

WSM, September 15, 1946

Good Morning, Friends:

The chief <sup>source of</sup> news out of Washington during the week was the

controversial speech by Secretary of Commerce Henry A. Wallace.

A <sup>leader of the so-called left wing or ultra liberal element of the</sup> <sup>Dem party,</sup> Mr. Wallace is a controversial figure. He arouses intense opposition and steadfast loyalties.

Last Thursday Mr. Wallace made a speech on foreign policy which in some respects ~~seemed to run~~ counter to the foreign policy pronouncements of Secretary Byrnes. This difference between two Members of the Cabinet is ~~the secret of~~ why we have heard so much and read so much about the speech in our papers under large head lines. I had not been in public life very long before I learned that a controversy ~~always~~ makes news. One of the faults or criticisms of our system of free press is its inclination toward sensationalism. For instance, let me give examples of what I mean: When Congress passes a bill without controversy it seldom makes news. Likewise a Member of Congress can make a very learned speech exemplifying profound thought and astute analysis only to find the press uninterested. I have heard many such speeches and have noticed them <sup>go entirely</sup> unmentioned by the newspaper<sup>s</sup> or the radio; but let a Zionczek or a John Rankin <sup>that</sup> heave an ink well at a colleague, then ~~it~~ is news -- headline news.

For another example, I went to Europe during the winter months of last year and made an <sup>in</sup> ~~extensive~~ study of military government of occupied Germany. Upon my return home I made a very careful and studious report to Congress. About 95 percent of this report was



praiseworthy of the efforts of our military government in occupied Germany. Of course, I did not find everything as it should be and there were a few critical paragraphs. When the report was made public the news stories headlined the criticism and entirely omitted the 95 percent action which I had found praiseworthy.

If Secretary Wallace had made a speech commending Secretary Byrnes then it would probably never have found its way into front page headlines. *maybe not even on the market pages.* I say these things to minimize the importance of Secretary Wallace's speech. ~~It is~~ It is maximized by the press and radio because it represents a controversy in which a controversial character, Henry A. Wallace, is involved. This will tend to give it notice in the public press out of <sup>all</sup> proportion to its importance in national or world affairs. *It was not an official pronouncement of our foreign policy, on the contrary it was nothing more than a political speech by a controversial political figure.*

Under the Constitution it is the prerogative of the President to determine the nation's foreign policy, subject of course to rights of confirmation and ratification by the United States Senate and <sup>the approval</sup> ~~support~~ of the Congress and the people. The President cannot lead very far or for very long in foreign policy or any other matter when <sup>he</sup> the people and the Congress will not follow. <sup>However,</sup> In so long as the President is within reasonable conformity with public <sup>opinion</sup> ~~sentiment~~ and the sentiments of Congress, he can make or change the United States' foreign policy. His official representative is the Secretary of State.

Very recently Secretary Byrnes gave a statement of American foreign policy in a radio speech emanating from Stuttgart, Germany.



President Truman has given strong support to Secretary Byrnes and although he gave his approval to Secretary Wallace's speech, thus unstandably creating some confusion in the public minds, this ~~is~~ *does* not likely that ~~this~~ <sup>message</sup> ~~presigates~~ any fundamental change in our foreign policy. *On yesterday, Pres Truman clarified his position by saying that he had approved Sec. W. right to make the speech but had not approved its contents.*

Although I do not agree with all of Secretary Wallace's speech, particularly that part in which he advocates "sphere of influence" I think in candor I must confess <sup>that</sup> I have serious misgivings about the rectitude of all our foreign policies, particularly <sup>those regarding</sup> ~~toward~~ Germany.

It seems an ironical stroke of fate that the United States and

Britain on the one hand and Russia on the other should be vying *with each other so soon after victory* for the friendship and support of Germany. Where are those who

advocated a ~~hard~~ peace for Germany? Perhaps many of you who are doing me the kindness of listening this morning will recall the debate immediately preceeding and following the end~~o~~ of the war between the advocates of a hard peace and a soft peace. Perhaps you know that

President Roosevelt threw the first handbook for military government *into the wastebasket* literally ~~out the window~~ and ordered it rewritten in stern <sup>er</sup> policies and principles. Even before the war ended ~~and~~ there were many

Britishers who opposed thorough deNazification of Germany; they vigorously opposed de-industrialization of Germany and also

opposed de-centralization of Germany. President Roosevelt held

out for all three and finally got agreement only on de-Nazification of Germany.

The United States however is now leading the fight for political



centralization of Germany <sup>as well as</sup> ~~and was~~ for revival of the German national economy on a centralized basis.

Some critics say that we have been taken in by the British. I do not hold this to be <sup>necessarily</sup> true although I do know that months before the war ended many leaders in Great Britain had already become apprehensive <sup>to keep</sup> of Russia and wanted Germany ~~to stay~~ strong as a buffer state. I know, too, that in Washington this same sentiment found considerable support even before the war ended. I heard speeches on the floor of Congress to this effect. What are the consequences of a restoring <sup>alien</sup> of a centralized or strong Germany? I do not profess to know the consequences but I do know a little of history and I know that it would be a repetition of what happened after World War I. Germany has long been the economic core of western Europe. Whether we like it or not, her people are more vigorous, her resources greater, her scientists more <sup>inventive and ing,</sup> ~~informed~~, her factories more productive than any other nation of western Europe. What's more, her people are more warlike as history will vouch than any other people of Europe. We have only to reflect upon Hitler, the Kizer, ~~and~~ Bismarck and other Hun leaders to know that the German people are easily ~~knad~~ led into militarism and into wars of conquest.

Time after time she has invaded her neighbors not only to the west but she has invaded Poland and Russia to her East. Is it ~~not~~ any wonder then that Russia, and France, too, for that matter, look



*missile*  
with suspicion upon an American policy of restoring a centralized  
strong Germany? Is it any wonder that they should question an American  
policy which demands unquestioned rights to *islands* of the Pacific  
and yet wants to restore to strength and power Russia's traditional  
enemy of central Europe? *Great B. has been a bulwark of  
civilization and progress. Her enemies pursued a policy of  
power that has repeatedly led to war.*

~~Perhaps~~ *perhaps* people are entirely too forgetful. I cannot think  
~~through that~~  
we are too forgiving, as a whole, but there are many instances when  
we have given pardon and ~~release~~ *freedom* to an imprisoned convict only to  
find that soon after he regains his liberty he commits some heinous  
crime against society. Germany as a nation has repeatedly committed  
a heinous crimes against world society. Because of this she has  
sacrificed many of her rights to freedom and equality among nations.  
Certainly so, until she has proven over a period of years beyond  
doubt that she is capable of living as a *peaceful* nation in the family of  
nations recognizing and honoring the rights of others. > To question  
American policy is not to condone the actions of Russia, but ~~on the~~  
~~other hand~~ *well* America would do well to take second thought of the  
utterances of those who give loud voice to prejudice, holding  
every action of America sactimonious and every action of Russia  
diabolitical.

A little over a year ago I was sent on a Committee to the  
Pacific Ocean to study and make a report on bases which we need to  
retain there for use of our Navy and Airforce. I believed then and



I believe now that the world should be willing for us to keep

possession of island like Manus, Truk, ~~Tuvalu~~ and others of the

Marshalls, ~~Carolina~~ <sup>Mariana</sup> and ~~the~~ groups. We have not waited and

I do not think we should have waited for the approval of the United Nations. We took them in war from the Japs and we have remained there

as I think we had a right to do. We are entitled to security. *As a great*

*would nation,*  
We are entitled to ~~possession~~ for an adequate national defense.

*Now*  
~~Then~~ let us look to our own hemisphere. What is the Monroe Doctrine?

It is that America unalterably opposes European interferences with

any country in North or South America. We use our great prestige

and influence to promote ~~free~~ <sup>freely</sup> government in all countries of South

America. With this policy I am in agreement. The point I am

trying to make is that ~~it~~ <sup>our policy toward Russia</sup> has some similarity with ~~Roosevelt's~~ <sup>to Russia's</sup> efforts

to have governments ~~free~~ <sup>freely</sup> to ~~her~~ in the countries adjacent to her

western borders. There is one fundamental difference. We seek to

bring about establishment and maintenance of such ~~free~~ <sup>freely</sup> governments by

means of cooperation, friendship and an encouragement of freedom for

the citizenry; Whereas, ~~it is reported that~~ the communistic effort

to dominate is characterized by oppression, tyranny and terror. <sup>As</sup> ~~if~~ <sup>all</sup>

<sup>there</sup> of this would indicate, I think ~~it~~ is something to what Henry Wallace

*has to think about,*  
said ~~by it~~ but ~~it is~~ <sup>as is</sup> typical of him, he has expressed himself

~~badly and controversially,~~ ~~in a manner which he may~~

~~in a manner~~