated in one of the founding documents in my own country that governments are established among men for certain purposes, one of which is to provide for the common security. We have come to realize that in the face of powerful, ruthless threats posed by dictatorship, there is no longer a possibility that any one nation may by itself produce the necessary security for its own people. Thus, whether we like it or not, our ancient idea of sovereignty has been impinged upon and modified by world conditions. But this does not mean that the cure is necessarily in conceding sovereignty to any group or supra-national structure, but certainly it does indicate a pooling of a portion of our sovereignty, and by pooling, regain the strength to perform for each of us one of the functions for which each government was set up. So, I say, as we proceed toward this goal, let us not delude ourselves with repetitions of dates and years, be it '53, '54, or any other. The target is there. It is something of a reasonable nature, but changing daily with new scientific appliances that come up to the battlefield. Every kind of influence that affects warfare will affect our problem and our list of requirements.

So let us by no means delay objectives that should be obtained now. Neither should we, on the other hand, so badly coordinate our military progress with economic capacity that we destroy both. This describes, partially, the problem for which you have set up the TCC. And I submit again that if our hearts, if our determination, if our qualities of leadership are equal to the task, then the economic limitations will not be nearly so rigid as we may first judge them to be. Morale can help here.

In these modern and sophisticated times, we have come to think of morale as something that you purchase materially. We seem to believe that morale and confidence and courage are produced by a full stomach, warm clothing, and a roof over the head - by a standard of living. A reasonable and endurable status in this regard is, of course, necessary to life itself; but true morale is likewise produced by direct appeal to the heart of man. Let us make no mistake about it.

Now, I am going to talk a little bit about a favorite subject of mine. It is also a favorite subject of several of my friends at this table; in fact, of practically everyone to whom I have talked in Europe. It is the idea of European unity! The advantages to be gained by us through unification of Europe are so great that I have never found anyone to quarrel with the abstraction, the statement of the principle. But I should like to have it distinctly understood that when I talk about advantages to be gained by a complete unity that may not be immediately within our grasp. I am not setting up any alibi for anyone failing to do his best today! We must continue, urgently, to march forward with what we have, and make the best of it.

On the battle field, when the bullets are flying, no soldier waits for tractor to bring up a ditch-digging machine to get him a bit of shelter from those bullets. He gets ahold of an entrenching tool, or even his bayonet, and he scratches gravel; he digs into the mud, into the rocks or anything else, so as to get his body protected. Now, we have so long neglected our common defenses and our military developments, that we are, in a way, in the position of that soldier on a battlefield. So let's grab an entrenching tool!

I do not need to recite to such a body as this the great advantages that would come to us through unification of Western Europe, unification in its economy, its military systems, finally its political organisms. Under such conditions we would no longer have the job of trying to determine what each nation would have; we would have Mr. Monnet's true concept of a single balanced force for the whole. No nation would have to keep, for prestige purposes alone, particular units, officers, organizations, or services. All this you can easily comprehend. But even as we long for such a great advance, I assure you that under the programmes now in hand we can, in Western Europe, erect a defense that can at least, although expensively and uneasily, produce a stalemate. But that is not good enough. As my Chief of Staff pointed out to you, we need depth to our defensive position; we need German assistance, both in geography and in military strength, if these can be obtained with justice and respect to them and to ourselves.

It is because of reasons, of which the ones I have given are only a few, that I have come to believe that we should have a European Defense Force. But merely because I believe we must have a European Defense Force does not mean that I am stopping for one instant my efforts to cooperate with every one of the chiefs of Staff in all our countries to produce, now, what they can as effective national forces.

But if we go ahead with the European Defense Force, gaining German strength without creating a menace to any others and in such a way that the Germans could cooperate with self respect, our goals will become much more readily obtainable. Here I must say one word about the German position. We cannot have mere hirelings and expect them to operate efficiently. NATO has no use for soldiers representing a second-rate morale or a second-rate country. German help will be tremendously important as it is freely given; and it can be so given, I believe, through a European Defense Force.

This European Force would serve another great purpose it would stand alongside the Schuman Plan - which must be successful - and the two would constitute great steps toward the goal of complete European unity!

Just as European unity is important to all of us, there is nothing more important to the entire NATO organization than an underlying unity among all of us based on a clear comprehension of the facts at issue. It is not enough that we here around this table agree on essentials. It is not enough that all of our governments agree. The important thing is that the populations standing behind those governments must agree. Our peoples must understand that, for each nation, the concept of collective security by cooperation must be successful or there is no acceptable alternative for any of us. All of us must understand that the task we have set for ourselves can be done because of our great resources and our determination and skill. All of us must understand that this task must take first priority over and above all else except only that of assuring acceptable levels of living in our own countries. Unless this kind of information is gotten out and understood, we are victims first of our own laziness, our own failures as leaders, and secondly we are victims of Soviet propaganda, because they will, in all cases assert the contrary. They will assert that we are trying to get together to launch a great invasion, when they well know that the entire aggregate of the forces we are talking about have no power to launch any attack across Europe. All soldiers know that it is an entirely different thing to establish a military stalemate in Western Europe on the one hand, and, on the other, to conduct an offensive. The Soviet General Staff is completely capable of understanding this. All of their verbal assaults and attacks against our motives are spurious. They know it and we know it; but the point is our populations everywhere must know that we are united for peace.

During this past year, NATO has marshalled and organized under competent commanders and splendid staffs, such troops as we have. I believe they could already give a gallant account of themselves if attacked, even though we are far too weak to provide the assured safety that we require. I might stop to observe that when your self-preservation demands the accomplishment of a job there is nothing that is impossible. The impossible then merely becomes a difficulty, something to be solved and something to be done. You don’t give up when your life is at stake. So, even now, our troops are not helpless. There was a famous old cavalry general in my country who once had part of his force surrounded by overwhelming numbers. A message came through to him describing the terrible situation, and the query was, “What shall we do?” The commander who was a bit illiterate sent back “Fight ‘em” and he spelled the message “fitem.” Now, if the balloon goes up today what we are going to do is fight, make no mistake about it. All of us would be doing the same.

I repeat that aside from their immediately available and disposable military force, the only attribute in which the Soviets have a temporary advantage over us is in their unity. And that unity has this one defect. In time of crisis - when the fear of the machine gun behind the line loses its relative importance because of the danger in front - that kind of unity begins to fall apart. What we must do is to produce throughout our countries, the certainty, the knowledge that we can voluntarily build a unity that will win and secure the peace.

My Chairman and Gentlemen, I assure you that it has been a very great honor to appear here with my staff to give you a few of the ideas and observations we have on this developing scene. And I assure you also that we are keenly sensible of the heavy responsibilities resting upon you Gentlemen. I tell you now, as a body, what I have frequently told you individually, whenever we meet with you it in the spirit of cooperation, in the confidence that we can attain NATO’s goals of security and peace if we all do it together. Thank you very much.

• **Address to British Members of Parliament, SHAPE Headquarters, January 15, 1952**

Gentlemen, I am going to address you in particular capacity. As I see it, you are a part of the high command of the Free World, and it is in that way that I want to talk to you. In your hands are part of the decisions that must rule the fate, current and future, of that part of the world not now under the Iron curtain; and, more specifically, that part represented in NATO.

Consequently, where others have talked to you about statistics of supply, the economies of various countries, the financial situation and production of munitions, I am going to speak more in the abstract in order to show you the motivation of this group here in SHAPE; and what we believe is, or, indeed I am bold enough to say, should be, representative of the attitude of twelve nations.

We start with a very simple basis: It is success in this, or it is "or else" for the Free World. Now that statement is not nearly so radical as it might sound at first. It stems from this: Given the interdependence of the modern world with its machines, its steel civilization, and the complex industrial fabric that is built up over the world, we find that there is no nation in the world which is capable of carrying on and operating successfully its economy by itself. At the same time that we have that situation, we have an announced enemy of any free system of government: The Communist doctrine states that it cannot co-exist with free governments.

So, with that enemy, united by the power of the gun in the kidneys, arrayed against this Free World in which nations must depend upon each other in order to exist, we find that there is no single one of these nations which can exist by itself; that can protect itself. This applies particularly to those that are close to the Iron Curtain. If we merely adopt the policy that we are not our brother's keeper and retire each unto himself and say, "We'll make the most of what we've got and let it stand," we will find that, one by one, due to the many-sided nature of the Communist attack, the weaker countries will fall. The attack is not purely and strictly military. Equally important, and sometimes more effective, I think, is the threat of using the military.

All of the free nations are involved in each other's problems in one way or another. Take the case of Indo-China. What would happen there if we should withdraw support of France completely? And then think of Siam, Malaya, Burma, in succession, and what would happen to India? And soon you see yourself in such a shrinking world that finally even great powers like the United States and Great Britain have to struggle for mere existence.

So, from our point of view it is this "or else." Produce collective security that can encompass us all. So we start from there. If we start from there, our next point is: All related, all ancillary problems are of no great importance to us. We represent that part of the decision of the high command that compels unified action. And so, in this headquarters - and I wish each of you could come back for informal visits, to go into each section, at your own sweet will, to visit them and see these men working together. There is no representation of any strictly nationalistic view in the solution of a problem. It is done professionally.

The nationalistic views are represented on a level higher than we are. I mean, in bodies higher than we are. They are decided there and we get them. But, in this unification and the production of the power that is the objective, the production of, let us say, the peacekeeping power that is the objective of the NATO nations, there is one great truth that none of us must ever forget. It is this: This power for keeping the peace is not merely the sum of the moral, economic, and military strength you can develop. It is the product. And the reason that that is important, is this: Let any one of those three factors fall to zero, and the whole is zero. If you economic power falls to zero, if you're busted, then you have no power to support the Free World. If your military power falls to zero, you are nothing but a fat cat waiting to be knocked off. If your morale, or spiritual power falls to zero, you are useless. You are just of no account. So, in this business we find these three things have to be produced: Moral or spiritual, economic and military power.

Now, the area with which we are most concerned, because of its great scope, is Western Continental Europe. I am not going to repeat what you must have heard about what would occur if we should lose Europe. There is nobody here who isn't completely alert to the extraordinary advantages that would accrue to us - if we should lose Europe. But how are we going to keep Europe, remembering that there must be a military power with an economy, viable economy, and can support that military power, and a spirit to keep it going. And these things are interrelated, and reciprocal, in their effect. The morale works on the military power, and the military power raises the morale. They are all intertwined. But we come to this basic factor in Western Europe: You must have a viable economy or you will have no security in this area. If you have no security in this area, we

know what the whole effect would be on NATO; on our nations, our two maritime Atlantic nations. And so you can almost say there is a viable economy in Western Europe or, it's this "or else." Now how are you going to produce a viable economy in Western Europe? You've got Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, other small nations; nations reduced, weakened by the war, competing with each other - not merely competing with the British economy and the American economy, but competing with each other in trying to make a living. All the Marshall Plan help in the world, in my mind, will never put Europe, Western Europe, that has had its old trade route and trade connections with Eastern Europe - with its bread-basket - cut off – you're never going to have a viable economy until you get rid of these little artificial separations and make Western Europe a federated unity, certainly to the extent of federating its economy and, therefore, many or most of its political decisions.

We therefore come to this fact: If you don't produce a federated Western Europe, you are never going to get a long-term cure for the threat now overwhelming the world unless, of course, there should be an internal collapse within the countries posing that threat, a circumstance for which we may devoutly pray, but which we cannot expect too suddenly; it is probably too big to have it happen suddenly.

Within that framework, then, we say, "Now let us produce the forces." And we run into another factor. Western Europe itself is shallow geographically. There is little depth in which to produce a defense. Instantly, your eyes turn to Germany because of the depth which it provides geographically to your defense. Also, your minds turn toward the Germans because most of us here have certain reasons to respect their fighting prowess, and we would like them on our side. And we know Western Germany is not going to remain a vacuum. And, in the same way, every needle is going to point to one of the poles. And, in the same way, every country in the world has to make up its mind, as long as power has become polarized; are you going to cling to the Free World concept, or are you going to accept without protest the authoritarian rule?

To get that power into Western Europe, that strength of the Germans - and remember we also know that finally we have to produce a political entity here - the European Army has been devised. I know you have been discussing this issue today with a number of people, and I am therefore not going into any details about it. I would simply say this: If you don't like the European Army, propose an answer that will meet this situation. But don't, when you do it, try to duck around and get away from the basic alternatives there are for a proper and satisfactory solution of this problem. I think you will come to the type of conclusion to which a leader in war often has to come; he brings up two or three plans, and since the function of the staff is always to point out the risks and the dangers, soon he has the sum of the negatives that are applied to each one, and every one becomes impossible. But if you don't do one of them, you are going to lose the war. So you have just got to go to work.

We have reasoned ourselves down to these basic truths: First, it is NATO "or else;" next, it is a unified Western Europe "or else;" and fitting into that picture comes the strength of Western Germany, which means for the present a European Army "or else," which fits into the other concept. And we see no way of ducking it.

Now I have just one aphorism, probably an aphorism, and it is not very profound, and it is that: When there comes a problem in human affairs that is a must, that is compulsory, then, gentlemen, there are no impossibilities. From that time on there are only obstacles to be overcome. If you are drowning in the middle of the river you don't say "I can't swim as far as the shore," you just swim. At least, you don't give up. That's where we are.

I can set before you, in my mid, what seemed to be the accomplishments of the past year, the progress we have made on the rocky road towards the ideals, the objectives, the aims we are trying to reach. I can show you where have been the discouragements, the setbacks. But this group remembers what we have to accomplish. We have been given a job by twelve countries and we intend to do it.

Question: When you talk about federation of Western Europe, do you include the U.K.?

Answer: No. And very definitely, I agree thoroughly with the Prime Minister on this point, and I should like to make this clear: I made my position very definite before I knew what this position was. The reason is this: I believe that in two world wars the Free World has never yet realized how valuable the British Crown was to us, and the allegiance of many peoples - forward peoples over the world - to that British Crown, and the promptitude with which Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and South Africa and other parts of the British Commonwealth answered the call of the mother country, I think proved that value. Now I don't see how, at this moment, you can introduce the U.K. into the European federation and meet that other situation. In course of

time you may find some way, where the U.K. may say “Well, now here, there is a trend going on in the world. We want to adjust to this or that or the other.” But as of now, no. I think it would slow up, make it more difficult. And because I believe that the European Army must be a prelude, a step toward the other, I do not want the British in the European Army, either. But I do want this: I want the greatest and most powerful voices of all Britain saying, “We support this morally; we will help with military advice, political leadership, military leadership.” Because the respect in Northern Europe for British maturity and political wisdom is profound. They won’t act, I should venture to say, without your profound support in these fields. But that does not mean active participation.

• Remarks at Academy of Moral and Political Sciences of the Institute of France, January 21, 1952

I deeply appreciate the great honor of being received as a foreign associate of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences of the historic Institute of France. This is the third occasion in my military career when I have been serving in France, and I am particularly happy that circumstances have made it possible for me to be with you today.

Here at this ancient seat of culture and learning, whence the genius of the French people has shone forth for so many centuries, I feel especially conscious of the role of France and her people in the past, in the present and in the future. History and destiny, tradition and geography, have combined through the years to focus the eye of people all over the world on this great land. They look to France as a beacon of freedom and progress along the long and arduous road towards human happiness. They look to France for the leadership and vision which she has so often given mankind.

The freedom loving peoples of the world have now embarked on a great collective effort to preserve those things which make life worth living. We can succeed in this great endeavor only if each and every one of us is willing to give the full measure of courage, sacrifice, work and vision; not in a divided effort, but working together in the pursuit of our common goal. In so doing, we are undertaking a task of a scope never before seen in peacetime, even during the three centuries of the existence of this ancient institution. We do not know what the precise solutions are, but we do know that we cannot succeed unless we are united. We do know that our purpose is a just and moral one, for we seek only peace with freedom. This endeavor must be exerted in every field, for the fabric of security is made up of the will to preserve our heritage, and the readiness to make any sacrifice therefor. There is hardly a political decision in the international field that does not have some security aspects; and similarly, there are few high-level military decisions which do not necessarily have profound moral, political and economic implications.

A world which has suffered so much in recent years wants peace. It is the challenge of our time to win that peace. We can meet this challenge only if we work together, each one of us striving to do a little more than the other to achieve our common goal.

The building of security which will give us peace is the business of all, for freedom itself is at stake. The work of this academy, defining and holding before us these eternal moral values, is the most precious contribution to the cause of free men.

In this task, I know that France, which has contributed so much to the cause of human progress in the past, will prove herself worthy of the glorious heritage which is hers.

• Statement to Press for BBC “Atlantic Alliance” Series, SHAPE, Paris, January 31, 1952

On behalf of all members of SHAPE and all soldiers, sailors and airmen serving with Allied Powers in Europe, I bring greetings to you this evening, wherever you may be. The members of this command are men and women of many nations, working together in unity and harmony for the cause that lies nearest our hearts today - the preservation of peace. The purpose of the twelve sovereign nations of the North Atlantic Treaty is not merely to give a good account of ourselves in the event of a sudden attack upon us; our true objective is to

prevent war.

The year just finished has been one of solid progress; a good beginning has been made. Confidence and morale have risen everywhere in Western Europe. Available forces have been gradually strengthened in numbers, armaments and efficiency. We have established a command; experienced leaders are guiding training, supply and development programs.

Of course, this is not enough - there is much to do; so much, in fact, that the security of all of us clearly depends upon maximum performance by each. We must have a strong, effective converging force of all services backed by well-trained and numerous reserves, which can be rapidly mobilized at any need. These reserves are vital - the very backbone of our security system. The entire military structure must be adequately supplied and sustained, and must be balanced from the standpoint of air, ground and naval forces. This organization is, so far, little more than a skeleton. We now have to supply it with muscles and sinews for efficient readiness to function.

1952 must be a year of even greater total accomplishment than was recorded in 1951. We must not lose impetus in producing the unified and combined spiritual, economic and military strength which will result in our common security. We must not undermine national economies, because to do so would endanger the systems of free government we are striving to preserve and protect. Yet even with the greatest efficiency and care, our resources will be seriously stretched and sacrifices must be made by everyone. No person or nation can depend complacently on the real or imagined strength of another. Collective security will be produced only through energetic cooperation among sturdy, self-confident nations, all bound together into a solid unit by a common devotion to freedom and peace.

The peoples of the West have developed systems of free government through generations of work and suffering and sacrifice. They are now pledged, each to all the others, to preserve these free systems through a common strength capable of confronting any would-be aggressor with a hopeless task. Danger to us diminishes as we grow stronger. Although we are a long way yet from attaining our goal, if our resolution and our patriotism are worthy of the history of free men, we can provide for ourselves, our children, and our grandchildren security and peace. Success requires nothing more, but certainly nothing less, than that each one of us should do his best.

• Extemporaneous remarks to press at SHAPE, January 21, 1952

I am going to invite your attention first to a phenomenon of life that seems to keep recurring. At any given time, a favorite subject of authors is shat should have been done five or ten years previously. In the meantime, of course, many of world-shaking event may have taken place. Obviously, this makes it important for people to put down their views on various problems as they occur. At least it prevents you from looking wise by hindsight.

Despite all this, I am going to use hindsight to relate some of the matters of interest to us this morning. Five or ten years from now, the really important question will be whether our efforts brought success or failure, and in general what should have been done. No one is going to be greatly interested in any detail - even though it appears of very great importance today. A European Army, or a German contribution, and many other things that today are properly important problems, will be studies, but the first matter of interest will be: was the conception right?

Now, today no one is arguing a great deal about the various war lords operating in China five years ago, or the effect they had on the delivery of equipment to the central forces. What really looked like the important problems of the time now appear to be merely details. The fact is that China went Communistic, and that is the thing we talk about. Now, the answer they are going to be seeking ten years from now is: “Was NATO a good concept, reasonably well run, and was it given every chance for success?” Now, of course, there is one thing about this particular question: if the answer is “No, it wasn’t successful,” maybe you people won’t have the opportunity to write. Because one of the things we are struggling for is your privilege of writing what you please, in whatever manner you please.

So, we take up the question: “Why was NATO necessary?” Governments are designed for several reasons, but one of the major objects is to provide for common security. When conditions of any moment make it doubtful whether a country by itself can maintain its national security, sovereignty is obviously endangered, since one of the primary functions of government is unfulfilled. Now, under the ominous threat of communistic dictatorship, the nations of the North Atlantic area have looked at the situation and said: “We may defend ourselves collectively, but individually we are very badly exposed.” The individual danger was more apparent since many of the nations in close proximity geographically to the threat were badly weakened by war and by many cataclysmic results of that war: for example, the severing of the ancient trade links between east Europe and the west. And so I say that we must get together so that the foremost of these nations feels the same confidence that the rearmost does. We must provide a collective security. This is what NATO is designed to do.

Now, in providing for this collective security, we know that it comes about as the product of three types of forces: spiritual force - in other words, the determination to do something; next, economic force - the power of the nation to make a living and carry great projects through from the standpoint of labor, industry, agriculture and finance; and finally, just sheer military force, whether it is latent or actually in being at any given moment. Now, the whole security function is the product of the three forces I am talking about. It is not the sum. You must multiply, which means that if one of them goes down to zero, the whole is zero. You cannot have any security unless there is the will to defend against aggression. That will come out of recognition that priceless values are at issue. It also derives from confidence that you can do something, that you are not helpless pawns. There is a whole series of factors which come into this spiritual force.

Next is the economic factor. The economy has to support whatever you have in the military line, because military forces are sterile and unproductive. As far as economy is concerned, military forces appear to be a luxury although their function is an indispensable one. Nevertheless, since the economy must sustain the whole, military forces must conform to a pattern that the economy can support. This is what NATO is trying to do on a collective basis. It attempts to raise both confidence and military strength of all by joining together in defense of great common values. Furthermore, by joining together, it tries to buttress the economies of war-weakened countries. It seeks a unity of action through voluntary association and dedication to the ideal of freedom to match the unity the Communists get through their police state, through the dagger in the back.

Now let us examine this formula with respect to Western Europe. Some years ago, the United States, believing that its own interests were thereby served, dedicated to undertake, in cooperation with the European governments, the Marshall Plan. The aim was to strengthen the economies of the war-crippled countries of Western Europe. As time passed and developments of the post-war period brought home to us the terrible danger we ran, there was brought forward the idea of collective security. But, remembering again our formula that security is the product of three great forces, the improved condition of the economy of Western Europe attained new and greater importance. The Marshall Plan began as an attempt, partially humanitarian, to prevent economic chaos: now the peace and security of the world demand that the economy of Western Europe be sound and thriving.

The requirement for a healthy and stable economy in Western Europe is not merely of interest for this year or next year. It is a matter of the indefinite future. As time goes on it seems obvious that it cannot gain strength and stability if it is to remain split up in a number of independent economies. There must be progress toward the unification of Western Europe if the objective of permanent security and peace in the Western world is to be realized. This statement does not mean, of course, that we cannot produce temporarily a military equilibrium. But remember we are talking of long-term security. If we were just meeting an issue of this winter or next spring, the program would be entirely different. Everybody would be working at a different tempo and with different emphasis. We are working for a solution that will allow Europe to be prosperous, with its people not only enjoying a decent standard of living but living in the confidence that it will thrive and endure.

Now as a means or method that incorporates some of the long-term objectives as well as the short-term objectives, the European Army concept was born. Through the European Army we can avail ourselves of German strength under conditions that are satisfactory to the people of Germany and that still do not give rise to justifiable fears in the rest of Europe.

We can take the European Army, we can take the political unification of Western Europe, we can take

NATO itself, and we can raise up dozens - literally hundreds - of questions: “How are you going to do this? What are you going to do with that?” To some there will be no answer until we get right up against them. The fact is - and this is what I’m trying to bring out this morning to you gentlemen - that the whole thing must succeed because there is no satisfactory alternative for any of us.

A nation might be tempted to say “We will simply sit back and retaliate against the Communists if they attack.” But where have they attacked since World War II except in limited areas like Korea or Indo-China? And yet, they have Czechoslovakia; they have the Balkans; they have China; they have incorporated the Baltic States and, of course, they control Poland absolutely. They have methods that leave the free world relatively helpless unless we have that great combination of morale, economic and military strength.

Enlightened self-interest is the cement that must bind us together. America, of course, is unique in the coalition because of her size, her industrial potential, her productivity, and the fact that she sits between the middle of the two great oceans, and therefore has the capability of disposing of her strength easily in either direction. But America, in common with the other countries of this coalition, must recognize that her own self-interest is served by making NATO succeed. This identical consideration applies to every other nation. If we are going to keep twelve independent countries together, working and sacrificing for the same objective, each of the twelve must see that its own enlightened self-interest is served in this community project, or it will not meet the sacrifices over the long run. It will not work as well as it should; it will not do the job. America is providing unusually large support in this project because it believes its enlightened self-interest is served thereby. No nation can expect any other, including America to carry the entire burden for a coalition. Indeed, no nation does expect that. The mere calling of the Temporary Council Committee, the bringing together of twelve nations where each laid out in detail its military position, its military plans, the cost of those plans, the relationship of those costs to its income - that by itself was revolutionary. Could such a thing have been managed even a few years ago? Here, in time of peace, we take our most intimate affairs and put them in front of each other and say “now take a look.” It would be miraculous if all of the NATO nations accepted all of the findings and conclusions instantly. But the mere fact that we did this thing is a great advance. It shows something of the strength that is developing in NATO.

After the Rome meeting, we hears much about the need for revising the machinery of NATO. Of course, there is such need; it was to be expected. This organization was thrown together - a great idea quickly implemented. As time went on, it became apparent that the organization set up in early meetings would not fully meet the situation. Naturally, plans developed for some streamlining of NATO. In the case of American interests over here, which are varied and far-flung, there has been a major organizational revision only within the last few months. An office has been set up in the United States under Mr. Harriman that is attempting to coordinate for America all the things that we do over here, all the functions which do not fall primarily and specifically in the hands of our several Ambassadors.

At the same time, we welcome Mr. Draper, over here, a man who possesses the greatest possible experience in this region. You will recall that he served as General Clay’s deputy. He is a great personal friend, a man for whom I not only have the highest admiration, but from whom I am expecting great service. But remember, his job is merely to coordinate the efforts of a great many devoted independent servants, all of whom are animated by the single idea of producing collective security among partners; partners among whom there is no boss and no servant. It is this partnership that we must study every day if it is to continue representing to each of us the maximum in our own enlightened self-interest, and the certainty of peace and security in our time.

Question: Can you tell us, Sir, when you feel is the time limit for an agreement on the current aspect of the European Defense Program, in order to enable Congress to appropriate promptly funds for foreign aid this year?

DDE: Well, of course, you know I’m not going to try to out-guess Congress and what they are going to demand. But I hope you will pardon me if I go back again to the heart and spirit of man. I think all of us forget it too much. We forget that if you bring men together who have a determination, they can do a lot. Now I feel we talk too much about raising the spirit of people through material means. We have the sophisticated, cynical

observation that “the most sensitive nerve in the human body is the pocketbook.” We are always talking about things that cost money. We are always showing that something can’t be done because it costs more money than we have. Now there are a number of things that could be done in Europe today that do not cost money. The Schuman Plan is one of those things. I must say that the progress made in the area is most encouraging. The European Defense Force is another. Of course, it will not come into being for some time even after all arrangements are made. It’s high time, it seems to me, after all these months of study, that the leaders of Europe recognize that there are going to remain to the bitter end some very tough problems. They must find a principle, a basic objective, and then a broad outline on which all can agree. That would cost nothing, and it would mean a great deal in America, which, as you know is greatly something. In the same way, if the countries of Europe would officially call a constitutional convention to examine and actually cope with the problems of a greater political and economic unit, reporting, let’s say, in a year or a year and a half, the mere fact that they called such a convention would mean a lot to the United States. So, while I think that most of us believe that Europe has been doing about as much on the economic and financial side as its economy can stand, it does appear that there is room for action in the great field of moral and intellectual leadership.

Question: General, can you say anything about the impact of such a war as that in Indo-China upon the Atlantic defense?

DDE: Well, first of all, there is no difficulty in seeing what you might call the spiritual connection. Whenever Communism attempts to overrun any part of the world, the struggle there - whatever its fashion, propaganda, subversion, bribery, actual contest of arms - is important to the whole free world. But in Indo-China, of course, you have the direct drain upon France. France is carrying a terrific load, and unfortunately there was an initial viewpoint, which France did little to correct, that is, that the Indo-China war was merely another incident of colonialism and expansion.

Question: General Eisenhower, do you feel that the American people and the American government have gone sufficiently into this question of European integration to be sure that it’s a practical possibility?

DDE: When you finally find something that must be done, impossibilities disappear and become merely major obstacles. In the light of cold, hard fact, I simply can’t see any acceptable alternative to a union, an economic union, between the states of Western Europe. I can’t see how economic union can be successful unless there is political cooperation. Now I would be the last to minimize the numerous difficulties that confront such a program. Consider just pride of sovereignty that has existed for hundreds, and literally in some cases, thousands of years: it’s terrifically important. But we are in a new age. We have come up to a time when the social revolution going on in the world has almost reached a crescendo. With atomic fission and other developments, we are in the midst of a scientific revolution; then we have a revolution brought about by the intense nationalism of backward countries. In any event all of these things are going on, and I believe that old traditions, old practices, even, let’s say, old affections, have to be readjusted, and new answers found. If someone would show me an easier, better answer for the safety and security of the western world, I would certainly be delighted. But I just cannot find it. I will add this: As I go around, I talk to many governmental officials in Europe. I have yet to run into one of them who did not believe that economic and political union was a necessity. Not one has ever quarrelled with the theory.

Question: Sir, do you include the U.K. in your definition of Western Europe?

DDE: No, and as a matter of fact I’m not certain how my own view developed on that. Perhaps my first teachers did not consider Britain part of Europe. As I said, I believe the sine qua non is political and economic union. With Britain’s world-wide responsibilities, with the world-wide nature of the British commonwealth of nations, and with the strength of its ties demonstrated many times, a political and economic union already exists; it is part of our existence today, and I think it is a fine thing. How can you combine that with Western

Europe today? I can't see it personally.

Now, aside from a satisfactory way of gaining German strength for the future I look upon the European Defense Force as a step toward the political and economic union that I believe necessary. Therefore, to my way of thinking, the attempt to include Britain immediately would be a stumbling block rather than a help.

Question: General, how do you think the cold war is going to end?

DDE: I think that's a good subject to leave for you fellows to write about a decade from now, but I'll say this: one reason for the cold war is a great asset on our side that we too often fail to publicize. It is the appeal of free systems of government to the hearts and minds of men. Now, remember, the free nations have never said, "We cannot live with Communism in the world." It has been Communism that has said, "We cannot co-exist with free government." Why? Because of their conviction that if both sides are allowed to exist, the free system in the long run will attract the hearts and minds of men away from Communism. Then they would find their power shattered and their system collapsing.

I think global war would be the greatest tragedy that we could possibly experience, except, of course, loss of freedom. Therefore, to answer more specifically your question, I believe we should strive to establish systems of collective strength that will bring about equilibrium as cheaply, effectively and economically as we can. And then, this situation would merely become a simple struggle between the two ideologies and not a struggle on one side backed up by frightening power that particularly upsets the nations close by. We would be content to trust to the decency and justice of our cause, and its appeal to people in the long run.

Question: Sir, some time ago, or repeatedly, the Russian politicians have threatened action if Germans are permitted to re-arm again. Can you see any reprisal coming if that is done, immediately, I mean?

DDE: My own feeling is this: Russia's policy is going to be determined by her own position - whatever she believes to be to her advantage at the moment. I doubt that incidents of the free world, any particular incidents, even one as important as West Germany partially rearming, would be sufficient to make her change materially the course she has set for herself. Now I can't say, of course, that over the long term Russia may not contemplate seriously the possibility of global war. But I do believe that as of this time it would be a very foolish policy to follow; and I believe that she sees that. She certainly could not hope to win the war at a stroke, which would mean she was embarked on a global war of attrition. Now it seems to me the men sitting in the Kremlin would think a long time before they would put to the test of global war their power and their influence in the world. We know something about their industrial limitations; their problems of transport and communications. We know many of the weaknesses they have as well as we know the terrifying strength they are building up in the form of military power. It would not look to me to be a sensible thing for anybody now to provoke a global war, and I think that also includes the Russians.

• Review of Troops at Fontainebleau, France, February 2, 1952

I am highly honored to be here this morning. I am very complimented that your officers and commanders should have asked me first to witness one of your combined parades. I shall not keep you long but I would like to leave with you this morning a thought that I feel very deeply. In every crisis in the world's history there is brought to a few men a great opportunity for service, an opportunity to put the world on that trend or that direction of effort which lead to greater happiness for mankind, and save it from destruction, or, at least, from disaster, privation, and loss of cultural values.

As of today, in the great struggle going on between those who stand for dictatorship against those who stand for freedom of man, freedom of the human soul - in that struggle, we seem to approach a crisis. To men such as yourselves is brought one of these great opportunities.

No matter how humble the actual work given to each of us, or no matter how heavy may be its

responsibilities, each of us as we work together, men of many nations, we have unusual, we have exceptional opportunity. We can demonstrate one to the other that we intend to live by, and support great and eternal values.

We are not going to be separated merely because one speaks in one language and one in another, one likes one kind of food and drink, and the other prefers some other brand or kind. We are going to stick together because we believe in freedom. We believe that man was not born to be a regimented slave, as merely a trained mule.

He is in himself the master of his own destiny and we are going to support and defend a system which allows him to work out such a destiny for himself.

Above all, we stand for that kind of civilization that makes no appeal to force in order to carry forward the precepts, the great principles of such a civilization. We resort to force only to defend what is our own - we want peace, nothing more.

But we are certainly not going to put peace above freedom.

We are not going to sell out souls for any price, or bow in front of any threat as long as it means our freedom.

And so, to you men here, I say - as you work out the tasks that are given to you, with others of the free nations, has come a great opportunity.

I congratulate each of you on the great progress you have made, and this parade, symbolic as it is of your unity, your determination to stand together in support of these great principles, is an inspiring thing.

Therefore, I can repeat, not only am I very proud of the compliment you collectively and individually have paid me by asking me here, I want to say that I am very proud to join with you in pledging my allegiance to the purposes, the intentions, the great principles of free government.

May we all live because of your efforts in security and peace, and may our children and our grandchildren after us live the same.

• Address at Greek and Turkey Flag Raising Ceremony, SHAPE Headquarters, March 1, 1952

We are met this morning to extend a welcome to the two newest members of NATO into the SHAPE family. NATO is an organization designed in peace, intended only to preserve the peace. It has been built in recognition of the fact that if any nation, wanting to remain free, has to divert too much of its own resources to its own protection, it could have disastrous results and could end in failure. So, we have determined to band together so that we can more economically, effectively and fully maintain the peace. Evan SHAPE itself is a most peaceful of all organizations. We organize to preserve and not to attack.

Mr. Ambassador, both of you, it is a very great pleasure to have you with us this morning on this occasion when your flags join those of other NATO nations here in front of SHAPE.

• CPX, Paris, France, Television Address, April 11, 1952

I am meeting with you today in response to your invitation that I comment on the letters released in Washington yesterday concerning my request for relief from my present assignment. In the main, those letters speak for themselves. They briefly summarize the accomplishments in SHAPE that now allow me to ask to return again to civil pursuits - which, from the date of my appointment, I have planned to do as soon as practicable. There are these additional points of possible interest.

The first point relates to the timing of submission of my request. During the past months, circumstances of my personal life have markedly changed. At the time of my public announcement of last January, I believed that the political movement involving my name, and undertaken in America by certain of my fellow citizens, would not necessarily impinge on the duties and responsibilities of my present post. Subsequently, events in the United States and their incessant repercussions here have made it evident that I was wrong. These pressures practically compelled me to wait no longer in asking for relief - I hope that now I shall have full opportunity to

finish up the work here that I have set for myself.

It was my desire to withhold announcement of this action until completion yesterday of the Command Post Exercise participated in by all NATO countries. I wanted to announce my departure personally to the more than 200 service associates who attended. They have worked loyally with my headquarters during the past year. Incidentally, that Exercise was an important milestone on SHAPE progress.

You SHAPE correspondents are at least partially aware of the mounting volume of inquiry that has been directed toward me during these many months; in fact, you have, under the spur of your home offices, been partially responsible for it. I am grateful to you for your understanding and forbearance during that period. I ask you to bear with me a bit longer, for, as you know, I must prevent politics from affecting this vital job during the weeks I yet expect to serve here.

My second point is this: I have not submitted my resignation from the American Army. I have forwarded a request that I be relieved from my current assignment and placed on inactive status. If, however, I should, through the current effort, be nominated this July to political office, I shall promptly submit to the President my resignation as an officer of the Army. From that point on, I would be free to act and speak as any other citizen, without any of the limitations imposed by the traditions of the military establishment.

The time remaining to me here is already heavily scheduled with military tasks. One of the most pleasant personal duties I expect to perform is a farewell visit to a number of the NATO countries. I plan to begin these by a visit to Brussels on April 16th following up quickly with The Hague, Oslo and Copenhagen. Other visits will follow.

As to personal plans in the early weeks after Mrs. Eisenhower and I return to the States, we have none! I do hope, most sincerely to attend a ceremony scheduled at my old home in Abilene, Kansas, on June 4th. Aside from this, we are eagerly looking forward to a short vacation - if we may be allowed one!

A final point that I must emphasize is this: Personalities and partisan viewpoints come and go in all our countries. But the values we of SHAPE have been called upon to defend are those that man has struggled toward since history began. The quest for peace and tranquility for all men, everywhere, is always with us. We must keep it sharply in focus. We must not let this great cooperative work, to which our fourteen NATO countries have so lately set their hearts and hands, falter or perish.

Security, peace, liberty - these are the watchwords by which we live at SHAPE - they represent the aspirations of all men who revere the free institutions of our civilization.

• Statement to Press, April 12, 1952

I am meeting with you today in response to your invitation that I comment on the letters released in Washington yesterday concerning my request for relief from my present assignment. In the main, those letters speak for themselves. They briefly summarize the accomplishments in SHAPE that now allow me to ask to return again to civil pursuits - which, from the date of my appointment, I have planned to do as soon as practicable. There are these additional points of possible interest.

The first point relates to the timing of submission of my request. During the past months, circumstances of my personal life have markedly changed. At the time of my public announcement of last January, I believed that the political movement involving my name, and undertaken in America by certain of my fellow citizens, would not necessarily impinge on the duties and responsibilities of my present post. Subsequently, events in the United States and their incessant repercussions here have made it evident that I was wrong. Though not mentioned in my official letters, these pressures practically compelled me to wait no longer in asking for relief - I hope that now I shall have full opportunity to finish up the work here that I have set for myself.

You SHAPE correspondents are at least partially aware of the mounting volume of inquiry that has been directed toward me during these many months; in fact, you have, under the spur of your home offices, been partially responsible for it. I am grateful to you for your understanding and forbearance during that period. I ask you to bear with me a bit longer, for, as you know, I must prevent politics from affecting this vital job during the weeks I yet expect to serve here.

My second point is this: I have not submitted my resignation from the American Army. I have forwarded a request that I be relieved from my current assignment and placed on inactive status. If, however, I should, through the current effort, be nominated this July to political office, I shall promptly submit to the President my resignation as an officer of the Army. From that point on, I would be free to act and speak as any other citizen, without any of the limitations imposed by the traditions of the military establishment.

The time remaining to me here is already heavily scheduled with military tasks. One of the most pleasant personal duties I expect to perform is a farewell visit to a number of the NATO countries. I plan to begin these by a visit to Brussels on April 16th following up quickly with The Hague, Oslo and Copenhagen. Other visits will follow.

A final point that I must emphasize is this: Personalities and partisan viewpoints come and go in all our countries. But the values we of SHAPE have been called upon to defend are those that man has struggled toward since history began. The quest for peace and tranquility for all men, everywhere, is always with us. We must keep it sharply in focus. We must not let this great cooperative work, to which our fourteen NATO countries have so lately set their hearts and hands, falter or perish.

Security, peace, liberty - these are the watchwords by which we live at SHAPE - they represent the aspirations of all men who revere the free institutions of our civilization.

Unidentified statement, 1952?

The past year at SHAPE has been vary valuable: we have plowed difficult ground and established successfully the political, psychological and organizational foundations upon which to build.

But this exercise must have made it very clear to you gentlemen that we must now get about the business of building the structure - the forces, the facilities, the command techniques, and the imaginative tactics that will make this organization an insuperable obstacle to any aggressor from the East.

Air strength, Reserves, Logistics, Training

We should quickly consummate arrangements for German participation in the framework of the European Army. You gentlemen from the participating nations can do much toward expediting the realization of this important goal. On this, a far-sighted view is essential, focusing on the major problems rather than on particular and minor difficulties.

As you go back to your assignments, I think you will have gained an understanding and view of our security problem in its full dimensions, and as a joint endeavor in which all our forces are joined together for a common end. It has been a notable meeting - unique in composition and truly beneficial in result. NATO will profit much from it. I trust it will be repeated at least yearly.

For me, it will probably be the last meeting of this sort. But whenever I depart, I shall feel a heavy burden of sadness on leaving this post. Almost certainly, it will be my last military command - and I need not tell you what that means to a man who has spent his complete adult life in uniform. Moreover, my feelings will be the more acute on departure from this continent with which much of my military career has been so closely associated.

Were a man to choose his final post of military service, he could not have found a better one. The past year and a half has been a tremendously inspiring and rewarding experience for me. I have enjoyed and profited by the fullest cooperation from all of your governments and from every official in those governments. I have had the most sympathetic and understanding support at all times from the National Military chiefs. And I have had the support and loyalty of one of the finest staffs it has ever been the honor of a soldier to lead.

Behind us, all in the NATO countries have worked devotedly to make SHAPE a reality that could stand as a guardian for peace and justice. But I am sure there are plenty of critics and military experts who regard it as a military monstrosity - as something that could not live long among the strains and pressures that influence nations individually and collectively. These skeptics are perhaps fewer in numbers than they were a year ago, but they are still with us, voicing their dire predictions of eventual collapse. It is to us and specifically to you gentlemen, who must carry on, to prove that they are wrong. We shall not fail because we must not fail.

It is true that a union among sovereign bodies is a very difficult thing to accomplish. If you take fourteen grains of sand on the seashore and put them in your hand and attempt to make a ball of them, you would not be trying anything more difficult than to get fourteen independent nations working together for a common purpose. But we do know that we can go to another part of the countryside, get a bit of rock, make some cement from it and then - out of those fourteen grains of sand - create something that is practically indestructible.

By treaties alone, you cannot produce a unity among sovereign nations which will hold up in the emergency of war. You can write all the provisos, clauses, and conditions into a treaty, but when a nation's existence is at stake - when it believes that it may be in total danger by clinging to the provisions of this treaty - words will not be enough to hold it together.

The force that will hold is mutual confidence. And as it grows and develops from the highest level of government to the soldier in ranks and the man in the street, there is finally produced something the strength of which is almost incalculable.

We are building such a bond between us, and its growing strength is the hope of the free world. From Norway, through Western Europe and across the Mediterranean to the Black Sea, I have seen this unity growing - this feeling of common goals and common destiny. In the space of a year, I have seen hope return to faces that before were shadowed with worry and despair. With high courage, we have met thus far the challenge of history: in brotherhood we have joined to defend freedom. Now we must persevere - with pride in our task - and will through all obstacles to gain or peaceful and honorable ends.

• CPX Conference, Paris, France, April 11, 1952

Though we belong to an organization that has been established to keep the peace, it is our particular function to study war. We must be able to advise our civilian superiors on a myriad of subjects pertaining to the general purpose of protecting Western Europe. We must perfect our own understanding of this particular problem so as to be ready to make the best use of the means at hand. These purposes have been at the bottom of this study conference.

On the first day, the Director of the Exercise made the most significant statement that I heard at any of the sessions I was fortunate enough to attend. He said, "At the outset of any war, the Russians will outnumber us badly on the ground and in the air, and they will enjoy the further advantage of surprise. But one factor in which we can enjoy a great advantage, both at the outset and throughout, is in brains. We must exploit this advantage to the full. This exercise is designed to discover new ways in which we can develop this advantage."

At SHAPE we hope that this Exercise has had this effect - that each of you will go back to your assigned duties with a better understanding of the relative situation, of the several problems arising out of that situation, and with your minds alert to seek ways and means for turning seemingly adverse comparisons into something more favorable to the NATO nations.

With your indulgence, I shall refer to certain specific directions which I should like very much to see examined by your individual and collective brains. I do not mean, in these instances, to present my own conclusions. My purpose is to pose questions some of which have been fairly well discussed during the course of the Exercise. Moreover, by no means do I mean to place a limit upon your intellectual discoveries - the points I raise are for purposes of illustration only.

In an exhausting war, when the life of the nation is at stake, the maximum useful output of all citizens is the first requisite to survival. Consequently, the job of planning for and of waging war requires wisdom in the disposition of available man-hours and material resources. Fundamentally, the government has the task of determining how much manpower and resources will be allocated to productive enterprise, on the one hand, and military functions on the other.

It is first necessary to supply the minimum basic needs of the country's population. A certain proportion of the national product must be set aside to provide for food, shelter, health, and well-being of the producers, so that their strength may be undiminished and the productivity of the nation may be sustained at a high level. This is the first charge on our store of man-hours and resources.

Next must be the number of men that the services believe they need for military formations. These formations must be armed with staggering amounts of complicated equipment. To produce and maintain this equipment, additional facilities and man-hours are required; so, it is quite clear that the higher we set our estimates in military force, the greater the number of our people that must be retained in productive work on farms and in factories. The job of balancing off these conflicting requirements is one where we could easily go wrong today, tomorrow, and during all the days while we are trying to prepare against war and develop applicable and logical plans for use in the event it occurs.

Decisions on military requirements become all the more difficult as the equipment with which war is waged becomes more and more complex. Two atomic bombs were employed in World War II. I have been told that more than two and one-half billion dollars were expended in atomic development before those two bombs were ready for use. Two and one-half billion dollars was and is a staggering sum; but the real point is that that sum of money represents a vast treasure in man-hours, scientific knowledge, skilled and unskilled labor, and other types of military power. I do not challenge the wisdom of the decision by which the atomic project was initiated - but you can see that it was a delicate problem.

In less dramatic fashion, this problem is before us all the time. Take the question of tank development. In World War I, the tank appeared on the battlefield as a clumsy, awkward, and unreliable mechanical answer to the machine gun. Most soldiers dismissed it, in early postwar days, as a failure. Nevertheless, there were some of sufficient imagination to see what the tank could mean to warfare if its obvious mechanical faults were corrected. Unfortunately, in that case, our later enemies were far more imaginative and energetic than the Western world. So, when the so-called Blitzkrieg came to warfare, it was the enemy who was overrunning Poland and dancing a jig in Compiegne Forest and terrifying the entire Western world with his new-found might. The enemy used his brains, even though for evil purpose.

Succeeding years have brought about a tremendous scientific development, and part of that scientific development has been directed toward the production of cheap, powerful weapons designed to counteract the influence of the tank on the battlefield. Even after making allowances for the tendency of the inventor and the scientific specialist to overrate new appliances, it is clear that the tank no longer enjoys the relative immunity from ordinary divisional fire power that it did some ten years ago. Light recoilless weapons, bazookas, mines, and improved types of guns give promise that the whole battle area can be so thickly studded with weapons capable of penetrating the thickest of armor, that the life of the future tanks is likely to be a miserable one indeed. If we are to produce thicker armor, we must have greater power plants, heavier transmissions, and bigger guns in order to pierce the enemy’s thick armor. Conceivably, the race, if conducted solely along these lines, could finally bring about self-defeat through sheer immobility. After all, we can scarcely put the Rock of Gibraltar on caterpillar tracks and march it across the Rhine.

The danger in merely going ahead, seeking another half-inch of armor, another hundred feet of velocity on the shell, and another few tons’ capacity on our bridges, is that we may be making an out-dated use of our man-hours.

Consider the airplane. As each plane grows more and more difficult to produce and requires a mounting portion of our precious man-hours, is it not possible that we have to conduct a complete reexamination of the kind of work we shall expect these weapons to perform? I do not mean to say that we can afford to neglect the production of weapons, in all categories, of the highest capability and quality. But as each machine demands more and more out of our pool of available man-hours, we inevitably must weigh its cost in this commodity against the cost of other forms of tactical power that might be applied.

Moreover, does it follow that all combat planes be of the most expensive types? A document that came recently to my desk estimated the cost of jet planes at six times that of propeller types in similar categories. The other day, one officer ventured the opinion that, for purposes of night penetration to disrupt supply lines, the Mosquito of World War II vintage might prove useful. Another officer rejected the idea, asserting that we are not going to find victory in the use of second-rate equipment. But this officer, in making his point, overlooked the importance of availability and cost, measured always in our primary commodity of productive capacity. What about six Mosquitos against one jet - not in direct combat, but both used on night missions against road bound targets? Even here I do not suggest the answer - I merely say we’ll get the correct one for our present

situation and our anticipated problem only if we use our brains.

Indeed, with respect to this one question, I do not ask you merely to decide whether or not six Mosquitos would be equal to one jet airplane - I venture the opinion that we might find one Mosquito superior to one jet airplane for the specific kind of action visualized.

Sheer performance characteristics in any weapon are important but, certainly, they are not the only factors to be considered.

Stated in another way, it would seem clear that, although the high cost of a piece of military equipment need not entirely price it out of the market, yet it tends to become a truism that, as the machine becomes more and more costly in man-hours, it becomes more and more necessary to reserve it for emergency rather than so-called normal operation.

In this day and time, when man's capacity to achieve the miraculous in the scientific field seems to be almost unlimited, I believe that we should more and more seek this relative superiority in brains. This superiority could far more easily develop into the decisive factor in a future war then would any disparity in material strength at the war's beginning. Moreover, I am speaking in a wider sense than mere improvement in the development of new weapons - skill in gadgeteering is one thing; but brains in knowing what to build, how much to build, when to build, and how to use the product can possibly be even more important.

This applies to the submarine and to all the devices for combatting the submarine. It applies to the surface of the sea and to the mining of harbors, to means of detection and reconnaissance in land, sea, and air. It has particular importance for us in all the positive and negative means for stalling a ground-air attack across the center of Europe. Mines of the most improved and deadly sort, demolitions cleverly planned and executed - all these things are important, because we are interested in one thing. This is the greatest effort for the least cost! Our staff colleges need to institute new and searching courses which I would call "The Economics of National Security."

The application of our intellectual resources is not to be limited, of course, to mere production of equipment. Every part or portion of our accepted doctrines should be constantly examined. Nothing is to be taken for granted; that is what we hope that our enemy will do if ever we should be attacked.

On Tuesday, there was argued back and forth the wisdom of using tactical air forces to attack defended airfields. I was struck by the fact that a number of individuals, in presenting their ideas on this point, did so out of the depth and honesty of their technical and professional convictions. Now, I most emphatically agree with those who believe that the European experiences of World War II show that there is no more certain way for a tactical air force to commit quick suicide than to hurl itself persistently against adequately defended airfields. Attached to this particular question was also the possibility of using long-range bombers against close-up airfields, and again we had a technical view that if we do so we are likely to overlook the true mission of strategic air forces. We were warned of the danger of getting some cities blown up if we diverted long-range bombers from their proper missions.

Here it seems to me that we must use or brains in a very much broader field than the purely technical and professional. All of us are in NATO because we, after complete examination of the security problem, believe that no nation could long survive a situation in which the Western European complex would fall prey to Soviet invasion. Moreover, we have followed this line of reasoning to the point where we understand that, if we should allow Europe to be overrun with the idea of achieving its later liberation, the consequences for the free world would be scarcely less disastrous. We, therefore, arrive at the conclusion that the complete overrunning of Western Europe would be almost fatal to western civilization. We must stop the attack short of its complete victory - there is no acceptable alternative.

The next step is this line of reasoning is the certainty that, no matter what the value of air and of sea in carrying out long-term so-called strategic missions, nothing can stand aside when the issue of retention or loss of Western Europe comes to the front! Everything we have must get into that battle. Every gun of our naval forces that can reach useful targets must be blazing away. Every plane that can fly from land or from the decks of ships must be in the fight. This goes for every airplane that can stay in the air and can perform a useful mission. This likewise applies to the atomic bomb and everything else that our governments may provide to us to make certain of the security of Western Europe.

Consequently, the two issues that in my opinion should have been examined by the conference on employment of tactical air forces against airfields were: (1) Were we at the critical point in the campaign to retain Western Europe? (2) Out of all the weapons available to us, including every airplane that can fly in this whole theater, what were the best targets against which we should assign each? Until the crisis has been safely passed, no other considerations apply!

The point I am trying to make is that, in war, we can come to places where there is no tomorrow unless there is success today. Except in such far-reaching crises, the normal truths of professional and technical competence apply and may be disregarded only at our peril. But when that moment does arise, then we must have the brains to see it, to understand it, and to take positive action.

Though speaking to a limited group, I am trying to get a point across that will enlist the mental power of the thousands upon thousands of officers and enlisted men under the command of you gentlemen. With your influence and day-to-day contacts, it also can bring to our problems the sympathetic help of our statesmen, the inventiveness of our scientists and the advice of experts from all walks of life. Our side is rich in this respect. Ideas flow in abundance from a free people: they have to be squeezed from the populace of a police state.

The Iron Curtain is a creation of fear - not fear of military attack, for the Kremlin knows that our intentions are peaceful just as well as we ourselves know it. They have a great fear of ideas: they know the potency of freedom as a challenge to their bleak system of autocracy. How can a people living in such a climate of repression and subjection ever match the creative powers of our free peoples in any endeavor.?

Now, the things I have said to you may seem to have wandered afield from the actual play of the Exercise but, in the vast panorama which we call preparation for war, all sorts of calculations and factors - everything that lives and breathes - has an effect upon progress. To achieve security, it is clear beyond all question that we must excel at forward thinking. This Exercise has been but one single example of how brains can be brought together to grow stronger through contact with others and to be helpful to others. If we are worthy of our commissions, the process will be a continuing one, never-ending - for “the mind, like steel, keeps bright through use.”

• 2nd anniversary of SHAPE, SHAPE Headquarters, April 2, 1952

Three years ago this week, representatives of our several nations signed the treaty that set up NATO. Sometime later, recognizing the special situation of Western Europe and their purpose of maintaining security of the Western World, they decided to place the forces already raised under a single command, and so SHAPE was born.

One year ago today, this Headquarters assumed operational command of the troops actually stationed in Europe for the defense of this great area. The purpose of our governments was a very simple one - to retain the peace through establishment of a sound collective security. This purpose was in complete conformity with the spirit and intent of the United Nations Organization - a regional pact to maintain the peace. The Organization of all of these independent countries to establish a military organization was, of course, a rather complicated sort of thing to do. They had many tasks to achieve before their objectives could be attained. As we proceed along the path toward the attainment of objectives that reach into our spiritual, our economic and our military activity, progress sometimes seems distressingly slow.

Only this week, my staff and I have prepared a report on the progress we have achieved. One of its purposes will be to fight any discouragement that might come about from the realization that objectives are still a long way off on the horizon - by glancing briefly over our shoulders to see how far we have come.

As in all things human, this report will be neither wholly white nor wholly black. We have had our discouragements, just as we have had our important advances.

On the discouraging side, for example, we have had the strained economies in Europe developing, threatening and slowing previously predicted schedules. We know that, in spite of the expenditure of vast sums of money in the United States and elsewhere, the flow of equipment has not been so rapid as previously predicted. In Korea, Indo-China and Malaya, NATO nations of Europe and in America are carrying very heavy

burdens; burdens that are costly, both in blood and in treasure. They have a direct effect upon our efforts here to establish a secure defensive arrangement in Western Europe.

On the encouraging side, there has been almost a revolutionary rise in the morale of the armed forces. Their training is efficient, directed by some of the most experienced soldiers, sailors and airmen alive today. In each case, in each unit, there is a growing confidence that they can do their job - do the job that they have been given by our United Nations.

Another encouraging factor has been the accretion of turkey and Greece to our organization. These two sturdy, self-reliant nations have joined us in the same spirit that others have displayed - to maintain peace through development of a collective security organization.

At last, ladies and gentlemen, the great productive machinery of the Western World is beginning to roll. Equipment is being produced at a much faster rate than has been the case over the past many months. It is to be anticipated that this will encourage and allow speed-up in the organization of military units.

A very important, possibly the most important single encouraging factor of the past year, has been the progress toward centralization and unification in Western Europe. We have had the Schuman Plan, soon to go into operation. We have had evidence of the nations trying to get together through agriculture and electric power and similar types of economic activities. Finally, we have the European Defense Force, an arrangement whereby German strength can be brought into the Western Security Organization with full status of respectability for Germany and without endangering the peace of Western Europe. It will bind together a single economic, political whole, to make the peace of this region secure and safe. Along with this, there is strong hope that a permanent peace treaty will soon be signed between Germany and the three Western Powers.

We here at SHAPE, representatives of many nations, work day by day constantly with these intricate and difficult problems. We have absolute faith that you can do the job. Of course you can do the job. All that is necessary is that each country remember that its own enlightened self-interest is served best by developing the common security so necessary to us all. The task, incident to it, must have first priority. We require faith, self-confidence, devotion, tenacity - always tenacity.

• Farewell to NATO, Paris, France, May 21, 1952

Ladies and gentlemen, I am certainly in a unique position. You know, you are my bosses and usually one does not go around giving good advice and lecturing to his bosses, so I will try today to avoid being in the position of teacher or preacher. I shall try to tell you, in my own way, something of what I think of this Group, something of my respect for its opportunities for service, its capacity for good in the world today.

Primarily, I believe this is the only body in the whole free world that is meeting day-by-day and studying objectively the real issues, the real problems, that are of concern to all of us. Those problems involve our freedoms as individuals - the rights that came to us when we were born in the image of God. Fundamentally, this is what you are dealing with and you are the only Group that is meeting and dispassionately studying the problem all the way from its material aspects such as making a living for ourselves and producing the strength to protect that living, to the challenge of growing culturally, intellectually, spiritually throughout our whole lives. Now, because I have the deep conviction that you people have a mission of such transcendent importance to the free world, I likewise feel that it is going to take courage on your part to discharge it effectively and properly. I realize, of course, that each of the members of the Council - the principals, the ones that have to bear the responsibility - each of you has a certain relationship with your own government, which is a sovereign nation, and that you have to present views in certain meetings that are not necessarily your own views. In such cases you have to present the opinion and conviction or the decision of your government, but thank God that is only part of your work. As intelligent men studying the great problems before our community, you not only have the opportunity but, in my humble opinion, you have the duty of reaching conclusions and convictions based on your own intelligence, your own heart and your own beliefs. And, moreover, I believe that you really have the duty once in a while in telling your own country, your own government, this fact, because I repeat, there is no one who can possibly have the opportunity to study these subjects as dispassionately, as objectively,

as the members of this Group.

In talking to you today I could recite experiences of the past year which would illustrate the very fine cooperation and support that we have received from the civilian sections of NATO. Such sentiments would be very sincere and, of course, they are rather characteristic of such occasions as this when some associate or member of an Organization is leaving. However, I think you know how cordial our association has been. I think that you, like those at SHAPE, have been animated by the same passionate hope of serving free humanity, of making it secure, of gaining ground toward that level of security where we can devote our income, our resources, our productivity to the good of people. We should soon like to reach that point where we do not have to divert so much of our national incomes into the profitless, sterile, negative means that we call military formations. It is a Group such as yours that can possibly do more to preserve that balance between what is necessary in a world threatened by evil, and what we must earnestly try to do in a more constructive direction, more in keeping with the ideals for which free government was set up. Now I realize when discussing such subjects before a body like this, that I am talking to people who in their intellectual and scholarly attainments can take the same subject and make something eloquent out of it. The only thing that I can maintain as I stand before you is that no one could believe more than I in the rights and privileges of free people. I believe also that they have it within their capacity to hold their freedom if each will meet his just obligations and duties. In the free world, the accumulated combined resources are such that it sometimes appears that we are foolish, practically ridiculous, to be frightened of any force in the world. Our one trouble is that we are not united; we too much enjoy the special prejudices and suspicions that keep us apart. Now the Communist uses the gun in the kidneys - a knife between the shoulder blades - and of course people are unified or else they do not exist. We have to find better ways. One of the ways is this body and I can see the development of friendship, understanding, unity as a primary job of you gentlemen who stand in the front row and bear heavy responsibilities.

You have got a great organization. It’s going to be far more numerous than SHAPE pretty soon! Everybody in that organization can do something - in their letters home; in all their communications with people throughout the world; in their day by day meetings. We can do this thing, and we can produce something close to that described by a great American President, Woodrow Wilson. He said, “The highest form of efficiency is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people.” Now, if you will simply take the expression “free people” and make it plural instead of singular I believe you will have the slogan, the watchword, the objective, that should guide everybody associated with this kind of an effort.

I should hope that I would not be out of place, Lord Ismay, in just making one simple pledge before I say my final goodbye.

Wherever I am, whatever I shall be doing, I shall never lose my faith, my conviction, in the essential truth of what I have been trying to say to you just now. I shall continue to work in that direction conscious that we must - quickly as is possible - get out of the strictly military business here and get into something that is more profitable for us as a whole - more in keeping, as I say, with our culture and our purposes of our type of civilization.

With that pledge, I hope that I have established a fact that with this body and with everybody in it I shall always be warmly associated in heart even if I am not here to clasp your hand - goodbye.