

## THE ELEANOR ROOSEVELT PROGRAM

June 26, 1951

Description: In the opening segment, ER and Elliott Roosevelt respond to a listener's question regarding US aid for Israel and a possible Marshall Plan for that country. In the interview segment, ER discusses human relations and the nature of making agreements with social scientist Stuart Chase author of *Roads to Agreement*.

Participants: ER, Elliott Roosevelt, Announcer Ben Grauer and Stuart Chase

---

[ER:] How do you do? This is Eleanor Roosevelt. Every Monday through Friday, my son Elliott and I have the opportunity to visit with you here in my living room, at the Park Sheraton Hotel in New York City. Each day it is our desire to bring interesting guests that we are hopeful you will enjoy meeting. Elliott, will you tell our listeners today's plans?

[Elliott Roosevelt:] There isn't anybody in the world who basically doesn't want to get along amicably with other people, although at times this is hard to believe. But basic human nature is not quarrelsome. At least such has been the findings of Mr. Stuart Chase, well-known economist, author, lecturer, and one of the best known American writers in the field of social sciences. Mr. Chase has spent the better part of three years in the study of how to get along better with other people. And today he is here with Mrs. Roosevelt to discuss this important subject. Before Mrs. Roosevelt introduces Mr. Stuart Chase, we will as usual discuss a current problem. Now our announcer has some messages for us from the sponsors who make this recorded program possible.

[Break 1:19 to 1:33]

[Elliott Roosevelt:] And now for our discussion period. Mrs. F. Rubensen of the Bronx, New York, has written to Mrs. Roosevelt as follows: "Last night I was watching a television film short program on another network. The first half hour was presented by Hadassah. During that time the picture showed what Hadassah had done in Israel; they had helped to build hospitals, medical schools, nursing schools, and so on. The next half hour was taken up showing the Marshall Plan in action. As I watched I wondered why the United States doesn't have a similar plan for Israel. They need our help desperately. We are helping our former enemies, the Germans, the Italians, but not our ally, Israel. These very Germans and Italians have made these Jews who are in Israel sick in body and as well as in mind, yet nothing is done for Israel. I do not question the Marshall plan, it probably is a good thing, but I would like one for Israel. I would appreciate a discussion on this subject if you feel it merits it. Best wishes for your health, I am very truly yours, Mrs. F. Rubensen. (2:40)

[ER:] I think probably the best thing that can be done for Israel is not to have our government actually begin to do things within Israel because there is a great deal of feeling in the country that the Jewish community in the United States has devoted so much of its efforts towards Israel that it, in a way, makes up for anything which might be done through the government in any other country. However, the difficulty that Israel is now fighting is the fact that in the whole area around Israel there is misery and unrest, and I think the thing that Israel needs is peace in that area. We had a television show, which you may have seen, discussing the question by a delegate from the Israel -- uh from the delegation of Israel and a dele-- a member of a group of Egyptians who are visiting this country, and I imagine this member spoke pretty well for the whole Arab League. Now, he made statements that I grieved over because he seemed to take the stand that Israel had no right to be a nation, therefore, and he would not accept the

overwhelming vote in the United Nations which accepted Israel as a nation. Now that is a stand which I think the Arab League should never take because they must bow to the majority decision of the world on that point. And unless they are willing to accept that decision, and to go on from here in trying to work out the best solutions uh we're going to have an impasse, which is going to be bad for everybody, bad for Israel, bad for that area of the world, and bad for the whole world because there will be no peace there. So I ah feel that that attitude is a very anti-United Nations and anti-peace attitude. I feel that they have a right to regret that Israel was set up, to regret that refugees, Arab refugees, now exist because through, any reason, through fright, and through conditions which come about in any war zone, they left their homes. That is quite obvious now you can't go back on that, they've left their homes, and of course what they would like is to have all of them go back to their homes, obviously impossible because most of them are now destroyed, some of them are already occupied by other refugees or other people who come in, and anyway, Israel has accepted so many refugees that the conditions of Arabs who return there would probably be very bad. (6:07)

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Let me ask you a question at this point, Mother. You say that in your statement that you doubt whether it would be advisable for the United States to give Marshall Plan aid or a similar plan to Israel, recently when you had a radio interview with Ambassador [Milton] Katz who heads the Marshall Plan for Europe, he pointed out very strongly that the Marshall Plan was coming to an end, a gradual end, in Europe because it has accomplished its purpose. That purpose has been to rehabilitate the countries of Europe. Ah do you not think, then, that in line with this letter, that a Marshall Plan program for the Middle East, involving Iran and Iraq and all of the Arab states, properly administered by proper representatives of the United States government uh should be set in motion to raise the standards of living of the Middle East, and also to aid Israel as one of the nations of the Middle East.

[ER:] I think that would be an ideal thing to do, and I hope our uh Congress will see fit to do it, but if they do it for the whole Middle East, it must be the whole Middle East and include Israel [Elliott Roosevelt: Oh definitely]. It must include the whole of the-of that area, but that has not been voted as yet. And I think what is going on, what has already been voted which is the money uh given by the UN, and we are a part of that, you see [Elliott Roosevelt: A major, a major contribution] because we made a contribution -- Yes -- That that should be used, and the Arabs should accept the plan for resettlement of those refugees because until they are resettled, there is no peace for anyone. There's no-- You can't have a festering sore of people in camps um and peace for any of the people around there. So that, for the good of Israel, for the good of everybody else, with what we have already done, what we have in hand and can count on, that's the first thing before we do anything else, it seems to me, uh to be pushed, and I hope and pray that this attitude taken by our Egyptian friend yesterday is not going to be an adamant attitude but that they are going to cooperate in removing this blight which makes peace for all of those nations practically impossible. Then I am hopeful that we as a nation are going to see that Marsh- a type of Marshall plan, must be made with the cooperation, with our cooperation and the cooperation of the UN for the world, [Elliott Roosevelt: yes] for all parts of the world. And the Middle East is probably the next step, and it should be then and that's made and our Congress has agreed, then it should be the whole Israel and all the Arab states together, but I think you have to get rid of the refugees first because I don't think any Marshall Plan can work until that's been done.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Well, do you not feel that as far-- having listened to Professor [Hussein Kamel] Salim Bey when he was talking to you and making clear that they had a very adamant view point with regards to the settlement of this, I gathered an impression ah that here was a representative of a country who was taking a very strong position because they expected to exploit this refugee problem until such time as they got a great deal more than a program of resettlement and aid in the resettlement of those people, they wanted a program which would enable them to go a lot further toward becoming a modernized nation. (10:23)

[ER:] I think they want that, but that they cannot come through the resettlement alone. That will have to come through the Marshall Plan in the future. [Elliott Roosevelt: But they are using this resettlement as a weapon.] Oh, they are using--without question they hope that in resettling people in Arab states will require, for instance, a beginning of showing them how to irrigate the land, uh they hope it will mean real help from the nations involved, which would be all the United Nations. There's no question about that, [Elliott Roosevelt: Yes]. But um I think the real problem, I mean the real changing of the conditions of people in all those Arab countries, is a long time problem because you have to do it from the spiritual standpoint also. There has to be a change in their spiritual viewpoint and a return to a certain self-confidence in the people which at present doesn't exist and a gradual change in the government which now exist in those countries. So that it's not a thing that will happen as you resettle the refugees. It will have to be done through a future all around plan.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] And that plan cannot be solely for Israel, it must be for the entire [ER: Oh no, it must be for the entire area] -- Right. Well, I think that effectively answers this letter, and I think that we should now hear a word from our announcer who has a very important message to make and then we will go on to the next phase in our program.

[Break 12:10 to 12:19]

[Elliott Roosevelt:] A recently published book entitled *Roads to Agreement* deals in specific terms with the most important problem of modern times: How can people learn to get along with- together? This book is a very practical discussion about what we must learn about living together as individuals, families, groups, and nations if we are to achieve any sort of stability or peace. To discuss his findings and reports, Mrs. Roosevelt has invited the author of this book to be her guest today. Mother, would you make the introduction? (12:58)

[ER:] Very gladly, Elliott. Mr. Stuart Chase is the author. He is a well-known economist, author, and lecturer, and one of the best known American writers in the field of social science. I present Mr. Chase. [Stuart Chase:] Well, Mrs. Roosevelt, it's terribly nice to be here with you this afternoon, and to know that you are interested in a subject which has taken most of my time for the last two or three years.

[ER:] Well, I certainly am interested. And first of all, Mr. Chase, what prompted you to write *Roads to Agreement*?

[Stuart Chase:] Hiroshima.

[ER:] Hiroshima?

[Stuart Chase:] Primarily.

[ER:] Well now, just how did that—

[Stuart Chase:] Develop that a little? [ER: Yes.] Yes. Well, it seemed to me with the development of modern science and technology, a subject that I have been interested in for a long time, uh we uh we may or may not be our brother's keepers, but we are increasingly in our brother's laps. You know you can drive around the uh whole planet today in the time it used to take to drive around a Texas county a hundred years ago. We are being brought closer together all the way now that the atomic age and that [unclear term recording skips] so we can get on together better should we get together, and that was my purpose.

[ER:] Well uh that certainly is very interesting and I'm sure that Hiroshima made a lot of us think on many subjects. Now, you've been studying the conflicts and agreements that emerge, what are the main questions which come out of your studies on this?(14:50)

[Stuart Chase:]Well, when you get into the whole subject of conflict and agreement, you, you run into a great deal of very fine work that the psychologists and the anthropologists and the other social scientists have done, and whole categories of questions arise, but it seems to me that most important ones are first of all, do people want to agree, there has to be that point. If they don't want to agree, there isn't very much you can do about it. Although sometimes you can go to work and maybe change their wants, but that is a primary thing: the desire. Then there's the whole question of human nature. Whether man is a combative and warlike animal, or whether he is a social animal, as some social scientists believe. And then you get into this very interesting question that the people up at Yale having been working on so significantly of frustration and aggression. That is, there's a lot of people are aggressive because they're frustrated and not because they are disturbed over the point of issue. That came out so well in a zoning meeting in our little Connecticut town the other day, which was a regular riot, but the opposition to zoning didn't care a thing about zoning; they were all hot and bothered about something else.

[ER:] [Laughs] That so often happens.

[Stuart Chase:]That often happens, doesn't it?

[ER:] It does very often. What did- did you get them down to Earth on zoning or?

[Stuart Chase:]Well we finally, those of us in favor of zoning, finally managed to get a vote and we won by a very narrow margin. And later on, the whole opposition just faded away. They didn't mind zoning, but they minded some other things. They minded taxation for instance, and they didn't like the way the school was being run. They were frustrated for other causes.

[ER:] They were frustrated for something in town for stuff they couldn't control [Mr. Chase: That's right]. And therefore, they had to make it harder to zone.

[Stuart Chase:]But some of us understood that and tried to do something about these other questions.

[ER:] That of course is a great thing to do. Well, taking your first question, what is the answer to what are the causes of human quarrels? I mean, what-what do human beings quarrel about? (17:18)

[Stuart Chase:]Well, I guess everybody would classify differently. I started out in chapter two by just taking the headlines in the *New York Herald Tribune* from May 4, 1950, and put down every headline that had a row and a quarrel in it, and then I reclassified, and got all together what I call an eighteen-story skyscraper. Starting with personal quarrels between, say, a man and his wife, or an employer and his servant, personal enemies, and then family against family, and feuds, and community quarrels, and sectional quarrels, such as the North and the South, in our war against the uh state, between the states. Then a very important category is workers against managers, the labor conflict. Then there's a political party conflict, of which we've had a sad example lately, it seems to me. And then conflicts between the races, which is very serious, religious conflicts. You know in India recently they've been [ER: Yes] Hindus and Muslims.

[ER:] Fights between Hindus and Muslims has created some difficulties.

[Stuart Chase:]Antisemitism, which deserves a category by itself, it's a very curious type of conflict. Ideological quarrels between the people who stand up for communism versus capitalism, or business against government. There are lots of those ideological quarrels. Uh competition between industries,

between uh businesses within an industry, and then we get up to the really-- the most serious ones of all: National conflicts. Conflicts between cultures, between nations, in the Cold War, and finally East verses West.

[ER:] Well, is there a common root in all these different conflicts or can you find nothing in which all the difficulties bring.

[Stuart Chase:]Well, an analysis shows that there are certain common roots. Uh for one thing, perhaps our most serious uh-uh conflicts, between nations or between cultures. Those foreigners talking gibberish, that's the most serious conflict it seems to me. And there it is due to the fact that we are born and brought up within a given culture. Of course, we're using culture here in the more--in the broad sense, not in the narrow sense of being very limited. We are, what I call, in another place, all of us culture bound. And unless we can climb up and look over the wall of our culture and see other people of the world behind their walls. Then we tend to regard the strangers and enemies and dog-faced men and-and it's a very, very serious problem there and it comes from the way we are brought up. It isn't in human nature.

[ER:] It isn't in human nature? (20:41)

[Stuart Chase:]No, because you can transfer a baby from any culture to another to be brought up. I met a Chinese boy the other day, who was born here, he's an American boy, American parents, brought up in China, and he had just as much trouble learning the English language in all his Mandarin Chinese, you see, if caught early enough, it's in the environment.

[ER:] It's in the environment, rather than in the- rather than in anything you inherit.

[Stuart Chase:]Yes, don't you think that's very encouraging?

[ER:] Yes, I think that's very encouraging. But now, what do you think of some of the offsets to these conflicts? What can one—

[Stuart Chase:]Well, that's what I give most of my book to, I- I call myself a-a walkie-talkie man. I go around listening to the social scientists in their laboratories, in their observation posts. I've been to Quaker meetings. I've been up to- over to Paris and participated in a tensions conference with UNESCO. I went up to Bethel, Maine, to look at their laboratory and group dynamics. I took a look at role playing. I just went around collecting techniques of which seemed proper ways and means of getting along together better.

[ER:] Well, could you give us some examples of how, for instance, an argument can be worked out?

[Stuart Chase:]Well, I did one very early in the book, there's a sample of my ways. Here you are at a tea party, and uh a man comes up to you and knows, for instance, that you are interested, as I have been in the past, in the labor movement, and he thrusts out an aggressive chin and he says, "all labor unions are rackets." Well your natural reaction is to say, "You're wrong." If you don't use anything stronger, but there's another little technique if you want to use it, and you can say, "Well, that's very interesting, tell me some more." That throws him right off balance, just the way we're getting the Chinese off-balance in Korea. He uh kind of stutters and he says, "Well, they are all rackets, aren't they?" And you say, "Go ahead, I'm listening." And pretty soon it comes out that he hadn't very many facts, or if he has a fact about some unions, of course, are rackets, you admit it, and then pretty soon he's asking you. And if you want to, you can find the basis for agreement.(23:31)

[ER:] Well, I'm sorry that we have to give our announcer a chance to say a few words right here, but I'm coming back because I want to ask you particularly the method of the Quakers, they seem to have uh great success. [Stuart Chase: That's perfectly true, yes.] Well, just one minute for our announcer.

[Break 23:51 to 24:05]

[ER:] Now we're coming back to our talk with Mr. Stuart Chase and -- the um author of a book called *Roads to Agreement*, and he was just about to tell us something about the various methods of agreement, in particular, the first question I was asked you were to tell us about Quaker methods because that has always interested me.

[Stuart Chase:] Course, the Quakers have two types of meetings. They have their regular religious meeting and then they have what they call a business meeting, and it is in the business meeting that this really remarkable method for agreement occurs. In the business meeting, problems come up as they come to any church, and with the Quakers their-their additional problems, problems of foreign relief, and the Quakers take positions in respect to very contentious problems. Anduh so in the business meetings these matters come up. And instead of the usual wrangle, that we humans so often indulge in, the Quakers never decide things except by unanimous agreement. Now how do they do that? Well, I attended uh several business meetings of our local Quaker group in Westport, Connecticut. And when anything becomes, you know, a little bit heated, a period of silence is announced and everybody bows their head, nobody says anything, but it gives you time to catch your breath and to think if your point of view is really the right one. And then uh the clerk continues the discussion, and if the silent period is successful, the clerk outlines the famous phrase that they have reached the proper meetings and method for agreement, and then he makes a minute showing unanimous decision. But of course, sometimes the silent period isn't enough, so they put it over until the next meeting. It kind of goes into the refrigerator, the deep freeze, as it were. Now it is said that the question of slavery, whether members should own slaves, came up in the Philadelphia meeting, for sixty years it was put over and put over, but finally, it was decided unanimously, that no member of the meeting should own slaves, and that was the year 1760, one hundred years before the Civil War. But most of their decisions, of course, are settled much uh sooner than that. (27:00)

[ER:] Much more quickly than that.

[Stuart Chase:] More quickly than that.

[ER:] That's very interesting, and a very good example of how to arrive at a unanimous decision. Well, Mr. Chase, there's a particularly interesting chapter in your book, entitled "Danger: Men Talking."

[Stuart Chase:] Danger. [ER: Danger?]"Danger: Men Talking."

[ER:] Danger! "Danger: Men Talking," which deals with semantics as a useful tool. First, how is semantics defined?

[Stuart Chase:] Well, semantics is a term that's been in the dictionary now for about forty years and it has to do with meaning. Ah what do words mean? And what do signs mean? It's the science of communication between one person and another. Of course, I have quite a method of communication with my two cats of which I'm very fond, I suppose that's semantics, too. I communicate to them and they communicate to me. Anything that deals with communication between living organisms would be semantics. And first of all, it is very helpful in giving us a little clearer understanding of the world outside our heads. It seems to me it helps us to think straighter. We make better maps of reality by virtual semantics. It also helps us to communicate more clearly, so that A knows what B is talking about, and

thirdly there is one group of semanticists who have used it with considerable success in mental therapy, in overcoming certain kinds of mental breakdown. [ER: Well--] That's the broad definition.

[ER:] That's the definition of semantics and the danger emerges uh then, what happens when men are talking together and don't understand—

[Stuart Chase:]And don't understand one other, surely.

[ER:] Well, of course, that's one of the great difficulties because language can be literally translated and still not convey its meaning very often. If you're talking different languages, for instance.

[Stuart Chase:]Oh yes, indeed.

[ER:] And there is lots of talk that can be very -- in fact, I am convinced that part of difficulty between the East and the West is the lack of really getting the shades of understanding and of knowing what certain things mean when they are said in a certain way by other nations.

[Stuart Chase:]That's perfectly true. Take the word democracy, for instance, which means a very different thing to Russians than it does to us. [ER: Oh, entirely different.] So when we say democracy, we think that such and such would be the behavior, and then the Russians say they think entirely different behavior. And so we just never get together and each country thinks the other is a series of hypocrites. And that's how we can -- and that's the semantic problem. We've got to somehow get together and agree on what democracy means.

[ER:] Well, um I-I suppose there is a way of using words to reduce conflicts, but I almost think that words have a tendency to increase conflict, very often. (30:25)

[Stuart Chase:]Yes, I expect that if we couldn't uh talk, could only use sign language the conflicts would be enormously reduced. I'm sure you couldn't carry on an organized war with sign language.

[ER:] [Laughs] That's a good idea, to we might try making everyone be silent.

[Stuart Chase:]Then you get back to the Quakers again.

[ER:] Yes you do.

[Stuart Chase:]Silent period. And listening, that's one of the great functions in this whole area, to learn how to listen. In any discussion, where there are ten people, 90 percent of your time is listening, or should be listening, but we Americans are not very good listeners. That's one thing that's been very helpful to me, I now listen much more than I ever used to.

[ER:] Well, I 'm accustomed to listening because I listen to all the different points of view in all the United Nations' meetings that I attend, and there you really have to listen because you can't uh interrupt to often with your point of view. [Stuart Chase: Rightly so. Rightly so.] Well now, you describe as the most difficult of all problems in human relations, the clash between nations and cultures. You just said that that was the ultimate, most difficult uh thing and you ask a question, can the big disagreements be handled like the little ones. Ah what is really your answer to this?

[Stuart Chase:]I think that they can, if -- there's that if that comes in -- uh if we can learn, a I said earlier, to climb up and look over the walls of our culture and see the other peoples of the world behind their walls and realize they are the same kind of people that we are, in spite of their different language and their

different customs. If we can look on them as fellow human beings then the big disagreements can be handled like the little ones. But if we are alienated by the fact that they do speak a different language, or that their marriage customs, or their funeral customs, are different from ours, if this puts us off and shuts us off from communicating with them, then the-then the difficulty is very much greater. Now down at the State Department, as you no doubt know, has set up this special college almost to teach the young Korean men how to look over culture walls, and I think that's going to be enormously helpful someday. (33:07)

[ER:] Well, it certainly will be helpful. I think it's probably one of the main difficulties today and as you say culture walls, you have to include everything that goes in to making a culture like religious [Mr. Chase: Oh yes.] and legal and all those different barriers of understanding, and you really have to know the history of people for generations back. For instance, I was talking to someone the other day who told me just a little thing that struck me as very illuminating, and that was: Why was it that the minute you cross into an Arab country, you found no nature, no trees, whereas in Israel, right across the line, you found all this green? Wasn't all cultivation, some of it was a habit that had evidently been formed over the years, evidently.

[Stuart Chase:] Agricultural habits.

[ER:] An agricultural habit, they let their goats eat everything, every bit of nature, and spoiled their own ability to live.

[Stuart Chase:] Yeah, they say divide culture, the learned anthropologists, in three parts: your customs, your artifacts or material things that you deal with in your society, and thirdly your belief systems, which uh cover religion.

[ER:] Well, have you found in writing a book that um any of the theories really helped you in finding your final solution? (34:53)

[Stuart Chase:] Well, it seems to me that nobody can go around with this walkie-talkie instrument the way I did, attending Quaker meetings and UNESCO meetings and laboratories at Harvard and Bethel and Michigan and California, without uh finding there a number of very useful techniques and hints that he can use himself in sizing up headlines in the paper in a political situation. In every meeting that I attend now, I know more about leadership, I know more how to get people to participate in the meeting. I know a little bit how to make the people who tried to run away with the meeting, how to make them subside a little, and how to make the Caspar Milquetoast come in and participate.

[ER:] Now that- that's a good- that's a cheery note on which to end our talk and make everybody read this book, so they will feel the same way. I'm sorry our time has come to an end but I want to thank you very much, Mr. Chase, for coming today.

[Stuart Chase:] Thank you, Mrs. Roosevelt.

[Break 36:06 to 36:15]

[Elliott Roosevelt:] And now it's time to close the program and to remind you that you've been listening to the Eleanor Roosevelt Program which comes to you each Monday through Friday at this same time, and this is Elliott Roosevelt speaking and wishing you all good day.

[Break 36:29 to 36:39]

[ER:] In the time we have left, I'd like to talk to you about something very real, something very tragic: Cerebral Palsy. If you've ever seen a little child struggling physically or with every motion, you need no

further urging to help him overcome his handicap. Most of the five hundred thousand suffering from Cerebral Palsy can be helped, if you help. Here's how you can help and win one of the five thousand valuable prizes. There are five thousand prizes offered for the outstanding slogans to be used in next year's United Cerebral Palsy Campaign. Slogans like: "Give them a chance. Your dollars today will make their tomorrow brighter." Send your slogans along with the contribution of one dollar or more to Palsy, P-A-L-S-Y, Box 555, Radio City, New York. The money you send in will be spent in your community because United Cerebral Palsy is an association of affiliates throughout the entire country and Canada. Here are some of the wonderful prizes: three thousand dollar custom-made fur coat by Frederika, handbags by Colette, Fedders air-conditioning unit by Frank J. Quiggin Company, carpets by Decorator's Carpet Company, handbags by Jamah, bedding by Burton-Dixon Company, citation-creston watch by Benworth's Watch Company, and many others. You are desperately needed by more than five hundred thousand people. Thousands who are cerebral palsy need you to help them lead a normal life. Give them a chance; send your slogan and contribution of one dollar or more right now to Palsy, P-A-L-S-Y, Box 555, Radio City, New York. Your kindness may bring you an award of a valuable prize, five thousand prizes in all. Slogans must be postmarked not later than July 7, and just so you remember, here's the address once again: Palsy, P-A-L-S-Y, Box 555, Radio City, New York.

[Break 38:57 to 39:05]

[ER:] In the few minutes that we have left, I have an announcement I would like to make. How would you like to do something for a very worthy cause and in doing so, win a wonderful gift? United Cerebral Palsy, an association dedicated to the welfare of over five hundred thousand children and adults suffering from this dreaded condition, is having a slogan contest. It is also very simple. All you have to do is to send in your slogan, along with a contribution of one dollar or more to Palsy, P-A-L-S-Y, Box 555, Radio City, New York. Wherever you live, your dollar will be spent in your community because United Cerebral Palsy is composed of many affiliates throughout the United States and Canada. First, I would like to tell you something about Cerebral Palsy. Do you believe that time heals all wounds, that's not always true. To a child suffering from Cerebral Palsy it takes money; a lot of money to help him become independent. It takes money to train the skilled and gentle hands that can help him overcome his handicap. It takes money to build and equip the desperately needed treatment centers. It takes money to finance the research into this tragic and baffling condition. Although Cerebral Palsy is one of the oldest conditions known to man, it is one of the least understood and one of the most expensive to treat. It is so expensive and the facilities are so limited that only four out of every hundred who are Cerebral Palsied can get the care they need. So you see, it takes more than time, it takes money, your money. Yes, your money will help, and it may also win you one of the five thousand wonderful gifts. Think of a good slogan like this: "Give them a chance, give today to help brighten their tomorrow." The shorter and more simple your slogan, the better. Remember there are five thousand winners. Send your slogan and your contribution of one dollar or more to Palsy, P-A-L-S-Y, Box 555, Radio City, New York, by no later than July 7. You may win a beautiful citation-creston watch by Benworth's Watch Company, mandarin coat by Dunnen-Latchford Incorporated, Emerson Radio model 640, men's top coat from Joseph H. Cohen Company, bedding by Burton-Dixon Company, all-wool blankets from the Lebanon Woolen Mill, handbags by Jamah. Let me repeat, you may win something of great value to yourself by helping other. Join United Cerebral Palsy's great slogan contest by sending in your contribution of one dollar or more with your slogan.

[Ben Grauer:] This has been the Eleanor Roosevelt Program, recorded in Mrs. Roosevelt's living room at the Park Sheraton Hotel on the corner of 55th Street and 7th Avenue in New York City. Today Mrs. Roosevelt's guest is the author of the recently published volume, *Roads to Agreement*, the well-known economist and lecturer, Mr. Stuart Chase. Before we say good afternoon, here's an important word from the New York City Cancer Committee. Wrong information about cancer is dangerous. For your own protection get New York City Cancer Committee's free illustrated copy of the book entitled: "What Most

People Don't Know," phone Plaza-9 3500 now, Plaza-9 3500. Let's take a look at Mrs. Roosevelt's guest list for the rest of the week: Tomorrow, we're going to have a visit with Walter Phillippe. He is the recently discovered and very widely acclaimed painter, painter of clowns. Mr. Phillippe has had a non-professional painting career for some years. His work was as an acrobat in the circus, as a waiter in the delicatessen. Only recently was his avocational talent of painting was discovered and brought to the picture-buying public. On Thursday, two ladies from Egypt are guests with Mrs. Roosevelt's microphone: Mrs. Asma H. Fahmy, a professor of education and director of the Institute of Education for girls at the Ibrahim University in Cairo, and Miss Laila Shukry, a graduate student, now at Cornell University. Friday, our guest week is completed with a visit from two gentlemen connected with the very popular comic magazine Archie. Mr. John Goldwater, the creator and Mr. Louis Silverclide, publisher of this comic magazine. Mrs. Roosevelt and Elliott Roosevelt will be with you again tomorrow with Walter Phillippe, the painter of clowns, as our guest, and every day, Monday through Friday from 12:30 to 1:15pm. At 12:30, our regular hour then, this is Ben Grauer, bidding you good afternoon.

---

Transcribed from holdings at Franklin D. Roosevelt Library (FDRL)

File(s): 72-30 (185)

Transcribed by: Susanna Israelsson

Edited (first round) by Isabel Maier

The Eleanor Roosevelt Papers Project