

THE ELEANOR ROOSEVELT PROGRAM

August 6, 1951

Description: In the opening segment, ER and Elliott Roosevelt respond to a listener's question regarding FDR's four elections for the presidency. In the following segment, ER interviews Clark Eichelberger, director of the American Association for the United Nations.

Participants: ER, Elliott Roosevelt, Clark Eichelberger, 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 enjoy the guest we've invited to be with us today. And now for a moment I am going to turn the program over to Elliott.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] This year, 1951, is the sixth anniversary of three important milestones in history. The United States Congress ratified the United Nations Charter, the United States entered the atomic age through the dropping the atomic bomb, and VJ Day. To discuss where we have come in these six years, both good and bad, Mrs. Roosevelt's guest today is Mr. Clark Eichelberger, director of the American Association for the United Nations. We will meet Mr. - Mr. Eichelberger after Mrs. Roosevelt and I try to answer a question posed by a listener. Now our announcer with a few words for us.

[Break 1:03 - 1:14]

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Mother, we have a question today which is not particularly pertinent to the present times but it uh goes back into uh when Father was president. The question is: The late president uh ran for office uh-uh of the presidency four different times. Was he always completely confident that he would win, and what would he do on election day after he had completed his elections tours?

[ER:] No, he wasn't completely confident. Sometimes uh sometimes they-they were fairly confident. They nearly always on the trains, uh the newspaper man and the people who went um with Father would make up a uh little pool in which uh each would write out the number uh of the vote as they thought it was going to come out. And um I think Father won that pool on several occasions, so he guessed pretty accurately. But um I think that there was always a sense that someone who is running for office -- In the first place it's bad luck to be too sure, and then second place uh even if you are uh sure, as I think he was in his second uh trip when he carried everything but Maine and Vermont, [Elliott Roosevelt: 1936] -- 1936 -- uh you don't ever say it. You're always a little bit nervous about uh saying it out in the open, and I used to carry it always to a much greater extreme. I always took for granted we were going to lose until the actual votes were counted uh, so that I don't think one is uh completely uh secure.

Now as to what happens after you finish, Father always used to keep the last few days for campaigning near home, [Elliott Roosevelt: Mhm.] and he very often took a motor trip through his old neighboring Hudson River counties the last day or two, [Elliott Roosevelt: Mhm.] um and then and spoke, of course, at different points all through the counties. [Elliott Roosevelt: Yes.] Um then you just go home and uh, and um uh of course when election returns began coming in he always-- he would always go in the morning and vote, and then we would um just calmly wait. And just towards evening when election returns would come in and uh he had a regular set up in the dining room of um telephones in all sorts of things. and in the little smoking room off it with different people who knew how to analyze when you got a certain percentage of votes from uh certain number of counties from a state, how much that would mean

and what-- whether the remaining counties unheard from were of another political party, so that you were getting a sort of prognostication of what the vote would be long before the actual vote was in. And he would have people who worked in the campaign there, and then the other people would sit with my mother-in-law in the um big library. And then late in the evening when it was pretty well settled, the newspaper people would come up and everybody would be given refreshments and they would talk, and finally when it was perfectly sure there usually was a procession from Hyde Park of people with torches, and Franklin would go out and make a speech [Elliott Roosevelt: Mhm.] and that end the performance and everybody would go to bed [Elliott Roosevelt: Go to bed.]. [ER Laughs]

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Well, uh I'm interested in the four different elections. Uh in 1932, [ER: Oh, it was very close, you see.] he uh was not confident at all [ER: No.] Uh in 19--

[ER:] And he wasn't very confident. 1936 he was confident, but 1940, particularly '40, with the third term issue he was anything but confident

[Elliott Roosevelt:] But in 1944 which was during the war, uh do you feel that he was confident at that time of his reelection or more confident than in 1940?

[ER:] No, I don't think he was more confident because it was a very um unusual thing to be running again. But I think that um -- well, I don't know, I think he had an attitude of um almost a fatalistic attitude about it. If he once made up his mind to run he done it because he felt that uh it was a necessary thing to do. The questions were grave questions and he felt it was an obligation to do it. Then um this kind of fatalistic feeling, either the people are with you or they're not with you, and you um you accept whatever the verdict may be. I-I think he-he was just in a frame of mind election night of accepting whatever the [Elliott Roosevelt: Uh-huh.] verdict might be.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Well, do you think that in the third term election that he had made up his mind to run and to break the tradition uh quite a long while before the convention?

[ER:] No, I think he almost went into that convention without having made up his mind.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] And you feel that the uh that the party leaders were rather than in the dark [ER: Oh yes.] as to just what his intentions were?

[ER:] Oh, I know - I know they were. I know.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] And uh do you feel that he had very much questioned about the necessity of his running for the fourth term, for uh--

[ER:] No, I think then he had a feeling that it was necessary because he felt that to put through the uh United Nations to end the war satisfactory. They didn't expect Japan to end so quickly. And in spite of all sometimes people forget now about uh various things that had happened, we did not have the atom bomb at that time, we were still uncertain about it. And um therefore, we had no actual uh knowledge uh that that could make us feel that the end of the war would come as quickly as it did come. I don't think he expected it so quickly, but he wanted to see the first steps taken in the United Nations Association. And he--it loomed, I mean he saw the end of the war was in sight, but how long the Pacific war would go on he couldn't tell, and he didn't know uh whether we were going to have a weapon. He knew a great deal was happening about the atom bomb, but no one knew definitely that it was going to be a weapon that could be used in ending the war [Elliott Roosevelt: Yes.]. So I think that he had a feeling that it was um essential that he should, if he was physically able, make uh that last term -- live through the last term.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Well, did he have any uh plans beyond the uh firm establishment of the UN? Were there any other things that he felt had to be tied up uh completed?

[ER:] He knew very well that we would have to have um a great many economic adjustments after the war. I think he had a very keen perception of what the after-war readjustments would be. But I don't think he ever went beyond thinking um we had to finish the war. First, we had to have a machinery through which we could work for peace, and then, I think, he knew that economic questions would have to be met, but I think he waited for those until the end of the war would actually be here.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] But didn't he once make the remark that the winning of the peace was going to take just as much effort on the part of the American people as the winning of the war?

[ER:] Yes, he did because I think he was quite sure that it would cost us a great deal to win a peace. But um-um I don't think that he had worked out --

[Elliott Roosevelt:] You don't think he worked out the economic requirements of the American people?

[ER:] I don't believe that he had thought out the exact methods by which we were going to meet our own economic situation, nor do I think that he had actually-- I think in the broad principles that we would have to help the world, yes, that I'm sure he recognized, but I don't believe that he had of yet-- Know that when you are in a war you are pretty busy actually fighting the war, and um I don't think he really had the time to work out in detail. He had some people who were working, and I know he felt, for instance, that our own national resources board on which was mapping our own national resources at that time and how we should develop them. See that was wiped out, uh I can't remember the exact time but just around then, but I think his feeling was that it was essential to have that because we would need to develop our resources to the utmost, but I--and therefore the plan should be laid at that time. But he himself would always say -- I know very well, I used to fuss because we didn't move faster with what was going to happen in the United Nations, and he would say look we have to win the war first. Let's lay the um plans for the first meeting, but beyond that you can't go until you've won the war. [Elliott Roosevelt: Well I --] And he did not think you see the war would be won until after that meeting.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] I have only one more question that I would like to ask. Do you think that he was confident that he could handle uh Stalin and the Soviet threat after the war?

[ER:] I never knew him not to be confident that he could not handle anyone. He always had the feeling that um he could persuade people to his way of thinking if he was right, and he was sure that at the end of the war that he could find the right answers, and uh that he could make people agree with him. Now that was a kind of confidence that I suppose was bred from having power for a long time and having found that he could persuade people to his point of view, whether it was justified or not, I don't know.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Well, I think that this has been a very interesting uh discussion and I wish that we could go on but I see that our time is up and we have to move on to another part of the program.

[Break 13:19-13:27]

[ER:] Thank you, Elliott. It gives me great pleasure to introduce to you Mr. Clark Eichelberger, who is director of the American Association for the United Nations. Welcome, Mr. Eichelberger.

[Clark Eichelberger:] Thank you, Mrs. Roosevelt, it's an honor to-to be on your program.

[ER:] Well, I'm very happy to have you here today, and I think that this program uh goes on the air at a time when we should be thinking about the anniversaries of a number of very important things. First of all, I'm sure that you think about the ratification by Congress of the UN Charter, and I think you'd like to give a little thought to what that meant has meant to us in the last few years.

[Clark Eichelberger:] Well, Mrs. Roosevelt, I was reading a magazine article the other day pointing out how most of the wars and the revolutions uh broke out in the-in the summertime. Um I believe uh that the author quoted Anatole France, I wish I could remember the exact quotation. He was criticizing, or rather joking at the Europeans who made their revolutions and their wars in the summertime, but the French would not get their feet wet for the cause of human freedom in the wintertime. Then I suddenly speculated that we have so many um peace anniversaries coming on at about this time and one was the ratification of the Charter. Um I was in Washington in the Senate gallery. Uh I had been there when President Roosevelt hoped that the World Court would be ratified. Seemed to me, I sat in the senate in the gallery and watched a good many defeats in the previous two decades, but I saw the Charter ratified with the two dissenting votes. And I have often speculated since whether the Charter was oversold at that time. I wonder if you would agree with me? That is was not in any way oversold, that the United Nations can reach all of its accomplishments, but we haven't made people yet see their responsibilities.

[ER:] Oh yes, I would agree with you that it was not oversold in its possibilities. It was perhaps uh not uh emphasized enough to the peoples of the world that uh the United Nations was actually machinery, and that people have to make it work.

[Clark Eichelberger:] Exactly, too many people think that uh-uh the Atlantic Pact, the United Nations Charter; they thought the same thing about the Kellogg Pact in previous days is somehow magic.

[ER:] Well, just putting it down on paper is an achievement. And then they lie down and don't do anything about it

[Clark Eichelberger:] Exactly, and they wouldn't take their own government as a matter of course, and I feel they have to regard the United Nations in about the same way it has to work day after day.

[ER:] Well, it has-it has to work. As a matter of fact, one of the troubles of most democracies is that people are not active enough; they don't do enough work in their democracy. And therefore, you have the failures which make um other people able to attack democracy as a form of government. (16:44)

[Clark Eichelberger:] Exactly, and in a democracy we have qualifications we have shades uh our judgements can be absolute, but uh in a dictatorship, of course, your program is always a creed, a number of --

[ER:] Yes it's always settled by-by uh a few people at most, and uh then you don't have to persuade people or educate them. You just make a decree and it becomes a fact and the people accept it, and that you can't do in a democracy. I know I used to get very impatient sometimes in achieving things, and my husband always said the ways of achieving democracy are slow, but then when people actually understand and believe something, then you are building on a firm foundation, and you are never building on a firm foundation when you are doing something which only a few people have directed other people to do. But of course, that's a very long-term view to take and as far as the Charter is concerned, of the United Nations, I've felt over and over again that the way in which people -- Let's take our own country where education is supposed to be more widely disseminated and probably better than in almost any country in the world. Um how many people have felt that they had an obligation to even read the Charter of the United Nations and know what we had undertaken?

[Clark Eichelberger:] And I'd go even farther than that. I would make this comparison also. They accept the government of the United States as a-as a fact. They know they can't escape from it. They may not like a particular congress. They may not like the results of a particular election, but they are a part of the government and the government is a part of them. But there are still too many people who think the United Nations is something about which they can choose or reject. Something that about which they can still pass a judgement of whether or not they will support it. [ER: Look at Iran on the World Court this minute.] Exactly, accepting the compulsory jurisdiction but uh--

[ER:] Accepted it, and now just calmly says the uh-uh decision handed down is not to our liking; therefore, we'll leave the World Court.

[Clark Eichelberger:] And may I point out that point? What an evolution there is in American thinking. I think there is universal condemnation of that point of view. bBut you and I can remember the time on the Senate refused to [ER: Refused to join--] ratify the court at your husband's request. even then when it was entirely voluntary there wasn't an optional clause involved.

[ER:] But even at the moment, I don't think we've accepted the jurisdiction of the World Court on a compulsory basis.

[Clark Eichelberger:] We have but uh with nullifying reservations.

[ER:] Yes, with nullifying reservations. [Clark Eichelberger: But I think that --] And so uh we-we can't look down our noses at Iran except for the fact that she did accept and now is going back on it. [Clark Eichelberger: Exactly.] We uh being a little bit um more worldly wise perhaps did not accept the reservations, so that we haven't had to go back on anything. Well now, let's think a little further as to what we are uh really considering in the way of anniversaries. Uh we have entered into an atomic age and very soon we will come to the anniversary with dropping the atom bomb.

[Clark Eichelberger:] Yes, that was on August 6, wasn't it? I uh I remember someone asked President [James] Conant of Harvard how he would compare the atomic bomb, and he said it's the most significant step since man discovered fire. Now uh we don't appreciate it today, but children in history will be maybe be saying wouldn't it had been great to live in that age. As uh children some years ago before everything to commenced to happen used to look back at some other period of history and think how great it was. Uh--

[ER:] Well, I suppose the reason he said that though was not so much because of the bomb as it was because of the possibilities which atomic energy has for civilian advances.

[Clark Eichelberger:] Oh yes, it wasn't the bomb, unfortunately the bomb was the symbol of the great discoveries. It's too bad it wasn't something besides a bomb.

[ER:] Because he-he was thinking, I'm sure, uh of what we may develop in the next few years, scientific research which may be of value to mankind. I look upon the bomb as being um, if anything, [Clark Eichelberger: Quite, quite.] a great detriment to mankind.

[Clark Eichelberger:] But uh isn't-isn't the bomb uh a symbol of what's happened to us uh say in two hundred years. I remember reading a volume of William Allen White shortly before he died, and it said that when our forefathers marched -- started westward at the close of the Revolutionary War, their means of travel and communication were not much different than the children of Israel used in their great migrations hundreds of years before. But between that time and the time of the First World War we had steam, electricity, the gas combustion engine, and the population of the world more than doubled because

of uh medical care that uh [ER:unclear term] could prolong life despite the tragedy and poverty of every part of the world today. And then when you think what happened between the First and the Second World War, and then what happened at the close of the Second World War this tremendous concentration of scientific forces. Would you agree with me that fundamental problem is: can we control them and can we control them with democratic forces? (22:57)

[ER:] Very decidedly I would agree with you that. [ER coughs] Our-our discovery, our technical knowledge and scientific knowledge um has gone forward so rapidly, and actually whether man has learned to understand himself and to control himself um, as well as um was done in the past um, or as honest even a balance let's say for everything as was the case in the past, is a question I think uh we really still have to solve. I don't-I don't think we have advanced as far socially.

[Clark Eichelberger:] No, I think that's fundamentally our problem.

[ER:] I think that is one of our great problems today: that we are out of balance.

[Clark Eichelberger:] And uh as I see it the purpose of the United Nations and the machinery that is being created is all to help us develop the political, social and economic controls to-to get things in hand.

[ER:] Well, I would agree with you there, and uh just at this particular spot, I see that our announcer would like to have a word, and so we will come back on the air as soon as we have heard from him.

[Break 24:25-24:44]

[ER:] Now we come back to our interview with Mr. Clark Eichelberger, director of the American Association for the United Nations. Now I was just going to mention the third anniversary, Mr. Eichelberger, VJ Day. That of course, we think of with thankfulness, but uh good many things have happened since VJ Day.

[Clark Eichelberger:] That's right. I remember being in Times Square on that day and seeing the typical enthusiasm that people saw in Paris and almost everywhere else in the world. Six years have gone by, and uh I would like to ask you what you think have been the great gains in the last six years, and I'd like to talk about what you think have been the failures of the last six years. That's a tall order [ER: You're asking me--] I know, but there's nobody in the world who can answer this as well as you can.

[ER:] Well, I could think, I think, um of a number of uh of gains. I would say that one of the great gains was uh the fact that we had uh developed a consciousness of the rest of the world. Uh we don't like it very much, but I think young and old alike today are thinking more of the world as a whole and less of their own particular part of the world.

[Clark Eichelberger:] And willingness to take responsibility uh for long far away parts of the world I think that what happened --

[ER:] I don't think I can say that we do it willingly. I can only say it's been forced upon us and that we do it.

[Clark Eichelberger:] That's right, but it seems to me Korea is a great symbol of that.

[ER:] Yes, I don't even say that we willingly are doing uh what's being done in Korea. I can only say that um we accepted what seemed to be the only thing we could do if the free nations of the world were not to

be constantly threatened by aggression, [Clark Eichelberger: Exactly.] and so we accepted the responsibility that we otherwise uh certainly we would never have accepted.

[Clark Eichelberger:] I think that um that growth of the world conscious-- consciousness is the-is the greatest gain. I have on my wall of my office an autographed photograph of Aristide Briand, where he says there isn't one piece for America, one piece of Europe, or one piece for Asia, but only one piece for the entire world. And uh troops of sixteen members of the United Nations are now fighting in Korea, I think, because that realization has been--has been forced on them you say they haven't done it gaily with bands and it's been a very hard task, but we have faced up to such a task, and our willingness to fight for the preservation of peace anywhere in the world I think is the greatest gain since the war.

[ER:] I think that's a great gain on-on the um on the side of world conscious. Then I think, perhaps, at home um it's a little harder to see what the gains are at the moment, but I think perhaps the gains are the gradual realization by the people that they cannot depend solely for the solution of their problems on leaders, that they must accept some of the responsibility. Now that again is the acceptance of responsibility.

[Clark Eichelberger:] Exactly, and the great debates that have been going on in the last few months uh have given the people a greater sense of realism and a sense of participation, I feel, despite their disastrous effect abroad.

[ER:] Well now, I would like to ask you something which you and I are very much interested in. What would you feel have been the gains and perhaps the failures of the United Nations in the last six -- well, the last five years?

[Clark Eichelberger:] Well, you could answer that very much better than I can, but I'll give my impressions because I am anxious to see if you will agree with them. Uh first place, I -- putting aside the growth of conscious and consciousness we have just disposed of -- I would that say the shift in the center of gravity of the United Nations from the Security Council to the General Assembly. In other words, you know there were some people right after San Francisco that said the United Nations must be changed and it has to be changed by changing the text of the Charter. Uh you and I and our association were very proud that you were a board member have taken the position at the United Nations must grow by evolution, we couldn't change the Charter at the moment. Well, I think by interpretation by changing no text except the rules of procedure, the United Nations has moved farther than it could have been contemplated by changing the text of the Charter in San Francisco.

[ER:] Yes, because I don't think you could have gotten it changed, and I think this way, through the development of necessity, you have got a much more democratic method being used [Clark Eichelberger: Exactly.] in the United Nations through the General Assembly.

[Clark Eichelberger:] A member of our delegation at San Francisco told me that we shouldn't advocate the United Nations military force because there is nothing in the Charter um to provide for it. But the liberal interpretation is that if isn't prevented in the Charter it can be done, and now our own government has suggested -- your own delegate has suggested a United Nations legion, and I would say, uh I'm sure that you feel very strongly on this point, the work that is being done by the specialized agencies.

[ER:] Oh, I feel that is that I think has advanced understanding among nations more than any other activity of the United Nations. [Clark Eichelberger: And it has--] World Health, UNESCO, um Food and Agriculture. I think they have really by the actual work they've done, small as their budgets are in many cases, have done an enormous amount to increase uh understanding between the nations.

[Clark Eichelberger:] You know, Mrs. Roosevelt, I feel that the world community is not only made by uh a world conscious and willingness to fight for peace everywhere in the world. A world community also means a people sufficiently civilized that they'll be kindly, that they will do something for people beyond bare necessity. I-I -- the other day, I was talking to Tom Power who just came back with Adriaan Pelt from a moment in North Africa, in Libya. At the moment some people from the US Department of Agriculture under the auspices of the United Nations are teaching Libyan boys, 105 of them how to sort wool, so that can pick out the best strands for a rug-making industry. Now that's a certain kindness that goes through the specialized agencies and economic work of the United Nations that uh means a great deal. And then uh I would certainly say the uh work, and here you have been the pioneer, the work of the United Nations for human rights. At the moment where there is still a great part of the world where people fear the knock on the door at midnight. For this world to have the courage through the General Assembly to adopt a Declaration of Human Rights and to be so far in the Covenant of Human Rights. Historians may say with the perspective that we don't have now that that was a greatest contribution of the United Nations to date.

[ER:] Well, I think it is a great contribution, though I feel we are very far from realizing an actual practice the human rights that we have tried to put into words both in the declaration and now in the Covenant, and um I think it's going to be a very difficult thing to get ratification of the Covenant because so many of the rights um of a type which have never been considered before as legally possible of expression. And uh I think we're going to have a good deal of trouble, but I think the mere fact that we are studying and working on it is in itself a tremendous step forward.

[Clark Eichelberger:] Well, to paraphrase a statement of one of our forefathers, in both the Declaration and the Covenant you have raised the standard by which all men must repair.

[ER:] Well, I think that's true. I think they have raised the standard, and um I I think it will take a long while. But I would say that perhaps the organization that is doing the most immediately fruitful work is the World Health Organization. [Clark Eichelberger: Mhm, I--] I think there you get an immediate result which does create better understanding.

[Clark Eichelberger:] Would you put that ahead of the Food and Agriculture organizations? That isn't a fair question, they supplement each other.

[ER:] That is very hard. They come so nearly side by side because, of course, the right, the freedom to produce enough to eat is the first freedom. I haven't any-any question about that. But then freedom to-to know enough about ordinary sanitation so that your children don't just die like flies after they're born of preventable causes, [Clark Eichelberger: Yeah] that is almost a second uh first freedom so to speak [Clark Eichelberger: Right]. I-- well now so what do you think were the failures?

[Clark Eichelberger:] Well, I would say that -- I would say that the two greatest failures one could go on and list many. One is that the United Nations is not yet been able to heal the breach between East and West. I would balance that by saying that if it had not been for the United Nations, I believe that the breach would have widened into a chasm and by this time we would be lost. But um I would say the failure yet to heal the breach between East and West. And then a corollary of that: the failure to reverse the rising tide of armaments and the economic regimentation that tremendous military preparedness. Of course, you and I supported this. It's necessary to build up the forces of the free world, but I say in balance it's not been achieved.

[ER:] Well, I would say, of course, that it was uh a very sad thing that split between the East and West had forced upon us something which we undoubtedly did not intend should happen. We intended to reduce armaments, and in order to keep peace we are now building them up, [Clark Eichelberger: Right.]

and that seems to me a very sad thing to have to happen. But on the other hand, I see no other answer until uh the world is prepared to actually uh not one -- not to allow one nation to interfere with another even uh ideologically. [Clark Eichelberg: Oh, I agree with you completely.] And therefore, um I think the failures are failures that we couldn't very well get away from at the present stage of development. The only thing we can hope for is to have sufficient uh social and spiritual development so that we will not be dragged by the present situation into the unfortunate situation of actually bringing on a war which would be a very sad result. Now I see that our time has come to a close, so I must thank you for being with me today and tell you how glad I was to have you here.

[Clark Eichelberger:] I enjoyed it, Mrs. Roosevelt.

[Break 37:18-37:28]

[Ben Grauer :] Mr. Clark Eichelberger was guest today with Mrs. Roosevelt, the well-known director of the American Association for the United Nations speaking from a background of many years of activity in national and international affairs, discussing with Mrs. Roosevelt the aims of his organization and some of the problems which beset the world in the international field. 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 director of the American Association for the United Nations, Mr. Clark Eichelberger. I think we might look, since this is Monday, look at the schedule for the rest of the week, where we find the usual variety of interesting personalities on Mrs. Roosevelt's guest list. Tomorrow our visitor will be Mr. Marion B. Folsom. Mr. Folsom is chairman of the board of trustees of the Committee for Economic Development. This committee founded some six or seven years ago by prominent leaders in national affairs and in the world of business has played a very important role in standing apart from the news observing it and then issuing its regular bulletins and reports on developments--economic developments and trends in the United States. Currently the Committee for Economic Development is interested in the problem of increasing America's efficiency and developing its strength in the defense mobilization of our nation so that we can answer the threat of totalitarian challenge from abroad, and at the same time make secure the economic strength of our nation and the richness of living for each individual and increased productivity of the American economic system. Mr. Folsom then discussing the activities of the Committee for Economic Development of Tuesday. On Wednesday we'll have the publisher editor of *Who's Who in the United Nations*, and on Thursday that delightful personality in the world of modern opera Gian Carlo Menotti, composer of *The Medium* and *The Telephone*. Mrs. Roosevelt and Elliott Roosevelt will be with you again tomorrow with Marion Folsom as guest and every day Monday through Friday from 12:30 to 1:15 p.m. This is Ben Grauer speaking.

[Break 39:56-40:02]

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Retrospect is sometimes good for the soul and it can point out where maybe sometimes we were wrong so that we won't make the same mistake again. Mrs. Roosevelt's guest today will review with her where the world has come in six years. Six years since the ratification of the United Nations Charter by the United States and other historic events. Now here is Mrs. Roosevelt and her guest.

[Break 40:28-40:37]

[Ben Grauer:] Friends, this is Ben Grauer speaking. Vegetable soup without vegetables: not so good. But when you serve Habitant vegetable soup, don't worry about finding vegetables. Habitant vegetable soup is generously blessed with all kinds of plump juicy garden favorites. And the broth is extra rich because it's made from the natural vegetable juices. Perfect seasoning and slow simmering bring out the heavenly flavor of Habitant vegetable soup. You'll also enjoy wonderful Habitant pea soup, the genuine old French

Quebec style pea soup, and tangy Habitant onion soup with its tender, juicy onion slices in a pure meat broth. Try and enjoy Habitant vegetable soup, Habitant pea soup, and Habitant onion soup. Get Habitant in the yellow can. Remember, Habitant soups have been granted the Good House Keeping Seal and have been tested and commended by *Parents' Magazine*. Now, here is Elliott with a question for Mrs. Roosevelt. (41:48)

[Ben Grauer:] Yes, Elliott, another part of our program and that means guest time coming up in a moment. But I'd like to take my regular look at the listening schedule for WNBC tonight. Particularly this Monday night which means Music Night on NBC, and there's a fine lineup of programs for lovers of music in varied moods tonight. At eight o'clock there's the *Railroad Hour*, the music story tonight is "The Big Top", a circus story with starring Gordon MacRae, Dorothy Warenskjold, and young film star Ted Donaldson, Common Dragons Orchestra and Norman Luboff Chorus. At 8:30 there's the *Voice of Firestone*, uh the guest today is that lovely, both vocally and visually lovely, soprano Eleanor Steber, and the program will include the "Czardas" from *Die Feldermaus*, "Summertime" from *Porgy and Bess*, and, of course, regular feature on *Voice of Firestone* is Howard Barlow conducting the Firestone Orchestra. Nine o'clock brings us the *Telephone Hour*, and I'm sure you've already seen in the advance listings as a high spot of the week the guest soloist is Ezio Pinza Vaso, and behind that that slim word Vaso, lies one of the most distinguished careers at the Metropolitan, sensational smash hit in the South Pacific, a trip to Hollywood, and now Pinza is back here in the East. Donald Voorhees and the Bell Symphonic Orchestra with Ezio Pinza at nine o'clock. Good summer time listening at 9:30 with the City Service Band of America. Henry Fillmore is the guest conductor, he will conduct the band in two of his own compositions and the male quartet is another feature of the program. And at ten o'clock comes the hour-long uh conclusion of our Music Night on NBC for Monday, the concert by the Boston Pops Orchestra. Samuel Mays is guest cellist, he'll play the [unclear term] for cello and orchestra, and of course, regular feature is Arthur Fiedler conducting the Boston Pops, and it's always a pleasure, speaking personally, for me to take position there as narrator of that distinguished musical program. There's the listening lineup of the musical program tonight warmly recommended for melodic, easy, summertime listening. Now here's Elliott to tell us about today's guest.

[Break 44:09-44:22]

[Ben Grauer:] Yes, it's almost midway mark in *The Eleanor Roosevelt Program* and time for our regular identification, 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. Today Mrs. Roosevelt's guest is Clark Eichelberger, director of the American Association for the United Nations. Before we return to Mrs. Roosevelt and Mr. Eichelberger, I'd like to bring you a little reminder from very good friends of ours and all Americans, The Red Cross. America has never owed a greater debt of gratitude to her war veterans. Through the American Red Cross we can express that sincere gratitude in services of real and practical value to the veteran. Your Red Cross serves our hospitalized veterans with entertainment, training in useful skills, helpful therapy, gifts that add to their comfort, and cheerful visits. From chapter workers and field director across the nation, veterans get Red Cross help with personal, family, and financial problems. Counsel and comfort daily saves some veteran, who could be your loved one, from tragedy. Very often the most important thing to the discouraged veterans is simply the living reminder through the Red Cross that we do care, that we are proud to give help to those who have served our nation. Remember this is your help to your veterans, you who are the Red Cross. Keep that help ever ready and available for the veterans who need it tomorrow by giving today through the 1951 Red Cross Fund Appeal. Mail your contribution to 315 Lexington Avenue, New York 16. That's 315 Lexington Avenue. Do it now, today. Here to continue our interview with Mr. Eichelberger, here again is Mrs. Roosevelt.

Transcribed from holdings at Franklin D. Roosevelt Library (FDRL)
File(s): 72-30 (214)

Transcription: Ruth Tornell
First Edit: G. Smith
Final Edit: Seth LaShier

The Eleanor Roosevelt Papers Project