

NOT FOR PUBLICATION, BROADCAST, OR USE ON CLUB TAPES

BEFORE 0315 D.B.S.T. ON

MONDAY, APRIL 5, 1943

THIS EMBARGO SHOULD BE RESPECTED OVERSEAS BY PREFACING
ANY MESSAGES FILED WITH THE EMBARGO

THE TOOLS OF FUTURE PEACE - AN ADDRESS BY A. A. BERLE

Reading, Pennsylvania, Sunday

Mr. Adolf A. Berle, jnr., U.S. Assistant Secretary of State, today told members of the Rotary Club that "in union, the United Nations, grouped around the United States, Britain, Russia and China, will be invincible in war," and that the "same union, carried forward into peace, will make possible the reorganisation of a peaceful world."

He warned against Axis propaganda which attempts "to create, in Britain and in the United States, fear of Soviet Russia." They were helped, Mr. Berle said, "by troublemakers" in both countries "who like to circulate wild stories, always without evidence, that public officials are not sufficiently friendly to Russia."

Mr. Berle's address to the Rotary Club follows:

The State Department is the country's first line of defence. It meets foreign problems long before they become acute. It endeavours so to handle affairs that world peace shall be promoted, American interests protected, and the future made as secure as the situation permits. The State Department must make arrangements so that the work of our fighting forces are as easy as possible. When peace approaches, it must bring into existence those agreements which are most likely to make for an enduring peace.

The American State Department has no secret agents. Its work is done in the open. The proposals it makes are submitted to the public opinion of the country, usually through direct submission to the Congress of the United States. We never have gone in for the practice of foreign affairs as described by popular fiction writers. The State Department is the smallest and least expensive department in Washington. Anyone has a right to ask us what we are doing, and everyone gets a prompt and clear answer. I am proud to have been a member of the department during the past few years. I think the record would show that, as the world war approached, the country was as well prepared diplomatically as American processes permitted.

Let me give a single illustration. When the Nazi and Japanese war lords in all seriousness concocted their mad scheme to conquer the entire world, we had reason to believe that the United States of necessity would be part of their plans of conquest.

On the Atlantic side, with which I have had most to do, you would find there are two great avenues of attack on the United States. One of them is called, in our trade, the "northern bridge". This is the passage from the Continent of Europe to England, from England to Iceland, from Iceland so to the North American continent.

The other great avenue of approach is sometimes called the "Atlantic narrows". This is the narrowest part of the Atlantic Ocean and lies between the shoulder of Africa, with Dakar at its point, and the shoulder of South America where lies the Brazilian city of Natal.

These are two arms, encircling a huge Atlantic lake. Under the old rules of land and naval warfare neither of these passages was dangerous. But some of us who have studied aviation, and particularly the rise of the German Luftwaffe, felt that both of these passages could be used by a determined enemy for surprise thrusts at the United States. If we had time to make arrangements and prepare, of course these thrusts could be blocked. But if we were not ready, we should find the enemy on our

/flanks - and the

flanks - and the whole Nazi plan of campaign was to thrust before the enemy was ready and if possible, to prevent him from being ready by fifth column activities, propoganda, dirty politics, and every other method known to these evil men. We know, now, that the Nazis planned attack by both routes.

We tackled both problems.

If you followed the news as events took place, you will recall that from 1936, at the Buenos Aires conference, to the present, President Roosevelt, Secretary Hull and under Secretary Wells, and the State Department worked steadily at bringing the other American Republics into a unified plan of defence of the hemisphere. We offered our aid and full cooperation. By 1939, before the war broke out, we had every reason to believe that any Nazi thrust across the Atlantic narrows from Africa towards South America, would be met with stiff resistance; and we firmly expected to be there, helping.

On the northern side, we endeavoured to strengthen the hands of the British. We had an added reason for doing this. Alone among the great powers Great Britain had not waited for an attack by the Nazi and Fascist powers. She guaranteed the existence of Poland, and served notice on Hitler that if he continued his career of world conquest he would have to fight not only weak antagonists but England as well. When war did come, in September 1939, we gave to Britain such assistance as we could, and shortly thereafter began an all-out rearmament programme of our own.

When in April 1940, almost exactly three years ago, Denmark was invaded, with the assistance of the Danish minister in Washington, we began discussions designed to give us the right to protect Greenland. We set up a joint staff group to work out a common defence of Canada. We undertook the defence of Greenland, and shortly after, first with the British and later alone, we in full agreement with the Icelandic government took over the defence of Iceland. This made safe the northern bridge.

The fall of France in 1940 had left Britain alone - the only country to oppose the Nazi forces then raging unchecked on the continent of Europe. Britain for a century has been traditionally, our friend; and she also is the great island fortress lying athwart the northern bridge. During the summer of 1940 we rushed supplies for the defence of Britain by every means in our power. Both in honour and in self-interest we could have done no less.

At that same time we took note of the fact that though France had been conquered, the great French empire in North Africa had retained a certain amount of freedom of action. We went to work to make sure that North Africa did not enter into the German orbit. The French government at Vichy of course was virtually imprisoned by the Germans and was being led by cajolery and threat towards the Axis camp. Until an allied army landed in Europe, not very much could be done except to hinder and delay the Germans, and this we did at Vichy. But in North Africa, we could make connections in the hope that that great territory would one day rejoin the liberty-loving countries of the world.

In terms of defence this meant added protection against a German thrust in the direction of South America. In terms of ultimate victory it meant the possibility of entry into the Mediterranean for allied armies and planes.

Thanks in part to these operations, and in greater part to the bravery of the British people, both the northern bridge and the southern narrows are now secure.

With the landing of our troops in North Africa last November, that operation was complete; and with it the character of the war changed. The Nazi attackers were now forced to the defence. Instead of being able to strike at will, they can be struck at will - which is not nearly as much fun.

This brief bit of history may serve to give you some idea of the kind of thinking and work the State Department has to do. You will recall that it has not always been easy. There were those who attacked us for being unduly friendly to Britain - and I think those critics know now that they were wrong. There were those - there still are - who attacked us for fighting a rear guard action at Vichy instead of abandoning old Marshal Petain outright to the Axis. There were others who criticised our maintaining our staffs in North Africa instead of leaving the field clear for the Germans.

/Most

Most of those people realise now, I think, that the policy followed was wise. Certainly the hundreds of thousands of American boys who landed in North Africa know that it was sound policy to work things out so that resistance there was slight, and so that they could get at the business of fighting the Axis who is our enemy, instead of fighting Frenchmen who are not.

This kind of work has to continue until the war is ended. But besides this, the State Department has the primary responsibility for working towards the agreements on which an ultimate peace must be made. In speaking of this I do not wish to give the impression that the war is nearly over. It is clear that Germany has wholly lost the war. But to say that Germany has lost the war does not mean that we have yet won it. The toughest part still lies ahead - a road of blood and sorrow which we must travel relentlessly to the victorious end. In justice to our children, we can do no less. We cannot condemn another generation to do this all over again a few years later.

The accords of peace must be submitted to the processes of American public opinion. Their bases are simple, and they are well understood. There are four great freedom-loving powers in the world. They are the United States, Great Britain, Russia and China. On these four the great structure of a re-organized and peaceful world must inevitably rest.

With Britain we have the ties of a friendship which has been uninterrupted for nearly a century and a half. This is partly due to the friendly understanding which exists between peoples which speak the same language, and which have, beyond all others, the great tradition of democracy. But this friendship has likewise been founded on the fact that in final analysis, British interests and ours have run together. The thing that was best for the United States was likewise best for Britain. We have been stiff competitors in trade - and both of us have prospered on competition. We have toughly argued questions of commercial policy. And probably will do so again. But whenever a crisis approaches, our two great countries draw together automatically.

A strong and victorious Russia is also necessary to the United States. Let me give a bit of history here which ought to be better known in America. If you follow it you will see that in the last century and a half, the existence of a strong Russia has proved a major guarantee of American safety. In the days when Napoleon attempted to conquer the earth, his plans included a large slice of the western hemisphere. He was never able to realise those plans, principally because a strong Russia which was not partial to his schemes made it impossible for him to divert sufficient force to make good his conquests; and the defeat of Napoleon began with his retreat from Moscow, just as the defeat of Hitler began with his retreat from Stalingrad. Again, during our civil war, certain European countries showed a dangerous desire to take advantage of our misfortune and to seize territory in the Americas. One of them actually set up a Hapsburg Emperor on the throne of Mexico. At that time the Russian fleet stood by, thanks to the wise diplomacy of Mr. Seward, then Secretary of State, acting under the guidance of Abraham Lincoln. This discouraged other European nations from taking advantage of our own tragic struggle, and safeguarded the American continent. Again in the war of 1914, the Russian pressure on the east front undoubtedly prevented Germany from crushing France as she did crush France in 1940. The time which Russia then bought for the Allies at the expense of her own men and blood made it possible for Britain, France and the United States to meet the Germans in the north of France and roll the German armies backward to defeat.

Finally, the Russian resistance during the past 20 months has without doubt proved the turning point in the present world war. Both Britain and we would have been hard put had Russia abandoned her resistance in 1941 and 1942.

I think it is thus clear that Russia is an essential part of the chain of American history. This does not mean that we have always felt that we should care to adopt the Russian form of Government. We were not interested in the Czarist Government at the time of the Napoleonic wars, or at the time of the Civil War. We were glad when the Russians liberated themselves from the rule of the Czars. Americans are not communist, nor ever likely to be. But we recognise that Russia's form of government is a matter for Russia to choose; and none but the ignorant fail to recognise the many advances made for the Russian people by the Communist Government.

The fourth great cornerstone is, of course, China. She is the oldest and proudest representative of the Asiatic peoples, with a majestic history. She has also been a power for peace; and a steady friend of freedom-loving forces in the Western World. She has met the rise of Japanese militarism with a steadfast resistance like that of Washington at Valley Forge. Under impossible circumstances she has stood off one of the strongest of modern military powers.

/Friendship

Friendship between China and the United States is, and must be the sheet anchor of our policy in the Pacific Ocean. Wisdom, justice and mere common sense require that China shall be the great eastern power in the framework of peace. With these four are the gallant company of the 30 United Nations -- and of certain of these a special word must be said. When a great country resists another great country, it hopes and intends to be victorious. But when a small nation fights against overwhelming power for its liberty, the immediate result is terrible catastrophe. It must expect to be overwhelmed by impossible odds. It must rely on the tenacity of its people, continuing to resist even after its enemy has conquered its armies. It must place its faith in the victory of freedom-loving peoples, and in the justice of the world. Many of the United Nations are small countries, weak by military standard, but everlastingly strong in patriotism and in spirit. In combination, their resistance, heroic beyond measure, has made possible the victory we hope to attain.

In union, the United Nations, grouped around the United States, Britain, Russia and China, will be invincible in war. It is my conviction that the same union, carried forward into peace, will make possible the reorganisation of a peaceful world. No one nation can maintain peace by itself, just as no one nation can make itself safe by its own efforts. The attempt to do so would exhaust even the strongest country, in a short space of years. It follows that we must work out ways of staying together; and our success in doing so will be the greatest guarantee we can give our children that they, in their mature years, will not go through the travail of another war.

For that very reason, our enemies have used every trick of propaganda to endeavour to create division among the United Nations. From reports reaching us, we know indeed that the Nazis and the Japanese warlords have already lost faith in their ability to win a military victory. But they hope to escape the stern justice which awaits them, by dividing the freedom-loving countries, and achieving a compromise peace. They will fail, of course; but we know the methods they expect to use. One such method is the attempt to create, in Britain and in the United States, fear of Soviet Russia. This is based on the fact that both Britain and the United States are not communist, and that their civilisations are firmly built on individualist lines, instead of on the collective model. Vague rumours, accordingly, are spread of huge imperial plans supposed to be harboured by Soviet Russia, in the hope that fools will thereby slacken aid to the Russian arms. These efforts of Nazi propaganda are often helped by trouble-makers; for both in Britain and in the United States there are meddlers, or loose thinkers, or plain liars, who like to circulate wild stories, always without evidence, that public officials are not sufficiently friendly to Russia.

In Washington we know both kinds of rumours, very well. I make two piles on my desk every morning, one of them is for the type of letter that says "beware of Russia", -- coming usually from some misguided person who has heard some propaganda scare story. The other pile is for the type of letter or report which says that there is a plot or conspiracy among public officials to hamstring Russia -- again, usually from well-meaning but misguided people who have swallowed propaganda from people who, for reasons of their own, want to create trouble between the Russians and ourselves. The latter type, recently has frequently been built around tales that Britain, or the United States, or various officials in one or the other, were engaged in constructing buffer states against Russia, or in building belts of states designed to be hostile to Russia, known by the French name of "Cordon Sanitaire".

Of course, the briefest look at the facts swamps both kinds of propaganda. Soviet Russia, when she is victorious, as she will be, and when she has cleared her lands of Nazi troops, as she will, faces a titanic job in rebuilding her own country. She will not, in our judgment, become then the victim of any urge to seize great additions to her already huge empire. What she will want - and ought to want -- is safety and security for her own country, which has been invaded by barbarians, with the bloodiest results, twice in twenty - five years. In her reconstruction she will be entitled to all the co-operation we can give; and while she is fighting, the limit of our help is the limit of our capacity. The military operations which have taken place have been of material assistance; and I

/am

am convinced that they will be increasingly useful.

The other story which relates to buffer states is built on the idea of "buffer states" used to be dear to the secret diplomacy of a few countries set up to keep apart great powers which could not get on. Today, the idea of a buffer state is as dead as a dodo. You can't build "buffer states" in air warfare. Any buffer state, or any belt of buffer states, built around Russia could be flown over by a modern air force in a few hours and probably demolished in a few hours.

The other typical propaganda line is the story that Britain is scheming to plot to seize the trade of the world, and that America must beware. That Britain is a trading nation, she will need all the trade she can get to make up the damage done her by German bombs. American businessmen themselves, for they hope to have expanded trade when the war is over. But neither Britain nor the United States is able to exclude the other from the world markets; and neither could if she could. The record shows that when British trade expands, ours expands, and that when the prosperity of either country fades away, both countries suffer. Britain is one of our best markets; just as the United States is one of the best British markets. We are far more likely to collaborate than we are to exclude.

We can dismiss, I think, the lies circulated by propagandists and troublemakers. We must, indeed; for we have a great deal of very serious and difficult work to do. The job of building, patiently, quietly and technically, a world peace, is beginning now and will probably last a long time. The guiding principles are very simple: world peace must be insured; world commerce must be kept moving; world opportunity must be kept open.

While the principles are simple enough, the actual task brings in a huge range of questions. They will emerge in general discussion from time to time. Some of them you already know: we are at work on the simplest steps of economic cooperation.

The United Nations, in this case at the initiative of the United States and Great Britain, have begun to exchange ideas on the subject of stabilised currency. If commerce is to revive, there has to be some kind of stable money to make commerce possible.

Discussions are about to begin on the problem of food -- a problem which interests everyone of us, and will do so even more as war takes its toll.

Preliminary studies are being made looking towards a solution of the vast, new problems opened up by civil aviation. These three discussions are merely the forerunners of a great number of questions which will have to be discussed by experts who can state problems and suggest solutions, and placed before public opinion so that a true meeting of minds may be had. The nature of all of the various problems may change or shift as the war goes on; but we are making sure that the hour of victory will not find us unprepared.

I am sure that, in spite of the vastness of the task, we shall achieve a great measure of success, the American continents have written a happy page in international history through experience in cooperative action between the twenty-one republics and between the United States and Canada. The development of the great inter-American experiment through the years, has reached the point where we had achieved peace with empire, and where the smallest nation on this hemisphere could cooperate with the largest without fear. An equally happy page has been written in the development of the British family of nations, the Commonwealth which includes Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the Union of South Africa. Here are nations independent yet bound together by common ideals, common interests and common desires.

The pressures of war have brought these great groups of nations together; and have brought them into ever closer relations with the peoples of Europe and of Asia. In our own lifetime we have seen the problems of organisation and peace solved between these huge groups. We have reason to hope that they can be solved with other nations and groups of nations as well.

Below these huge problems are always people -- your family and mine, our various friends; boys and girls getting through school, getting married, getting jobs, raising families; mature men and women bearing their part; older men and women, nearing the sunset of life.

No one can look soundly and sensibly at foreign affairs unless he looks straight through the screen of governments and diplomats and treaties and pacts, and sees clearly the million of people, known and unknown, who are striving to live, to work, to serve their country and their kind, to be themselves.

The object of all this huge struggle must be greater security and great opportunity for all of these people, even to the least. When we realise this, it is plain that the selfish interest, the narrow nationalist, the trickster who wants a cheap advantage, the imperialist who wishes to seize the countries of others, have no permanent place in modern history.