

Radio Speech, WSM
March 21, 1943

Good Morning, Friends:

The Washington spotlight for the ~~last~~ week has been focused upon problems of foreign relations, taxes, food and manpower. Almost concurrent with the arrival of Anthony Eden, Great Britain's Foreign Minister, four United States Senators introduced into the Senate a resolution committing the Senate to a post-war policy of collaboration with other nations in the preservation of international peace. This immediately called to everyone's mind the ^{is nations} abortive experience following World War I when a minority of the Senate wrecked ~~the~~ hopes for establishing international peace and order under law. Then, as now, the sentiment of the American people and the majority sentiment in Congress was strongly in favor of this nation's full-fledged cooperation in establishing, maintaining, and policing world peace. Then, as now, a minority of the Senate was opposed to such a program. Then, as now, a two-thirds vote of the Senate was required to ratify a treaty with a foreign nation. ^{unfortunately,} Americans are not the only ones who recall this ^{ugly} ~~unfortunate~~ page in our own and world history. Indeed, the whole world remembers how the United States ran out on the League of Nations after ^{her} ~~its~~ own President had sponsored it and obtained commitments to it by many other nations. This has even had its effect in the present war, ~~it has dampened and lessened~~ the effect of our psychological and political warfare.

^{Upon introduction of the resolution,}
Mr. Wendall Wilkie immediately sent telegrams endorsing the ~~resolution~~ ^{it}.
^{so it took on a political tinge.}
~~in the Senate~~. The President and his Administration spokesmen acted warily.

I feel very sure that the President would like to see the Senate act favorably

upon some general resolution of this nature. It would undoubtedly strengthen his own hand in world politics and diplomatic offenses. But there is lurking in many a responsible mind the fear that to push such a resolution now would precipitate a long, hard fight in the United States Senate which would hamper rather than help our efforts toward winning the war. That, indeed, would be a nightmare. In commenting upon ^{the resolution,} ~~this~~, the President was so wary some

people got the opinion that he was cool to the idea. Later in the week, he gave frank endorsement to the ^{general} objectives of the resolution, ^{but steered clear of any term or definite endorsement of action or need for immediate action.} The Isolationists

in the Senate such as Senator Wheeler and Senator LaFollette immediately

let it be known that a long debate could be expected if the resolution were

pushed. So, today, the outlook for action on the resolution is uncertain

and, therefore, the part which the United States will ^{play on} be capable of playing in world affairs after the war is made even more uncertain in the eyes of the world.

Foreign Minister Eden has made a good impression in Washington. He is

moving quietly and quite circumspectly. He made an off-the-record speech

before a small group of Representatives and Senators and ^{inspired confidence.} ~~made a very good~~ ~~impression.~~

The coming week will ~~find~~ find the House of Representatives in hot debate over pay-as-you-earn tax legislation. The House Ways and Means Committee has reported out a bill, but the Republicans ~~will~~ are not satisfied with it and they will advocate the so-called Rum1 Plan. I will not take the time this

morning to discuss the details of the different proposals as I expect to have a rather full discussion of the subject for you next Sunday morning.

During the week, the Senate passed the Bankhead Bill, which would defer from the draft all farm workers. This bill has been referred to the House Military Affairs Committee, and it does not appear that it will receive favorable action any time soon. There is a lot of opposition ^{to the measure} in the House ^{if it became} to ~~the measure~~. ^{Some} Many say that it is class legislation and that every draft dodger in the country would immediately try to claim that he was a farm worker.

On Friday, the House passed a bill introduced by Representative Pace of Georgia to include the cost of labor in the calculations of parity. It does not mean, as so many people ^{seem to think} have understood, that the farmer could add the cost of labor to the price of his commodities. It only means that the cost of labor would be included as one of the items upon which parity is calculated. A great many products, such as beef, pork, poultry, milk, and a whole list of things, are above parity now. Therefore, the Pace Bill would not affect them in the least. Mr. Pace said that his bill would only increase ^{farm + food} prices 3%. And yet in supporting the bill, many speakers said that it was necessary to pass this bill if the country was going to have enough to eat, or if the farmer was to hold his labor on the farm. Now all of us want sufficient labor left on the farm, because all of us want enough food produced to win the war. ^{as for me} But I don't see how a 3% increase in prices is going to solve that problem. Three per cent will not attract people away from the shorter hours, high wages,

bright lights, and nickelodeans of the city and back to the farm. Nor will a meager 3% do very much toward increasing production. The problem of manpower for production of food can more realistically be approached through a more sensible administration of the draft law - and there are some signs now that the government has ~~not~~ finally awakened to the problem, and second, by a manpower program based upon a law which would give the government the authority to put people to work on the farm or in the factory as they are needed. Now this latter suggestion sounds very harsh and bad. It is. So is the war. If the government has the right and if, indeed, it is right - and I believe it is both right and necessary, to draft people into the army to serve their country, it is just as right and I believe fast approaching the time, when it is just as necessary, to draft people to do the kind of work which is needed to win the war. Of course, this is not the first time I have said this, nor will it be the last ~~time~~. Other people in the government, however, much more highly placed than I, ~~will~~ are reluctant to embark upon such a stringent and radical course. Just this week, President Roosevelt said that he wanted to hold off this kind of a measure as long as he could, that he would like to steer the country through the war without resorting to this. If we can win ^{+ win} as quickly without it, then fine and good. But if putting everybody ^{where they are needed most} to work would bring an earlier end to the war and save countless American lives, then, in my humble opinion, it is now necessary. Some people say this would be slavery. Well, let us take it this way. The Supreme Court

has said that to draft a person into the army is not slavery. An army ^{thought} is helpless without equipment. Obviously, a person could be drafted into the army and put to work in a gun factory at \$50 a month. What is the difference, then, in drafting a person into the army and putting him to work in a gun factory, ~~on the one hand,~~ ⁱⁿ and drafting him to work in the gun factory as a civilian. Well, one difference would be the amount of pay he would draw. Another difference would be that the man in the army would wear ~~a~~ a uniform. But this is not the difference in slavery and freedom. ^{Far from it.} More and more people in the capitol are coming around to the ^{point of} ~~the~~ view that some sort of a National Service Act will eventually be necessary.