

THE ELEANOR ROOSEVELT PROGRAM

June 7th, 1951

Description: This recording was produced while ER was in Paris. In the opening segment, ER reads a listener's letter regarding foster care. In the following segment, ER and Elliott respond to a listener's question regarding political corruption. In the interview segment, ER discusses the Marshall Plan and the rebuilding of Europe with Milton Katz, a United States special representative to Europe.

Participants: ER, Elliott Roosevelt, Ambassador Milton Katz

[ER:] How do you do? This is Eleanor Roosevelt speaking. We are continuing with the programs which I recorded while I was in Europe attending the United Nations Human Rights Commission meetings.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Today Mrs. Roosevelt's guest is Ambassador Milton Katz. He is a special representative in Europe for the United States and a Roving Ambassador for the Marshall Plan. We are very proud to present Ambassador Katz in this recorded interview from Paris, and you'll meet with him shortly. Now before the usual discussion period between Mother and myself, let's stop for a moment and listen to some very sound advice from the announcer.

[Break 0:49- 0:58]

[ER:] Today I'd like to take a few minutes to read another interesting letter sent to me in connection with the foster parents broadcast last April. It is from Louise Lesser of Brooklyn, New York, and she says: "Dear Mrs. Roosevelt, to begin with, may I thank you for the interesting program you so ably present. This letter is in reference to the foster parents program on May 7, 1951. The reason I decided to express my opinion and offer a suggestion, for what it is worth, is because matters relating to human welfare are of first importance, and the welfare of children not only touch us emotionally, but have social and economic impacts. This has developed our baby clinics, milk stations, child study groups, specialists in child psychology, et cetera, adding up to what is known as pediatrics. At the same time, another social phenomenon has developed: the matter of a longer lifespan and what to do about this at sometimes a disguised blessing, geriatrics. And still another strange development, a peculiar cleavage between the generations due to economic and social changes brought on by the war conditions. These past thirty years, shall we say, where homes have dwindled, housekeeping for the greater part taken out of the home, and the idea of three or even two generations sharing a home is looked upon by our specialists in these fields as paramount to cannibalism. At the same time, I read that a Cornell University-that at Cornell University a study on imposed retirement according to pre-geriatrics ideas on old age, sixty or sixty-five years, is the death knell for many vigorous persons still capable of and willing to continue at some useful needed work.

What appalls me is the glaring gap between our scientific findings by different groups as if they were working on different planets and their application to all fields of human relations. As a matter of fact, we're always about one hundred years behind our own development. It is time for a non-scientific person, just an all-around rough-and-tumble person, experienced in living, to take over and coordinate these specialists. And I'm serious. Trained efficiency experts can't see the problems for their own restrictions. They were trained on past problems; life consists of immediate and tomorrow's problems, as any old fashioned housekeeper-mother knows, as you, Mrs. Roosevelt, very well know. Here we have a scientific foster parent setup that isn't aware that some couples of sixty or even sixty-five are better fitted to care for and love a lonesome, helpless waif, or group of such children, than some couples of fifty who are eligible. We have all at some time seen grandparents left with motherless babes, and the care and love

they lavished on these children. Some years ago I wrote about the human waste of older people, set aside as useless furniture in an attic, dying from lack of being needed, feeling unwanted and unloved, waiting for the end, on one hand. And the love-hungry children in institutions, who could each have a grandma or grandpa if only these institutions were arranged with ideas relating to human beings. I brought out the fact that these older people would find in themselves great resources of long-forgotten abilities, and little children would get care and individual attention they so sorely need. I can hear an uproar of the scientifically-trained; it doesn't have to upset schedules or interfere with discipline. In fact, it could be arranged so that all concerned would profit. But I see the experts are catching up with the rocking chair. All the new ideas aren't any more perfect than the old ideas were all wrong. With best wishes for your good health and continued activity for many years beyond the accepted retirement age [ER laughs], I am sincerely yours, Louise Lesser."

[Break 5:30 - 5:56]

[Elliott Roosevelt:] In Paris, Mrs. Roosevelt, has concluded her interview with the Roving Ambassador for the Marshall Plan, Ambassador Milton Katz, another of the noted personalities whom she's brought to a microphone in her overseas tour. Now, here is a message from the makers of Joy.

[Break 6:15 - 6:21]

[ER:] How do you do? This is Eleanor Roosevelt speaking to you from Europe where I'm attending the meeting of the United Nations Human Rights Commission.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Today Mrs. Roosevelt's guest is Ambassador Milton Katz. He is a special representative in Europe for the United States and a Roving Ambassador for the Marshall Plan. We are very proud to present Ambassador Katz in this recorded interview from Paris, and you'll meet with him shortly. Now before the usual discussion period between mother and myself, let's stop for a moment to listen to some very sound advice from the announcer.

[Break 7:02 - 7:11]

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Mother, our letter for today comes from Mr. James A. Palmer of Hollywood, Florida, who has some comments on one of our previous discussions. In his letter he says: "In this morning's discussion, you lamented the fact that the recent law limiting the president to two terms makes that right - - takes that choice uh right of choice away from the people. You certainly know that the people are a trusting and gullible lot, that many of them are like putty in the hands of the dishonest, clever politician. How then, are the people to be protected if not by laws? How are the people to know that tens and hundreds of thousands of dollars corrupt elections, buy appointments, et cetera? How are they to know the scandalous bribes and luxurious furs [Elliott Roosevelt laughs], expensive home appliances, which figure in the news and of which conditions, incidentally, are uncovered merely through some accidental leak. In these critical times, especially, are we to indulge in the sophistry of what people and conditions ought to be, rather than deal with them as they actually are? To be sure we need more enlightenment in our duty of selecting the right men to guide our ship of state. But don't we also need more and more laws to discourage such greed in some of our so-called statesmen? Uh I think that uh your comments on this will be very, very interesting." (08:49)

[ER:] Well, in the first place I think the um abuses which he mentions um are [ER clears throat] not actually, uh, majority things. They are usually individual cases which come out, um, because they are unusual. [Elliott: Mhm.] If they were the run of the mill thing, they wouldn't come out because no one would think of reporting them. They are, for the most part, unusual things which have come to somebody's notice, therefore, somebody's brought it out. [Elliott Roosevelt: Well now--] But I personally

feel that even if, as he says, the people are a gullible, uh lot and unable to make their own decisions, um, I don't agree, you see. I disagree with him completely on that. I don't think the people are gullible. [Elliott Roosevelt: Mhm.] For a long time I think they're perfectly able to, they might be fooled for a short time, but I think they're perfectly able to make their own decisions. And I don't like the habit of making laws on things which should be the decisions of the people, and which, when made, should be observed because the people really believe in the laws. You can't ever enforce a law that the people aren't willing to enforce, and if the time came when the people wanted for one reason or another to rename a man in spite of the law that there would only be two terms um the people could upset the law because the-- all the power in this country stems from the people and not from a law or from-- we- we are an abi-a law abiding people just as long as our people are that kind of people and no longer.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] And now to go back just a little bit in your observation with regard to the fact that things that come out are uh of malfeasance in office are rather unusual, what about the uh recent crime investigation as conducted by Senator Kefauver, which report shows that in many, many areas of the United States, what this man writes, the people-- that there are tens and hundreds of thousands of dollars corrupting elections and buying appointments. That it is actually happening uh in many, many parts of this country and that to a very large extent the underworld, the criminals that are in our midst, are enjoying a very great control in the political picture of our country. (11:53)

[ER:] Well, the contributions to political machines are made not because those people in the underworld are particularly interested in uh the type of government and the-the top officials, or any kind of officials, except those who touch their particular interests and business. And therefore, they make a political contribution to a machine so that they will keep in power people who are willing to let them operate whether it's a- a uh, speakeasy in the time when we had Prohibition law, or whether it's gambling i- illegally, or whatever it may be, but that only affects a very small section of the people, and um you would not find that all the officials uh were vulnerable. You would only find that here and there certain people had been picked out and possibly, their election made-made possible through a contribution in order that they might be the subservient one in a-in a group who would be able to do what the particular interests of the underworld required. Well now, you fight that by fighting the underworld's power. You don't fight it by saying that your whole democratic system is uh rotten to the core. You know that um people, very respectable people, have thought for a long while that it was um uh quite all right to try and gain a sufficient amount of power uh to uh accomplish the ends they wished. As long as the way they gained it was legitimate within the law. [Elliott Roosevelt: Mhm.] And sometimes that within the law is quite as bad as without the law.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Now let me ask you a question. On the whole you think that uh government as such is conducted uh on an honest, straightforward basis. Uh what would you think of uh a man being [ER: Let's put it--] able to stay in office who has been very seriously challenged. I'm thinking particularly of uh former Mayor [William] O'Dwyer, who is Ambassador to Mexico and has been very seriously challenged by a responsible body, this investig-- Crime Investigating Committee of the United States Senate led by Kefauver who, incidentally went out of his own way, being a Democrat himself, to challenge the honesty of the administration of this man.

[ER:] Well, let's put it this way: I think you will find that the average individual in a government position is personally honest. I think you will find that um a machine uh may sometimes do things which uh are dishonest because of their need for money to run or because they think they can use certain people with interests and that it's impossible to uh stamp out something which human nature uh, like for instance, gambling, and therefore you might as well um get something out of it. I've heard that argument a good many times from people who were the-the mach-in the machinery of organizing politics. That doesn't mean that the individuals holding office are dishonest. Very often they don't know anything about it. And um it's only when it is brought to their notice that either they have to have the courage or they have to

build from the outside the power, and sometimes they're not big enough to do that. Um now you asked me directly about uh Mayor O'Dwyer. I have not seen anything which has made me actually believe that Mayor O'Dwyer was proved to be personally dishonest. I think it was proved-- I think what was--

[ER and Elliott Roosevelt overlap]

[Elliott Roosevelt:] There was-- there was no question of proof uh here uh charges been made.

[ER:] The charges been made. Well, I don't believe anyone should be removed from office or should be, um, uh, questioned in holding office until there is proof of his having done something which was personally wrong. If that is proved, uh then that's quite a different question. I would, however, say that I think many politicians, particularly where they deal with machines, are bound to know that things go on but they don't know how to prevent them. Now, you take Mayor LaGuardia. He was an extremely honest and very diligent in trying to stamp out things. If he had been successful, there would've been much less of it today. He wasn't successful and uh yet you couldn't have had a more diligent and courageous person, and--and therefore I think you have to realize that it's the individual citizen's morality that really sets the standard. When the day comes that every time one of us sees something we think is wrong and reports it immediately and makes a lot of fuss about it, even though it makes it very disagreeable for us and gives a lot of trouble, that day we'll begin to have better government.

[18:08] [Elliott Roosevelt:] All right, I hope that this has been a uh s-sufficient answer to the letter, which was written in to you from Mr. Palmer, and I see that we must now go on to another part of the program, and we'll turn our program over for the moment to our announcer.

[Break 18:26 18:35]

[Elliott Roosevelt:] From the Paris studios of the Radiodiffusion Francais, the French Broadcasting company, Mrs. Roosevelt brings you another distinguished guest who is in Paris on an important mission for the United States. Mother, will you tell our listeners who this guest is and introduce him, please?

[ER:] Thank you, Elliott, I'm happy to do so. Ambassador Milton Katz is Special Representative in Europe for the United States and the Marshall Plan's Roving Ambassador. It gives me great pleasure to present to you Ambassador Katz.

[Milton Katz:] Mrs. Roosevelt and Mr. Roosevelt, it's a very great pleasure for me to be here with you today.

[ER:] Now we can begin our questions, Mr. Ambassador. I am wondering if it's correct to say that, in effect, the Marshall Plan has come to an end.

[Milton Katz:] I should say that, fundamentally, it is correct. That is uh the Marshall Plan, as you know, had been originally conceived as a four-year program. And I think for once, or perhaps, for this time, the democracies have not been too little and too late, but have finished a four-year program in somewhat under three years.

[ER:] Well now, could you sum up for us what the expenditure of some twelve billion dollars has meant to Western Europe and to the United States? Has it been a worthwhile investment and has the money been well and wisely spent? It's rather hard to ask you that, I think, but still I, for one, would like to know!

[Milton Katz:] Well, I make no pretense to be an impartial witness in answering that question [ER laughs]. But I like to look at it this way, Mrs. Roosevelt: twelve billion dollars means what for the average American? Roughly, there are some thirty million families in the United States with a head of

family who we may think of as an actual or a potential taxpayer. That would mean that twelve billion dollars represents for each of these families an expenditure of four hundred dollars, four hundred over a three year period, roughly the cost, let us say, of a television set. And it seems to me that from the point of view of each of these heads of families, he should ask himself whether what he got for those four hundred dollars was worth to him as much as, let us say, a television set, or anything else that he might have bought for four hundred in a three year period. Now speaking as one such head of family, the answer to me is perfectly clear. In 1947, when the prospective Marshall Plan was first announced, we faced a Europe that was beset by hunger and dislocation, poverty, and confusion, and as such was a forcing ground for potential aggression, potential war, and for communism. As of today, we have a Europe with its economy greatly strengthened, its morale greatly lifted, a Europe which has a substantial degree of internal stability, and which is now able to arrange itself alongside of us in the protection of the-of the free world. Now if that isn't worth the equivalent of at least one television set to the average American, I'd like to know what would be.

[ER:] Well, that-that's a [Elliott Roosevelt: Excellent example!] a very good answer, I think. Well now, we'll go on! We know that the Marshall Plan has done much to increase the production of the vital elements of defense: coal, steel, electric power, chemicals, oil, and so forth. Will this increased production permit rearmament to go forward with less of a pinch in the general standard of living than otherwise would've been necessary? (22:13)

[Milton Katz:] Emphatically, yes. As a matter of fact, if the European economy today were in the condition in which we found it when we began three years ago, no armament program would've been possible at all for Europe. As of today, she's well able to undertake a substantial armament program without impairing her standard of living in such a degree as to make it untenable, either politically or socially.

[ER:] Well that's uh that's a real uh-uh good hard fact, I think, for us to be grateful for because unless Europe had been able to carry this, in the long run we'd have had to carry it all alone –

[Milton Katz:] It seems so to me.

[ER:] If we hadn't uh had some allies over here to begin the struggle, uh we would've been the frontier.

[Milton Katz:] It seems so to me. Of course, I don't want to suggest that when we started the Marshall Plan in 1948, what we had in mind then was to strengthen Europe for potential military activity. [ER: Certainly not]. The armament is something that's been forced upon us by subsequent Soviet aggression. The fact is, we began to strengthen Europe because we wanted a sound and healthy Europe. The effect, not the purpose, but the effect has been to create a Europe which is able to align itself up with us as an effective ally.

[ER:] Well, sometimes I feel that all the different names of the defense and economic agencies which are working to the same end in Western Europe, such as the ECA, OEEC, NATO, SHAPE, et cetera, are a bit confusing. What is being done to see that America's objectives are carried out with some kind of coordinated teamwork?

[Milton Katz:] Well, I should think these initials would be confusing to the public. In fact, sometimes we ourselves get lost-- lose touch [ER laughs] and wonder what a new initial means. We here in Europe have tried to bear one thing in mind at all times, and that is that we can only afford one United States government in Europe, and that at all costs we must so handle our jobs that there is one United States government in Europe. Now we've -- that represents the guiding principle of our work. We have given effect to it by establishing a group which has another name, and I hesitate to inject still another new name,

but this is a rather simple one. This is called the European Coordinating Committee. Apart from the name what it means is this: that each American in Europe who has responsibility on a Europe-wide or regional basis, such as Ambassador [Charles] Spofford in London who is our Chairman in the Council of Deputies, Mr. [William] Batt who is with the Defense Production Board, General [Thomas] Handy who's in command of United States forces in Europe, General [Cortland] Schuyler who represents the American element in General Eisenhower's international headquarters, and I [clears throat] meet systematically and regularly once a month. We meet in rotation in London, in Heidelberg, which is General Handy's headquarters, and in Paris. Our staffs are in constant touch with one another, we're in constant communication with one another, and our whole purpose is to make sure that we represent one closely-knit American team in Europe. (25:36)

[ER:] That's uh wonderful coordination; we don't often get such good coordination as that when there are different types of things going on. Well, there's been a great deal in the European-European newspapers, especially those in France, about the Economic Cooperation Administration's sponsored productivity program. [Elliott coughs] Would you tell us just what is this program to raise production in Western Europe and what devices it employs?

[Milton Katz:] Well, the program seems to me to go to the heart of the problem of Western Europe and perhaps to the heart of the problem of the free world today, confronted as it is, [Milton Katz coughs] by the need to build up its defenses against, uh, actual and potential aggression by the communist forces, and at the same time, keep steadily in front of our people the prospect of a decent and affirmative future. Now I think again I'd like, if you permit me, to go back to some statistics and try to make them meaningful

[ER: Mhm.]. Uh by productivity, of course, we mean output production per hour of work for individual worker. And here I use worker in the broad sense to include professional people, managerial people, anybody who works. Now the uh per capita, the man hour productivity of Europe on the average, has run- has been running, about one quarter that of the United States. Now just think what that means. Uh, we have a, a term called Gross National Product, that's another five dollar word, but what it is, is the value of all the goods produced and all services rendered in a community in a given period. Europe's Gross National Product for one year has been running at about a hundred thirty five or a hundred forty billion dollars a year. That means that the total value of all the production and all the services in Europe, in free Europe, of course, uh in the course of a year, is about that. Now if Europe's per capita productivity were the same as that of the United States, its gross national product in any year would be somewhere between four hundred and twenty and four hundred and fifty billion dollars. That is to say, it will actually produce and have available for more than three hundred billion dollars worth of goods of all sorts more than it has now. Suppose that European productivity could close just one third of that gap. That is to say, suppose we could bring Europe's productivity one third of the way toward the productivity of the United States, that would mean that each year she would have available for distribution another one hundred billion dollars' worth of steel and coal and clothing and shoes and copper and if necessary guns or bread. And that would mean that she could carry, you see, a very large armament program and still actually add to her standard of living. (28:43)

[ER:] Well now, is this, what's the reason for this? Because certainly the people of Europe are as skilled in their work as the people of America. Now is it lack of machinery? Or what-what's the reason?

[Milton Katz:] It's a- it's a great variety of factors, Mrs. Roosevelt. In part, and perhaps in the most fundamental sense, it's a psychological thing. Uh for instance, uh if-- someone once asked me why is it that American productivity is so much higher than French. And in a desperate attempt to explain it, I said for the same reason that the French cook better than we do. It's built into the whole structure of a society.

[Elliott Roosevelt: Mhm.] But there are some factors that you can put your finger on. One is that the United States, the possibilities of production in the United States, are projected against a very, very large market of one hundred fifty million people, and one of the reasons why we in the Marshall Plan have pushed so steadily toward what we have called economic integration of Europe has been that we wanted to make it possible for Europe's manufacturers and farmers and working men to be able to use their imaginations and plan their production on the assumption that any seller could sell his goods anywhere in Europe and any buyer could buy goods, the best goods available, anywhere in Europe. In addition to that, we have had a program of technical assistance, which was an attempt to show European labor and European management some of the techniques of management and techniques of labor relations which we have evolved in the United States. I've given you a rather long-winded reply on this, but I really think we're coming close to the heart of the business. And of course, I want to mention one additional thing when I talk of the psychological factor. The state of management and of European labor is such that when you talk to them about increased productivity, they're likely to think of it as somehow, something that's going to interfere with their lives. A large part of European labor is afraid that increased productivity means speed up and loss of jobs. One reason why we're so anxious to bring them into contact with American labor is that they can learn a set of labor relations which understands that increased production means a higher standard of living and not loss of job. And if you permit me to say one more thing on this enormously important subject, I think that we should bear in mind, we in America, that among the things which American society and American culture had developed, which are profoundly important, are not only American managerial skills but American labor relations. I think we have devised something there, something has evolved out of our free society which is enormously meaningful in the most practical, as well as the moral sense of the term. And that's some of the things which we're trying to get across to our friends here in Europe. (31:43)

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Thank you, Mr. Ambassador, and, Mother, if you don't mind, I'm going to interrupt at this moment in order for our announcer to have a word, and then we'll come right back to Ambassador Katz and this all-important subject.

[Break 31:56- 32:04]

[Elliott Roosevelt:] And now we come back again to our uh interview between Ambassador Katz uh and Mother, and I believe that uh there's a great deal of information which uh we would still like to get out of Ambassador Katz which will be of enormous interest to our audience, Mother.

[ER:] Ambassador Katz, I'd like to ask you one more thing. When you talk um about this gap between the productivity of the United States and Europe, isn't, perhaps, the fact that there have been increasingly uh a number of wars [ER laughs] that have actually been fought on the territories of the people of Europe, in their homes and in their fields -- uh isn't that, perhaps, one of the things which saps vitality and possibly makes it harder to face up to uh a modern world and um increased production and all the modern ideas that we are trying to-to-uh get across and which we have accepted because we haven't had any interruption in going right ahead and learning about them.

[Milton Katz:] I think that's true and I think that's a terribly serious factor. After all, consider what I have been talking about. None of what-- none of the things that I have described are possible [Milton Katz coughs] unless people are able to plan for the future. Now that uh planning uh means that the farmer must be able to plan for new crops which won't come in for two or three years, and management must be prepared to install new machinery which won't yield a return for two or three years, and working men must be prepared to take on training and readjustment programs. Now when you're living under the shadow of war and with a bitter memory of war, where it's very, very difficult for you to have any faith in the future more than six months ahead of you, it really saps all your impulse to do better work right at the start. And that, you know, brings out something that I think is terribly fundamental. I know some of

our friends in Europe, many of them, have tended to think of armament, and this organization for defense, as somehow or other an interference with the processes of economic recovery and the attempt to build a better standard of living. In a sense, of course, it is, but that's only if you assume that there is no such thing as the menace of war. Given the actual menace which these people all feel, given the threat of aggression, the whole economic life in Europe is weighed down by this incubus of fear. And armament, a building up of Europe's military strength is needed not only to protect uh freedom and security, but also to create a bulwark behind which people can again believe in the future, believe that it's possible to plan for more than six months or a year, and so do the things that are necessary if they are to have a higher standard of living. [35:13]

[ER:] Yes, I think that's a great factor. Well now, I just wonder what your feeling is as to whether the free nations are winning the battle against communism in Western Europe. Uh how would you appraise the record to date and the outlook for the future?

[Milton Katz:] Well, as Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record!" Every single political election that has taken place in these countries in Europe in the past three years has been one in which the communists have lost ground. That's the political side of it. Of course, one of the great places where the communists have concentrated their attack has been in the great labor unions. And while they still represent a very serious menace in the great labor unions of Europe, the fact remains that they have also lost ground steadily in France, in Italy, [Elliott Roosevelt: Mhm.] and in other key places. On the moral side it's important to remember that we won the successive crises of Berlin. It's important to remember that a year and a half ago, Greece was in the grip of guerilla warfare, and Greece is now secure. It's important to remember that in Turkey we have had a magnificent revolution, peaceful and quiet from a dictatorship to a democracy. It's perfectly clear to me that in the fundamental moral and human and political and social sense, we have been winning the fight against communism in Europe. I don't mean by that that the fight is won, but I certainly mean that we have been winning. (36:40)

[ER:] Well, that's a comforting thought because um uh that, I think, will stabilize the Europeans themselves. And one question which everybody um is worried about in America, and I'm sure that Europeans are worried about it too, is the question of whether the European people have the will to defend themselves against possible aggression or whether they'll just say, "We can't bear another war, and we'd rather have anyone rule the country as long as um we don't have a war." And I think in America you get, sometimes, among the people the feeling that they're entitled to know whether their allies on this side of the water really have the will and the vitality to fight for their own security if they have to do so. Now you must uh have com--a comparison in your mind on that and what do you think about it?

[Milton Katz:] Well, I think this, Mrs. Roosevelt. I think the question is a very serious one which Americans have every right to ask. I think it's very important to approach that question in the right way. Well, perhaps I shouldn't say the right way. There is a way in which I think the question must be approached. As I see it, Europe is a battle ground, and it has been a battle ground for the past five years. It's a battle ground quite as genuinely as Korea. It's an exceedingly important battleground. We've been fighting in Europe in the political arena, the psychological arena, the propaganda arena, the economic arena, and in many cases, by actual shooting, like the guerilla warfare in-uh in Greece, and of course, there was the blockade in Germany. In this vital battle ground we have allies, and who are our allies? Our allies are all those Europeans whose roots in the great moral tradition of the West are firm, and who have enough energy to be able to act. And we have an enemy, that's the communist. And we have neutrals, and who are the true neutrals?

The true neutrals are all those Europeans whose roots in the great tradition have been withered by events, or who, while they still retain a fundamental belief in the great tradition, because of misery or condition or circumstance or poverty or fear aren't able to muster up the energy to act. And the job of the American in this fight, as I said before, it's a fight in which we have been winning, our job is to organize

ourselves and our allies, in the sense in which I have defined, to win the neutrals to our side, to go forward to consolidate the position we have already won, and to go forward and complete the job. To say that there is some doubt as to whether we will win, which is true, to say that there is some doubt how as to how some of these people in Europe will act in the long run, which is true, is not to say that you abandon an absolutely vital battleground when you're winning and when you have, in that battleground, millions and millions of Europeans who are your genuine allies. Those are the terms in which I see it. In other words, to put it in practical terms--in the most practical terms possible, to me the real question isn't "Will these people fight?" To me, the real question is 'how do you create the conditions and circumstances under which you make sure that they'll fight?' And the point of view of Americans who have a practical tradition, and have a problem with which they have to deal, that's the way I think you have to look at it. (40:23)

[ER:] The only way, really, to create those conditions -- and that, of course, is a wonderful reply of yours -- the only way really to create those conditions is um to create conditions in which, perhaps, war will not come about because uh none of the free people really want war. American's don't want it. Europeans don't want it. Clearly, the purpose of American aid and the rearmament in North Atlantic Treaty countries is to avert war and to try to secure peace. What is your judgment as to the prospect of success in this objective?

[Milton Katz:] Well, obviously, uh what will really happen depends, to some extent, on the mind of the Kremlin, and I certainly don't propose to join the ranks of those who've tried to guess what goes on in the mind of the Kremlin. It seems to me that as-as practical people, and as moral people who believe in the future, we have to assume that we can succeed. I'm satisfied that on the record we have at least a reasonable chance of succeeding. And I also believe that the course we have been following in Europe is the right course to assure the peace and to succeed, if it's humanly possible to do so.

[ER:] That's a wonderful note to end on, and I thank you very much for being with us and for giving your valuable time to come on this program, Mr. Katz.

[Milton Katz:] Well thank you, Mrs. Roosevelt and thank you, Mr. Roosevelt.

[Elliott Roosevelt:] Thank you, Mr. Ambassador.

[Break 41:51 - 42:03]

[Elliott Roosevelt:] July 25 is the cutoff date for educational benefits under the G.I. Bill of Rights. There is still time to train for the many good jobs now opening up. A thorough informational bulletin, available free of charge, tells all about it. Just drop a penny postcard to the Public Information Department, City College, Midtown Business Center, 430 West Fiftieth Street, New York City, for your free copy. That's the Public Information Department, City College Midtown Business Center, 430 West Fiftieth Street, New York City. Do it now while there is still time. This is Elliott Roosevelt speaking and reminding you that you've been listening to the *Eleanor Roosevelt Program* which comes to you each Monday through Friday at this same time. Today's program was recorded in Paris and we wish to thank the French broadcasting system for making their facilities available to us.

Transcribed from holdings at Franklin D. Roosevelt Library (FDRL)
File(s): 72-30(172)

Transcription: Donna Ra'anan-Lerner (Reformatting by Meg Brudos)
First Edit: Anna Karditzas
Final Edit: Seth LaShier

The Eleanor Roosevelt Papers Project