

THE ELEANOR ROOSEVELT PROGRAM

August 13, 1951

Description: In the opening segment, ER and Elliott Roosevelt respond to a listener's question about fair trade. In the interview segment, ER discusses the Korean war with the chief of the Washington Bureau of *Newsweek*.

Participants: ER, Elliott Roosevelt, Ernest Lindley, Ben Grauer

[ER:] This is Eleanor Roosevelt speaking. Our program is coming to you from my living room here at the Park Sheraton Hotel in New York City. I'm very happy to have this little while with you each day, and I hope you'll enjoy the guest we've invited to be with us today. And now for a moment, I'm going to turn the program over to Elliott.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Mr. Ernest K. Lindley [1899-1979], chief of the Washington Bureau of *Newsweek* magazine is Mrs. Roosevelt's guest today. Mr. Lindley will have many interesting observations to make on world affairs and also some on possi-uh-possible things to come. Mrs. Roosevelt will introduce Mr. Lindley after Mrs. Roosevelt and I discuss a letter sent in by one of our listeners. We'll pause now for just a minute to let our announcer have a few words.

[Break 00:47-00:59]

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Mr. Meyer Boxer of Brooklyn is concerned over the controversy about fair trade. He has written to Mrs. Roosevelt as follows: "Dear Mrs. Roosevelt, I am a pharmacist employed in the Picker Pharmacy in Lynbrook, New York. I am vitally interested in this controversy over fair trade. Let me present to you a picture of the conditions in the average drug store, which I found existed fourteen years ago before the advent of fair trade. One, it was a known fact that many drugs stores could exist by only selling bootleg liquor. Two, we had to switch every sale we could to a more profitable item than the one advertised, in spite of an inferior item being offered as a substitute. Three, we had to employ inferior, incompetent help because we could not afford to pay a livable wage to people of adequate skill and experience. The public relied on their judgment for advice concerning their health and safety. Four, competition between the stores was of the most degrading business ethics to beat a competitor. Can you imagine what effect this had on the ethics and ideals of any employee who was forced to engage in any these tactics in order to secure a livelihood? I could not blame the owners entirely. They too were forced by cutthroat competition to make a livelihood by unethical means. I felt ashamed and degraded because I was forced to do these things. After the advent of fair trade I found a completely changed picture existing. There was no attempt at switching products to give the customer something he did not ask for. We did not have to engage in unethical practices; we had the security of a fair profit. I now know I could look into the eye of each customer with an honesty and integrity I never could before. I found the competition had changed from a dog-eat-dog affair, to an effort to better one's service, quality, and courtesy, and ability to serve the public. I dread the repeal of fair trade because it means a return to all of the abuses I encountered before. Take the security of fair trade away from the businessman and you have a condition similar to the fear of the poor people in Europe who are being enticed by communists. We are sending them aid because we know the dangers involved by insecurity. We as pharmacists find ourselves in the same position as these people. Without fair trade, our security is threatened. Sincerely yours, Meyer Boxer of Brooklyn, New York." (3:48)

[ER:] Well, of course, I am not an economist but I certainly have always believed that fair trade regulations were essential, and I think that um what we've just seen here in New York with the big stores um carrying on um totally unfair um sales um which meant that they were able to carry losses and the little man couldn't possibly have done the same thing was evidence enough that fair trade was something we should preserve, and I am all for it!

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Well, do feel that uh that fair trade means uh that when a national uh product manufacturer distributes his product to stores throughout the country, he should set a one-scale retail price for that product, which allows a uniform profit throughout for the retailer?

[ER:] Why of course, of course.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Well, there are a lot of people that maintain a very different point of view. For instance, uh if you're the operator of a small store uh and you only buy a small amount, you are not entitled to the same uh amount of discounts as the manufacturer oh uh -- rather the manufacturer grants to the retailer who buys in huge quantities and is willing to pass on the added discounts on to his customers. (5:29)

[ER:] I don't-I don't think that's fair. That always has given to uh the uh man who was big um an advantage over the man who was little. And um it is true that if a man sells a great volume uh he can afford, probably, to give his customers some of the advantage of the volume of his sales. That's really where the chain stores, for instance, uh should make their profits, simply by the volume they can sell, but not by any difference in price from the manufacturer to them or any difference in the price set and the amount that they can ask for the product.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Well, if they buy at--from the manufacturer, at the same price uh and they are willing to take a smaller degree of profit and pass that on to the consumer, would you regard that as fair where it lowers the-the cost to the customer because the size of their volume enables them to say make a one cent profit on an item where the smaller man uh needs the two cents because of his lower volume. (6:52)

[ER:] I don't like it because I happen to think we should keep as much small business as possible, but I think it is fair. I think that um-um if they are willing to do that, they will attract a good many customers, but the customers uh who have small stores near them will at least know that while they are not getting the price that they would get--um they're--from-from the big store, perhaps they're saving something in the distance that they go and not using the gas to get there--

[Elliott Roosevelt:] The transportation cost. (7:32)

[ER:]The transportation cost. Uh perhaps they're saving a good deal in convenience and time. And therefore, uh I think there is still a chance for the little man to have his customers and for the customers not to suffer very much, and there certainly is a reason why in big centers, um big chain stores are bound to be able to sell for a little bit less and you can't prevent it, uh so that I think eh that will probably always happen. But I think where it is important is that between the manufacturer and the retailer uh there must not be two prices.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] In other words, volume should not earn you additional discounts.

[ER:] No.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Well now, there's another kind of retailer that I happen to know of, and that is the retailer that goes out and buys--I know of a tremendous store in the Southwest ah that achieved a huge

success by buying what they call damaged goods, uh goods which did not meet the complete 100 percent inspection uh of uh-uh the manufacturer because in transit they were damaged or something, they were put up for auction sale and brought in by these people, and they bought huge car loads of-of what were known as uh "seconds." When they bought these "seconds," they put them out a very very much lower price than anybody who was buying what was known as top-grade uh materials. They might have been uh materials that were cut and hadn't allowed in the--sm--in the uh--hadn't met the very exacting standards of the manufacturers so they were discarded. (9:32)

[ER:] Well, I-- everyone-everyone who has ever bought, for instance, at a mill-el has seen that very same thing. For instance, you can buy blankets at a mill where they make them, which are called "seconds" because they don't quite meet the specifications. When you go over them carefully you will find that here and there perhaps a number of things that can be different.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] The hem is not quite right.

[ER:] You may find that the hem is not quite right, or you may find a black thread running through a white blanket in some place, or you may find some little place where it is a trifle thinner than it is in other places. Um if you want something that is flawless you pay the price for it, uh but a great many people who can't afford a flawless thing can get extremely good things that, as far as use goes, are perfectly good for use, uh by buying those that haven't--th-those goods that haven't passed the 100 percent perfect test, [Elliott Roosevelt: Mhm.] and I see no reason why that is not permissible. That seems to me quite permissible.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] In other words, you feel that uh a store that is enterprising enough to make it a practice to buy up these so-called "seconds" and that advertises--

[ER:] Of course, it's even better for the public if the public goes straight to the mill [Elliott Roosevelt coughs] and gets it because they'll get an even better price.[Elliott Roosevelt: Ah, yes but how many of us can afford to--] But if the mill doesn't have any outlet of that sort, um then this other thing, if the store chooses to do that, and tells the truth about it, doesn't try to sell it as the number one product [Elliott Roosevelt: Mhm.] Uh I think it's perfectly all right. (11:30)

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Well, I think that uh that that type of enterprise in business, as long as it's done straight in the open and as long as fair trade practices are observed in relation to it, uh that they're giving a great service to the public, [ER: service to the public] because certainly the public, Mummy, isn't going to be able to get around to all the different mills and pick up "seconds."

[ER:] Well, I-I know very well that I've driven through New England very often and seen advertised in the mill building, a little office where these things--and possibly you can find places in New York state where they do that. [Elliott Roosevelt: Mhm.] And I've often stopped, and I've often bought seconds and um never found very eh-uh evident where the thing was different. It was just as good for use.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Well you are in favor, though, of a fair trade practices act that will--

[ER:] Oh, absolutely! (12:25)

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Well, I think that answers uh Mr. Boxer's letter, and I see that our time is up and that we have to go on to another portion of the program right now.

[Break 12:33-12:45]

[ER:] Thank you, Elliott. It gives me great pleasure to introduce to you the chief of the Washington Bureau of *Newsweek* magazine, Mr. Ernest K. Lindley.

[Ernest K. Lindley:] Mrs. Roosevelt, it's always a great pleasure and an honor to be with you.

[ER:] Well, I'm so glad that you could come today, and I thought that it would be interesting if we could talk a little about uh what will happen, assuming that we achieve an armistice, uh ceasefire, with the proper safeguards in Korea, uh what-what may look for afterwards, and also a little review of the past, because this situation is one that I think has confused a great many people in the United States. So the first question I would like to ask you is: Has the fighting in Korea been worth the cost to the United States and the United Nations?

[Ernest K. Lindley:] That question involves a good deal of conjecture, Mrs. Roosevelt, but it's a very important question. I think first we should consider what probably would-have happened if we had not gone to the aid of the Republic of Korea. It's reasonable to suppose, I think, that if that first direct resort to military aggression after the war had succeeded, if the Republic of Korea had been overrun and wiped out, there would have been other aggressive moves following in rather rapid order, perhaps. In some cases the mere threat of aggression might have been sufficient. We might well have had a series of cave-ins in the free world, particularly on the periphery of Europe and Asia.

[ER:] Well then, looking at it from that point of view, we upset the USSR timetable by resistance on the part of the United Nations.

[Ernest K. Lindley:] That seems to me to be a very reasonable conjecture, Mrs. Roosevelt. And as another point, it seems to me that the United Nations would have gone the way of the League [League of Nations] if it had not acted in the face of this first resort to military aggression. (14:55)

[ER:] Well, um yes, because it would have been considered just uh without any force at all, without any ability to bring together any of the nations to work together in a situation where force was needed. So that-that seems to me quite evident, but now those are the things we prevented, but what do you think we really achieved?

[Ernest K. Lindley:] Well, I think, don't you, Mrs. Roosevelt, we made a beginning, through the United Nations, in making a system of collective security work. Now it may be true, and I think it is, that the response of some of the members of the United Nations was disappointing. Uh they did pretty well on the first hurdle; when it came to a little bit higher hurdle a good many of the balked, some of them finally got over. But on the whole, uh it would seem to me, as an observer, perhaps you would have a different view having been in the very middle of this, but it would seem to me on the whole we have made a start toward making a system of collective security at work, and that is very important. (16:04)

[ER:] Yes, I um I would-I would say that that was one of the most important things that happened. I would also say, however, that the fact that we had not been able to do it more quickly and more effectively immediately had posed another question because um whatever we--whatever happens, Korea has been devastated. There is no--the people of Korea uh certainly have had a very tough time. And while the rest of us have been proving that collective security, with a good deal of prodding, could be maintained in the face of aggression, um Korea has just been practically made flat with its people suffering. Um and any suffering of human beings is hard to bear, but certainly their suffering has been pretty intensive. Now um how is that going to affect um the feeling of people, generally, in-in the future, is it going to have the good effect that we would hope, which is to point out the fact that for real success we must build strengths within the United Nations which can be overwhelming and used immediately, that that is the one thing which can be affected and can-keep us from having a repetition of what

we've had in Korea, or are we going to find that people aren't willing to face that fact, and that we're going to dilly-dally and shift and-and not be willing to make the sacrifices, and not be willing to do the organization, and find a million and one difficulties, uh and what will happen if we do that? (18:07)

[Ernest K. Lindley:] Well, it seems to me, Mrs. Roosevelt, you've touched upon what seems to be the greatest danger to the free world from an armistice in Korea. That seems to me to be the danger of a general let down. When the Korean aggression occurred, we at last got started in this country on a rather comprehensive program of rearmament and the armament of Europe, the rearming of Europe, which had been talked about and uh which had made some progress before, again to be accelerated. General Eisenhower went over there. During the past year it seemed to me that we have made considerable progress toward making the free world strong enough to make aggression very risky to anyone else. But now if the fighting stops, will there be the feeling that the danger has passed, that we don't have to spend quite so much, or quite so rapidly, we won't need so many men in the armed services, and we have a general letdown and unwillingness to prepare against an aggression in the future? (19:18)

[ER] Well, of course, if that happens, then I think the free world is in really very serious danger um because we know, at least it would seem apparent uh that um the lesson of Korea, from my point of view, is that we had too little joint strength, and if we let down now uh we will still have too little joint strength to meet a really um serious enemy to freedom.

[Ernest K. Lindley:] Oh, I thoroughly agree. Yet, as I've watched uh Congress in operation, while up to the present, at least last year it voted defense funds, and I think it uh probably will vote most of those asked for this year. Still it's never been willing to levy the taxes to um put the program on a pay-as-you-go basis. One sees in watching the struggle there in Washington, all sorts of pressures being brought to prevent uh one person's taxes or this person's taxes from going up. There's naturally a general drive for economy. Many people think that you can uh save billions of dollars by cut-cutting the non-defense parts of the budget. When you begin to examine it you find you--while you might be able to save hundreds of millions there, the billions and the billions are in the defense end. And so the pressure to economize, and the urge to avoid higher taxes results, eventually, in an effort to cut the defense budget, or at least that part of the defense budget, or at least that part of the defense budget--I use the term in a broad sense--which applies to foreign aid. That seems to me to be a very likely political development in Washington this summer. (21:16)

[ER:] But it's one of the most shortsighted things we can do. And I should say what was really the trouble was that our Congress -- uh congressional representatives were afraid of the people. As a matter of fact, I think the people, if they once understand what is before them, are usually ready to make the necessary sacrifices. But I do think it takes a little courage and a little leadership on the part of Congress, and um I think that is perhaps where our difficulties lie at the moment. Um we cannot let down on military expenditure, but neither can we let down, it seems to me, on foreign aid. Because the minute we do, how can we expect the pe -- the other people of the world, if they're getting no help to build up their economy, to go on making their sacrifices, and they must make them if they're going to rearm. They're not rearming entirely with what we send them; they are making real sacrifices themselves. Now if from us they cease to get some help, and if also we are not willing to take the burden of leadership which is thrust upon us, yes, but the burden of leadership to build new economies in the underdeveloped areas of the world, even if the change is only one little step up, uh we must face the fact that then we're leaving a vacuum and the vacuum is always filled by something, and it will be filled by the communists. And so we might just as well face the fact that we are in for sacrifice now for high taxes, for a fight on inflation, for controls, for keeping up things that seem to us hard to do, but, nevertheless, if we don't do them, what's going to happen to us? (23:35)

[Ernest K. Lindley:] Well, I thoroughly agree with you, Mrs. Roosevelt, and when it comes to the Atlantic Pact nations, who are our main partners in this rearmament effort, most of them have less of a margin than we do in this country. Rearmament does mean a sacrifice for them, proportionately at least, even more than it does for us.

[ER:] Look at the sacrifice it means in Great Britain, [Ernest K. Lindley: Oh, it's--], where they've never let up on any of their-their wartime sacrifices.

[Ernest K. Lindley:] And if they cut a little--if we cut a little, they'll be tempted to let down still more. And one can envision the sort of spiral of descending effort from one side to the other as a result.

[ER:] Well, we are the leaders. We are the ones that the world looks to and if there's no leadership on the part of the democracies, who's going to lead? (24:23)

[Ernest K. Lindley:] No one unless we do, I think.

[ER:] I think it'll be the communists, and I think that's something we ought to face. Well now, I see our announcer must have a word, but we'll stop for just a minute and come right back.

[Break 24:36-24:44]

[ER:] Now we come back eh to our interview with Mr. Ernest K. Lindley, chief of the Washington Bureau of *Newsweek* magazine. And I want to go back for a minute uh, Mr. Lindley, to uh the question of Korea. Uh if we get an armistice in Korea, does it mean--you--do you believe it means real peace for Korea as a whole?

[Ernest K. Lindley:] I should doubt it very much, Mrs. Roosevelt. I have a feeling the Chinese and the Russians really want to stop the fighting for good reasons at this time, but um polit--the political future for Korea seems to me to be a question that probably can't be settled for a long time to come. Um eventually I presume um we'd all like to see it restored as one country. And certainly that has been the political objective of the United Nations um for several years. But the--

[ER:] Well, um how-how can that be done?

[Ernest K. Lindley:] I doubt that it can be done until we get, eventually, maybe, a final settlement of a great many things with the Soviet Union. I would question very much whether it can be done except as a part of a general world settlement, which would have to be uh much more favorable to the free world than any of the agreements we've been able to get in the last few years.

[ER:] Well, that means then, at the same time, that you don't feel very hopeful of any settlement uh with China or in the whole Asian situation until a settlement is made with the USSR.

[Ernest K. Lindley:] I must confess that I don't. I do respect the views of uh those who think that the Chinese communists, at least some of them, are nationalistic. They may veer away from the Soviet Union very much as Tito did, but uh certainly during the past year they have acted as very close allies. And unquestionably, whether or not they're closely allied with the Soviet Union, they have certain ambitions of their own, or certain things that they may claim as rights, such as Formosa. And in view of the fact that some of our allies, including Britain, have uh taken a different view in the past from ours about Formosa, and about the Chinese Communist regime, it seems to me that we may be in for a good deal of diplomatic dissension in the months ahead, and uh that we're unlikely to be able to achieve anything like a settlement in the Far East. What do you think about that Mrs. Roosevelt? (27:29)

[ER:] Well, I'd like to consider first, um how-how long, for instance, naturally, if we should get an armistice in Korea, it would mean that we would at once start rehabilitation? Now I don't see how rehabilitation can be done in South Korea and in North Korea, unless the whole of Korea is under the United Nations protectorate or something of that sort, at least for two years, let's say. Um well, suppose uh suppose for- just for the moment, that we obtained that in the original arrangement for um what should happen in Korea, um I wonder if you think that that would mean, because eventually we must look to setting up a government of its own in Korea, whether that would mean that at the end of the time, if we held a United Nations supervised election in Korea, we would have any hope of not having it a communist uh controlled election?

[Ernest K. Lindley:] Just a guess, but I would presume that if the United Nations could really administer all of Korea for a period of two or three years, during which uh a great deal of rehabilitation was carried on, that a free election would not favor the communist. But isn't it supposing a good deal to suppose the communists will permit the United Nations to exercise any real jurisdiction over northern Korea? (29:18)

[ER:] Well, I ask that question because um I have no idea that they would permit that unless they were very sure that they could infiltrate sufficiently in both North and South Korea to control eventually an election, and therefore would accept this just as so much stupidity on the part of the United Nations would hand them a recovered country, eh where much money had been spent, which still would be under their um ideological control. Now if they um accept all this, I shall be terribly afraid that it is with that idea in mind, and, yet, I don't know that we don't have to take the risk and do it if they're willing to give us the time, um and-and try and find a way of fighting the infiltration. Um it's such a gamble, but I think it's a gamble almost that we will have to take against odds that seem to me quite terrific because we are uh not accustomed to fighting the kind of propaganda system that they have and the kind of infiltrating methods that they have, and uh I think we'd be fighting against tremendous odds, and yet, if that is what is apparently possible for us, I don't know how we can refuse it. (31:00)

[Ernest K. Lindley:] I shouldn't think we could refuse it provided that the United Nations were in Northern Korea not just to administer aid but with some administrative authority. It would seem to me that in that event the United Nations ought to have full control of the internal police and the-and the other instruments by which the Communists so often seize power and extend their control. It seems to me we could very well refuse an invitation just to uh go in and uh help rebuild northern Korea. We would have to have real control over--

[ER:] Yes, we would have to have complete control, or none, [Ernest K. Lindley: Yes.] I mean--or do no rehabilitation. [Ernest K. Lindley: And that's--] But I'm-I'm terribly um worried for fear um that looking at the countries of Asia where there has been so much misery for so long in many of those countries, um knowing how misleading are communist promises when they are just talk beforehand um and how much they would mean to the people of those areas. Um for instance, I heard, quite--on quite good authority, from two sources, not long ago, that today in China there is, of course, a good deal of terror going on, particularly in the rural areas. The landlords are being brought into village squares--those who collected money for land--and uh spat upon and shot. Um but, cleverly, there has come into the government um a good deal of um inspiration in the fact that they are making it an honest government; they are not cheating the people as they always used to. They are, by military force, holding inflation down, and for the vast--even--they are making a great deal, as the always do, of the young people and making them feel that they are a part of building something new. Um now if that is-is being done, it's very clever because it gives for the first time, to people who have always lived under corruption, who have not only um had uh corrupt government, but even organizations which had to be paid off before you could run your business and so forth and so on, those are being wiped out today, I understand. Now of course, you are told these things and you always take them with a grain of salt, and yet I've heard them twice now from two different

sources. And it seems to me to make sense because if you want to build up the loyalty of your people uh you would take, I think, as one of the first things, building up some kind of confidence in the government's honesty. And um if they do that um in China today, um won't that in itself be a certain type of propaganda uh which will help them in Korea, and uh perhaps if they play hard enough on the Asia-for-the-Asians--Asiatics -- um [ER clears her throat] perhaps they will just be glad to get rid of us. (34:50)

[Ernest K. Lindley:] Well possibly. On the other hand, many observers whose opinion uh I would value, I think you would too, thought that the Republic of Korea had a pretty honest government before this invasion occurred. And I don't believe it is beyond our capacity or that of the United Nations or that of the democratically-minded--democratically-minded in our sense of the word--leaders in Korea to set up an honest government. After all, there has been no country which has gone communist by popular vote, except, I believe, Yugoslavia which in uh turn split off from the--from the main shoal.

[ER:] Yes,, that's quite true. Well I wonder if you feel if we're firm enough in the free world to withstand a new and persistent Soviet peace offensive which seems to be coming up in the near future. (35:45)

[Ernest K. Lindley:] I can only say that I hope we are but I have my doubts at moments but my-I suppose one must rely on an essential faith in the common sense of the American people and the rest of the free world to pull us through, even though uh previously, since the war, in '45 and six, again in '49 when the Berlin Blockade was lifted, we seemed to have letdown pretty rapidly after a crisis had passed.

[ER:] Well ,I hope that you will do all that you know how to arouse the willingness to sacrifice for the future in the American people and the vision of what we might do if we made the sacrifice and perhaps a little apprehension as to what may happen if we don't make it. Thank you, we have to go off the air.

[Break 36:42-36:54]

[Ben Grauer:] Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt has just concluded another in her series of guest interviews with personalities in the news today, statesmen, citizens in public affairs, those in the artistic world, and today our guest a noted journalist and columnist, Ernest K. Lindley, the chief of the Washington Bureau of *Newsweek* magazine, discussing the problems of today from a newsman's view point in his interview with Mrs. Roosevelt. Now before we say goodbye here's a post-script to our program.

[ER:] In keeping with my plan to bring to you some of the outstanding thoughts written and spoken on the subject of freedom, I would like to read from a speech delivered by Abraham Lincoln at Edwardsville in September 1858: "What constitutes the bulwark of our own liberty and independence? It is not our hounding battlements or bristling seacoast, our army and navy. These are not our reliance against tyranny. All of those may be turned against us without making us weaker for the struggle. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit, and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own doors."

[Break 38:31-40]

[Ben Grauer:] This has been the *Eleanor Roosevelt Program* recorded in Mrs. Roosevelt's living room in the Park Sheraton Hotel on the corner of Fifty Fifth Street and Seventh Avenue in New York City. Today Mrs. Roosevelt's guest was the noted journalist and columnist Ernest K. Lindley who is chief of the Washington Bureau of *Newsweek* magazine. Tomorrow Mrs. Roosevelt invites to her microphone one of the country's most distinguished woman educators, Dr. Rosemary Park [1907-2004] who is president of Connecticut College for Women. Mrs. Roosevelt and Elliott Roosevelt will be with you tomorrow with

Dr. Rosemary Park as guest and everyday Monday through Friday from 12:30 to 1:15pm. Till tomorrow again at the usual time, this is Ben Grauer bidding you all good afternoon.

[Break 39:31-39:35]

[Ben Grauer:] Friends, this is Ben Grauer speaking. Have you ever dipped into a bowl of vegetable soup and only found a smattering of vegetables. Rather disappointing isn't it? Even down right annoying. Well, you'll never have that trouble with Habitant vegetable soup. Habitant vegetable soup is chock full of all kinds of garden fresh vegetables aswim in the broth of natural vegetable juices. Yes, for hearty, satisfying nourishment, Habitant vegetable soup ranks right up front. And then too, your family will love the special Habitant flavor created by old fashioned French recipes. For interesting variety in your soup menu, remember Habitant pea soup, genuine old country French pea soup and heavenly, really heavenly Habitant onion soup, rich with true golden goodness. All three come in the yellow cans and all three have bene granted the *Good Housekeeping* seal, plus the seal of approval of *Parent's* magazine. Now here's Elliott to start our discussion period:

[Break 40:40-40:55]

[Ben Grauer:] Right, Elliott, it's coming close to guest time on the. And this is the point in our regular daily visits where I like to take a glance at the uh listings for station WNBC for tonight, pick out some of the high spots. Monday you know is music night on NBC and we start off our evening of music at eight o'clock with the *Railroad Hour*, an original play with music, and tonight it's titled "One Thousand and One Nights," drawing its inspiration from the tales of Scheherazade and the glorious music of Rimsky Korsakov, starring of course, Gordon MacRae [1921-1986] and Dorothy Warrenskjold [1921-2010]. That's the *Railroad Hour* at eight, followed at eight-thirty by the *Voice of Firestone*. Howard Barlow [1892-1972] and the Firestone Orchestra and Chorus and our soloist for tonight, Brian Sullivan [1917-1969], tenor. At nine o'clock, the distinguished music of the *Telephone Hour*, Donald Voorhees [1903-1989] and the Bell Symphonic Orchestra. Always a notable guest list, and tonight's guest for the *Telephone Hour* is the lovely American soprano, Eileen Farrell [1920-2002]. At nine thirty, perfect summer-time listening with the City Service Band of America, conducted by Paul le Valle [1908-1997] with Ross Goldman, if you please, bagpiper, as soloist in a salute to the Gathering of the Clans on August sixteenth. At ten o'clock comes the hour long concert by the Boston Pops Orchestra directed by Arthur Fiedler [1894-1979] with a program including an English folksong suite, music by [Jacques] Offenbach, [Arthur] Khachaturian, Viktor Herbert, and Cole Porter. There's a variety of moods and light music. I'll have the pleasure of playing my regular role of narrator and-in that program at ten o'clock.

And I'd like to remind our listeners to WNBC of a very unusual feature which will start tonight, Monday night, at eleven fifteen. Program is titled "Robinson Crusoe, USAF," and will draw our inspiration from the fine work of the US Air Force and the great story of Robinson Crusoe who was stranded on that desert isle, because NBC news commentator W.W. Chaplain uh went to down to uh a little island just off the coast of Florida and lived with some Air Force men in their new survival program. And he'll describe how he and several fliers lived in and off the everglades almost as Robinson Crusoes testing out new techniques and equipments of the Air Force. That's at eleven fifteen tonight and those are some of the highlights for listening on WNBC.

Now to introduce today's noted guest, here is Mrs. Roosevelt.

[Break 43:29-43:46]

[Ben Grauer:] Yes, the clock says it's time for our regular midway pause in Mrs. Roosevelt's interview with her guest today, Ernest Lindley of *Newsweek*. This is WNBC AM and FM New York, and you're

listening to the *Eleanor Roosevelt Program* recorded in Mrs. Roosevelt's living room in the Park Sheraton Hotel. Before we rejoin Mrs. Roosevelt and her guest, I'd like to bring our listeners a message from the American Heritage Foundation on the all-important theme of good citizenship: "A devoted servant of the people and the president of our country, Grover Cleveland had this to say of fellow citizens who become careless about their obligations as good citizens. 'The abandonment of our country's watchtower by those who should be on guard,' President Cleveland said. 'And the slumber of the sentinels who should never sleep, directly invite the stealthy approach and the pillage and loot by forces of selfishness and greed.' Well, Mr. Cleveland would probably be proud of his country today. For today all but a shameful handful of the one hundred and fifty million and more Americans are vigilantly within the country's watchtower, wide awake instead of sleeping, readying themselves to protect our freedom from the forces of selfishness and greed whether those forces be enemies abroad or lawbreakers here in America. Yes, while our good citizens mobilize to meet any danger from abroad, they obey and respect the law, and also they help officials in preventing lawlessness, and the courts in giving true evidence. And in these ways they help preserve our freedoms. Surely you are among them, for freedom is everybody's job." Here again is Mrs. Roosevelt.

Transcribed from holdings at Franklin D. Roosevelt Library (FDRL)
File(s): 72-30 (219)

Transcription: Pre-2015
First Edit: Natalie Hall
Final Edit: Seth LaShier

The Eleanor Roosevelt Papers Project