

PRODUCTION FOR PEACE

ADDRESS OF HAROLD E. STASSEN OF MINNESOTA AT JEFFERSON DAY, THE ANNUAL COMMUNITY CELEBRATION AT JEFFERSON, IOWA, SPONSORED BY THE AMERICAN LEGION ON MAY 21st, 1947, AT 8:00 P. M. BROADCAST OVER A MIDWEST NETWORK.

(Mr. Stassen was introduced by Governor Blue)

Your Excellency Governor Blue, Commander Halden, fellow Legionnaires, friends of Iowa:

It is a thrilling and invigorating experience to drive down through the green growing fields and neat farmsteads of Iowa in this month of May. I bring you a friendly salute from your Minnesota neighbors to the North. I also bring you warm personal greetings as a fellow mid-Westerner who will never forget his boyhood on the farm.

My recent observations abroad move me to comment that we must be certain that the farms of America in the years ahead continue to be privately owned on a family-sized basis, privately owned by their actual operators to the greatest possible extent, and that we avoid both the evils of government-ownership and the evils of huge, centralized private ownership of the agricultural territories of America.

I commend the American Legion of Jefferson and the people of this community for this outstanding annual community celebration and for your colorful emphasis upon the United Nations in your excellent parade. I respond with pleasure to your invitation to meet with you and to speak to you. Let us discuss very frankly some of the great issues of our time, the decisions on which will directly affect the future happiness and well-being of every farm in Iowa, of every home in America.

Our joint objectives in America are clear. We seek for ourselves and for our children future well-being, and individual liberty, and peace. We recognize the dangers of economic crashes and the dangers of international conflict.

We want never again to experience the black days of agriculture of the 1930's with eighteen cent corn, three cent hogs, 32 cent wheat, and with every courthouse step a stage for the sad scenes of mortgage foreclosures.

We want never again the long lines of unemployed shuffling to the relief windows for a subsistence grocery order.

We want never again a multitude of business men closing their doors dejectedly, meeting their creditors in bankruptcy court.

And above all we want never again to see millions of our young men leave our farms and homes to face, and to fall before the bullets and bombs of war.

Clearly on these objectives we are united in solid strength. But when we come to consider the measures and means by which we shall attain our united objectives, we hear many diverse proposals. We also note a considerable silence and evasion. But out of an open discussion constructively carried on before the people as a whole, I am confident that we will arrive at better answers than any one man or small group of men can propose. We will demonstrate once again the value of a representative government of free citizens.

It is in this spirit that I talk with you tonight. I do not say here are the final answers, but I submit some of my thinking upon the subject, that out of the differing and amending we might stimulate a fruitful search for the best course for America to follow in the years immediately ahead.

Everyone in America now realizes that we are not concerned with two separate sets of policies, the one foreign and the other domestic, that we do not have two compartmentalized problems, the one - our world relationships and the other our internal success - but rather that the two are completely interwoven and constitute one inter-related problem for decision. If anyone had any doubt of this it would certainly be dispelled if he went abroad and heard over there the persistent searchings and questions as to our internal American economic future by leaders in many countries of many different viewpoints and forms of government - from Russia's Stalin and from England's Churchill, from Czechoslovakia's

Benes and from France's Ramadier. Equally is this interlocking of domestic and foreign policy clear when we confer with the business leadership in America and note the degree to which analysis here of conditions abroad affects plans at home for production and employment, for building and investment.

In considering these future policy decisions of ours in America I believe we can best understand each other if we sharpen up our discussion on a basis most easily understood. There are two extremes advocated in America as to all major phases of our inter-related foreign and domestic policy. And with reference to the foreign policy phases in particular, one extreme of policy is currently advocated with greatest attention by Mr. Henry Wallace, now the Editor of the New Republic magazine. The other extreme is persistently presented most powerfully by Mr. Robert McCormick, Publisher of the Chicago Tribune. One is a Democrat - the other a Republican. I refer to them specifically not to attack them personally, for they both have and must have the complete right to speak and publish their views and I give each of them and their supporters full credit for sincerity. But if we are to consider these questions of vital and far-reaching importance we must clearly characterize our positions in a manner that all may understand.

Thus at this early stage of my address I say distinctly and definitely that I reject for America both the Wallace doctrine and the McCormick doctrine. I reject both extremes.

As I see it the Wallace doctrine would make of America a nation of fellow travellers going down the wrong road. It would place American hand in hand with those elements in Europe who would decrease individual economic freedom and would subsequently dim other human liberties. It would dissipate our domestic assets, centralize our economic authority in America, and bring about lower and lower production at home. It would repeat the errors of appeasement of the 1930's. It would discourage in other lands the stalwart believers in true liberty and take us away from the victorious and dynamic quality of a people's capitalism. America should never adopt the Wallace Doctrine.

The McCormick doctrine, on the other hand, would make of America a nation of cold-hearted misers passing by on the other side. It too, in its isolation, would lead to tragic results for our country. It would make us hated around the globe. It would set the world against us. It would lead us to boom and to bust and finally to a defensive war. It would make us a temporary pleasure ship in the path of a storm of despair. America should never adopt the McCormick Doctrine.

There is a natural attempt of those who follow either one of these two doctrines to attempt to throw all who disagree with them over in the extreme opposite camp under the opposing banner. But it is tremendously important that we realize that the choice is not between these extremes.

In between is a very broad area in which I am optimistic that we can find the course of a strong and wise and humanitarian world policy. It must be a policy that seeks peace and plenty and freedom for ourselves and for others. We must become a nation of courageous pioneers blazing the postwar world trail toward peace and plenty and freedom. We must recognize that these three - peace and plenty and freedom - are indivisible.

You cannot have lasting peace if you have shortages, scarcities, and want. You cannot have lasting peace when men are oppressed and subjugated and enslaved.

You cannot have plenty unless you have the very high production that stems from individual freedom - economic, social and political - and from the resourcefulness that arises with personal initiative, and from broad practices of open trade.

You cannot have plenty when your resources and your production are dissipated by war.

And equally, you cannot have freedom - individual freedom of men and women - economic, social, political and religious - unless you have peace. You cannot have individual human freedom under conditions of war, or of destitution, or of want.

Some will say that if these three are tied together, they constitute a hopeless circle and progress is impossible. These are the same people who repeat the insidious whispers that war is inevitable, that economic crashes are unavoidable. They are the distant descendants of those who said in 1620 that it

was inevitable that the good ship Mayflower would never get across the Atlantic Ocean. They are the remote echoes of those who said in 1787 that the thirteen American colonies would never succeed as a United States. They are the disciples of gloom who are present in every generation and who always must be rebuked if there is to be progress in human welfare.

These three goals, far from being a hopeless circle, present the necessity and opportunity of a joint and balanced and constructive movement, admittedly against great obstacles, for a measure of achievement of all three.

I would not attempt to present a complete and final program of the immediate steps to be taken towards these three goals, and to avoid both of the extremes. The specifications of such a program, which our people can understand and support in unity should be established by an outstanding volunteer commission of men, representing both political parties, and including leaders of business and labor and agriculture and education and science, appointed by the President with the advice of the Senate, joining together in extensive discussion and analysis.

Above all our entire approach to the world-wide and domestic situation now after the war must be constructive and not negative. We must seek to build up and not merely to block or contain or oppose. We must also think in big terms for the winning of this postwar struggle for peace and plenty and freedom, in terms just as big as those in which we thought when we faced the task of winning a world war on the opposite sides of the two great oceans.

I believe that for the next ten years we should devote ten percent of our total national production of goods and food (not of our gross national product) to building for worldwide peace and plenty and freedom. It should not be a sharpster lending program. It should not be a light-headed give-away program. It should be a practical, sound, long-visioned business-like approach to the situation that exists in the world today, and to what we can foresee in the years ahead.

We should request the views of the Economic Council of the United Nations as to the manner in which we conduct this production and should welcome their continuing advice. But we must ourselves, on a bipartisan basis actually administer the program and control the rate and type of production supplied, so as to safeguard against inflationary effects at home or diversion from our purposes abroad.

We should also require that each government that joins with us gives steady and unwavering support to the United Nations organization and its high objectives.

This production should not be scattered, or in fits and starts and handouts to those who cry "wolf" or "communist" the loudest. It should be based on a careful, worldwide evaluation of the best long-term basis on which we can rebuild after the war. We should not expect repayment in dollars or in manufactured goods, because the rest of the world cannot repay in either one of them, and we do not need either one of them.

We should expect repayments of the kinds and types that the rest of the world is capable of giving and that we need. We should expect long-term agreements for the fair access to raw materials in other parts of the world and a current availability of major quantities of those minerals and other raw materials so that we do not further dissipate our own natural resources in this tremendous productive effort.

We should expect agreements that the governments with which we work will not move farther away from individual economic freedom and will not go down the sad trail of increasing nationalization or socialization or government-ownership, which would result in lower production for them, would negative the constructive efforts we are making, and would make more difficult our own free economic future.

We should expect that our governmental representatives, our private citizens, and our press and radio without censorship, should be able to visit any area that is participating in our Production for Peace Program.

We should expect that they will not discriminate in any way against our citizens and that they will not tax our private capital at a rate discriminatory in comparison to domestic capital and will not expropriate without just compensation.

We should expect that others in the program will not indulge in a practice of exploitation of dependent peoples that would run directly contrary to our basic long-term objectives.

We will also need to develop a code of the standard of conduct for our own private capital when it is invested abroad, based upon the best records of American capital in past years. We must not follow the pattern of some of the old instances of grasping imperialism.

We must likewise make it clear that we do approve of the correction of the evils in a free economy and in private capitalism, of the initiation of land reforms where there are great concentrations of land, of restrictions against monopolies and trusts and cartels, of minimum wages for workers, of the rights of free workmen, and of the decentralization of power both private and governmental. We must also emphasize the need of stability in representative party government and of the serious weakness of the fragmentation of political action in multiple parties with a government that precariously perches for its continuity on the day to day whim of a number of small minority groups.

We must not impose our programs upon others, it must not be what we say should be done but what both agree is for the sound economic future of their countries, and ours, and the world.

Such a program should not include under any circumstances arms or munitions for others. Any exceptional instances, and they should be rare, of limited supply of minimum arms for stability of other nations, should be separately considered with complete individual debate in Congress and should not be injected into the Production for Peace Program.

Such a program should not be directed against anyone. Its whole emphasis should be positive and affirmative with the objectives of progress of all mankind and of our own future peace and prosperity.

Coupled with the maintenance of a modern American defense force, and with sound domestic measures, including a new national labor policy, economy in the domestic activities of government, and encouragement to small new business at home, we can well afford such a program. In fact we cannot afford not to engage in such a program.

Properly carried out it would be one of the greatest single assurances against depression or economic crises in America. Properly carried out it would be one of the greatest safeguards against a descending spiral of regimented economy, lower production, want and misery and suffering around the globe.

It must have its priority list of projects carefully worked out. I believe that Number One on that priority list would need to be the redevelopment of the Ruhr area in Germany to get more coal out of the ground so as to make it possible for the industries of the rest of Europe to get underway. Without coal, factories closed, schools closed, churches closed, and the people half froze throughout Europe this past desperate winter. This coal production is now inexcusably low, at only about 40 percent of prewar. It is a problem that is not caused by any failure to agree on the overall peace treaty for all of Germany. It rests entirely within the scope of agreements between the British and ourselves and the proper use of our own productive resources. Ruhr coal is the key-stone to a healthy Europe. The Ruhr should be redeveloped under private ownership without monopolies or cartels. It should not be socialized. Former Nazis should be barred from ownership. Provision must be made for incentives to produce for workers and managers and owners. Capital from other countries should be permitted, but strict limitations must be placed upon its extent and its terms. The long term governmental supervision should be provided by the United Nations through its Economic and Social Council, which acts without vetoes, and without complete detachment from Germany.

Second in priority should be the encouragement of the Belgian, Netherlands and Luxembourg customs and economic union to accelerate this determined and desirable development of a free economy for 18 millions of industrious people.

Third in priority should be the agreement with England of the necessary steps and agreements for their long-term sound future as a free economy. We should not postpone a frank and friendly analysis with England of both the emergency and long term aspects of their situation arising from the extreme sacrifices and losses in the war.

A dozen other projects should follow, the order determined by careful study by the outstanding men of our country on a bipartisan open basis.

These are sweeping proposals that I have made this evening. I have made them not as Republican proposals, but rather in a desire to see a truly American doctrine developed after this war that is worthy of the strength and inspiration of the dynamic ideas, the powerful position, and the great stake of America.

I am convinced that the people of our country know we are facing a situation that cannot be met by small programs, nor by extreme impractical measures, nor by drifting. The people want to know how their leadership appraises the world situation, and after frank discussion, the people will decide.

I welcome disagreement and criticism openly expressed. I suggest that it take the form of including definite counter proposals for the future long-term policy of America.

Let me make it crystal clear that I recognize in full the tremendous difficulties in the postwar world. I do not underestimate the clash of ideologies, the depth of misunderstandings, the thickness of suspicion, the bitterness of hatreds. I realize the size of the task of obtaining agreement and action on so broad a program in America. But what I propose is not vague or hazily idealistic or a dream. It is a practical, hardheaded, businesslike, sound approach to the situation in which we find ourselves. The long term cost will be less than the alternative cost of the negative current patchwork and partially misdirected loan approach with huge armaments and unemployment and economic instability.

The obstacles are not grounds for dismay and inaction. This is not a time for timidity, or evasion, or delay. This is a time for courage, for frankness, for action.

I have great faith. I have great faith in the people of America. I have great faith that we can win a future of peace and of plenty and of freedom for America and for mankind.



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org