



Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

MS-4787: Abba Hillel Silver Papers, 1902-1989.

Series II: Harold P. Manson File (Zionism Files), 1940-1949, undated.

Sub-series A: Main Manson File, 1940-1949.

Reel
106

Box
37

Folder
302

Brewster, Senator Owen, 1946.

(FOR RELEASE PAPERS OF AUGUST 30th)

Hartford, Connecticut: Thursday evening, August 29, 1946.

Statement by Senator Owen Brewster (Republican) of Maine
in opening discussion at America's Town Meeting of the Air
on

Subject: WILL AMERICA PROGRESS MORE UNDER
REPUBLICAN OR DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP?

Leaving the discussion of the discord and dissension in Democratic ranks on domestic issues and the resulting chaos and confusion to my very competent colleague Congressman Brown of Ohio I wish to address your attention to the same disastrous difficulty in foreign policy.

Discussion of the possibility of a third World War goes on apace and the mothers of America are vitally concerned.

Avoiding war is the supreme challenge of statesmanship.

I do not charge as did Congressman Clare Booth Luce of Connecticut that a Democratic administration "lied us into war" or even "led" us into war.

I charge rather (and this statement certainly is not subject to challenge) that the Democratic party has not "kept us out of war."

Twice in our own generation America has entrusted the Democratic party with power and twice under these Democratic administrations we have found ourselves involved in worldwide wars at a tremendous cost in American lives and resources.

In each instance these wars came after four to eight years of Democratic administration of American foreign policy and within one year after reelection won on a platform of "keeping us out of war!"

That is the record.

I do not say any patriotic American of any party would deliberately plan to get us into war. I say the Democratic party obviously failed in its endeavors to keep us out of war.

Napoleon in selecting his generals asked whether or not they were lucky and the American people surely have ample evidence that the Democratic party is unlucky in its endeavors to keep us out of war.

In this respect the Republican party has been more fortunate since in fifty years under Republican administration the nation was not once involved in any world wide war.

If we agree with the Honorable Harold Ickes that "War is the result of stupid statesmanship" then we must apportion some measure of responsibility to those in authority when the tragedy of war arrives.

To the extent that America has any foreign policy today chief credit must be given to Senator Arthur Vandenberg, Republican, of Michigan. The Vandenberg speech following the collapse of the London Conference of Foreign Ministers set the pattern for American policy since that time - however feebly pursued.

All too slowly the administration comes to grips with the realities of world affairs. Only in Japan today does the American flag command the respect due America.

What is our policy in South America? Is it the historic policy of the Good Neighbor first outlined by James G. Blaine, a Republican Secretary of State, and implemented so successfully by Cordell Hull and Sumner Welles?

Or is it the policy of Spruille Braden as Assistant Secretary of State for South America who undertook most unsuccessfully to purge Peron in Argentina and picked the wrong horse also in Brazil - the two most potent South American Republics?

Maladministration of our occupation policy in Central Europe is the great tragedy of the post war era.

Palestine and China are today the two most explosive spots on earth.

What is our policy in China? Is it to keep the "open door" of John Hay and Henry Stimson against any European or Asiatic aggressors? Or is it to be the policy of Democratic Senators Taylor and Ellender who demand our withdrawal from China thus permitting Russia to take over the Orient in flat contradiction of the policies being pursued by MacArthur in Japan?

One year ago this very week President Truman requested of Great Britain the admission of 100,000 Jewish refugees from central Europe into Palestine in accordance with the obligation of Great Britain under the Mandate of the League of Nations and its solemn treaty with the United States negotiated by Calvin Coolidge.

Yet more than one million displaced persons in central Europe are still today - one year later - dependent on American bounty for even a crust of bread and Ibn Saud, the synthetic sheik of Saudi Arabia, threatens us with war altho his only weapons are those given him by Great Britain or the United States.

During this year while Great Britain continues "the repudiation of a solemn obligation" - to quote the words of Winston Churchill - America has loaned Britain four billion dollars and this last week loaned Ibn Saud ten million dollars - presumably to assist in his preparations for war on the United States if we continue to insist on the fulfillment of the solemn pledges of both the Democratic and Republican platforms in the last campaign promising an open door in Palestine for Jewish immigration.

Now we are told by Bartley Crum, Presidential Commissioner on Palestine, that each time the President makes a statement of American policy on the Middle East members of the State Department advise the Arabs to pay no attention as the policy will not be carried out.

Acting Secretary of State Dean Acheson issues a denial whereupon Mr. Crum offers to give the official numbers of the secret communications he has seen in the State Department files supporting his charges.

It would now seem incumbent on whoever is running our State Department to reveal these messages or to resign.

This all adds up to a bewildered donkey with one crowd of so-called New Dealers belaboring the poor animal to go much faster in the direction of totali-
old fashioned
tarian and world government and the other crowd of ~~so-called~~ Democrats hauling back on the bit and insisting he go slow.

How can the country be otherwise than confused and paralyzed by these contradictions exactly as France was rendered prostrate by the division in counsels in its government before its surrender?

Napoleon said one bad general was better than two good generals. Today the Democratic party has two hundred generals adding to the confusion of counsel.

In the Republican party Senator Vandenberg has spoken for a foreign policy made in America and not in London or in Moscow.

Senator Vandenberg's clear cut and courageous declarations on American foreign policy have met with the overwhelming support of Republicans and Americans generally and indicate the character of leadership offered by the Republicans in foreign affairs. The difficulty with their implementation by the administration has been in the weakness and vacillation with which they have been applied.

Who is the Democratic party? Bilbo and Rankin obsessed with white supremacy or Pepper and Taylor who want us to surrender to Russia.

The President purges Slaughter in Kansas City with the aid of the PAC and the Pendergast machine and Senator Pepper at once proposes the purge of President Truman as far too conservative.

All this adds up to confusion in counsel and resultant paralysis in action which is even more dangerous in foreign than in domestic affairs because as Harold Ickes says "war is a result of stupid statesmanship."

Without discounting or denying the historic divisions in the Republican party there is abounding evidence that there exists today within the Republican ranks a far more united approach on foreign and domestic policies alike than within the ranks of the opposition.

Senator Vandenberg has been accepted as the Republican spokesman on foreign policy as shown by the almost unanimous vote of the Republican Senators on the United Nations' organization.

The Vandenberg voice will undoubtedly be determinative on questions of foreign policy in the next Republican administration. There speaks the voice of America in its perception of our needs and our opportunity to help in building a better world without sacrificing America in the process.