

The Journal of Commerce (New York)

Nr. 13498

**KENNEDY IS SLATED
FOR POST IN LONDON****Reciprocal Trade Pact,
Debt Settlement, Among
Issues to Be Faced**

WASHINGTON, Dec. 9 (UP).—The expected nomination of Chairman Joseph P. Kennedy of the Maritime Commission as Ambassador to Great Britain was viewed tonight as part of a broad program to solidify Anglo-American relations and to stiffen this nation's entire foreign policy in the face of world unrest.

The White House, the State Department and Chairman Kennedy were silent on the nomination, but close associates of the forty-eight-year-old banker, financier and close adviser to President Roosevelt, said it probably would be sent to the Senate within a fortnight. Quick confirmation is anticipated. He conferred with President Roosevelt today.

Bingham Ill

Mr. Kennedy was offered the London post several weeks ago when the health of America's present Ambassador to the Court of St. James's Robert W. Bingham, Louisville, Ky., publisher, began to fail. Mr. Bingham is now at Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore.

The proposed London shift became known soon after William E. Dodd had resigned as Ambassador to Germany. He is expected to be succeeded by Assistant Secretary of State Hugh R. Wilson, one of the shrewdest members of the diplomatic corps and a close student of and an expert on European politics.

Faces Four Problems

Four immediate problems would face Mr. Kennedy in London. They are:

The proposed Anglo-American reciprocal trade treaty; Anglo-American relations in the light of the Rome-Berlin-Tokio axis, and the Sino-Japanese crisis; war debt settlement; stabilization of currencies.

There was speculation that Mr. Kennedy might carry with him war debt and currency stabilization recommendations from the White House.

The reciprocal trade treaty, however, is being discussed, pending formal negotiations, and Mr. Kennedy could be depended upon to provide the President and the State Department with complete and accurate reports on European political realignments which play such a vital part in this Government's foreign policy.

Duplikat

A 22 g 2^a Ver. H. v. A.

09407-0002-000

Kennedy, Joseph P.

**Hamburgisches
Welt-Wirtschafts-Archiv**

Signatur

Datum 13. Dez. 1937

The Journal of Commerce (New York)

Nr. 13500

***Choice of Kennedy
Mystifies Britain*****Theory Holds He Will Seek to
Ease Reciprocal Trade Agree-
ment Problems**

LONDON, Dec. 12 (UP).—Britain's political and financial circles were mystified tonight by the apparently imminent selection of Joseph P. Kennedy, dynamic business man, as United States Ambassador to the Court of St. James.

Since the days of the literateur, James Russell Lowell, the job has been more decorative than active.

An explanation, advanced only privately, is the theory that both President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Cordell Hull are conscious of the active resistance of the powerful federation of British industries to the proposed Anglo-American trade pact and so decided to send the New Deal's proven trump negotiator and trouble shooter to iron out expected difficulties.

The reputation of Mr. Kennedy, now chairman of the National Maritime Commission, as a glutton for work has preceded him and has been stressed in the British press, which has excluded the idea that he is coming for a "cushy" job.

The press apparently has taken the appointment for granted, although it has not been confirmed.

"If it is officially confirmed that America's choice has fallen on Kennedy, known on the other side of the Atlantic as the President's No. 1 business man," the conservative Morning Post said, "this country will regard the selection as the highest compliment President Roosevelt could pay Great Britain."

"There is hard business to be discussed if the projected Anglo-American commercial treaty is brought into being, including satisfactory arrangements with the Dominions."

The Commercial and Financial Chronicle (New York)

Nr. 3785

J. P. Kennedy Nominated Ambassador to Great Britain H. R. Wilson Named Ambassador to Germany to Succeed W. E. Dodd, Retired—J. E. Davies Transferred to Belgium and N. H. Armour to Chile

President Roosevelt yesterday (Jan. 7) announced several appointments and changes in the Diplomatic Corps. The President sent to the Senate the nominations of Joseph P. Kennedy, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, to be Ambassador to Great Britain; Hugh R. Wilson, Assistant Secretary of State, to be Ambassador to Germany; Joseph E.

Davies, Ambassador to Soviet Russia, to be Ambassador to Belgium, and Norman H. Armour, Minister to Canada, to be Ambassador to Chile.

Mr. Kennedy, who prior to becoming Chairman of the Maritime Commission, had headed the Securities and Exchange Commission, will succeed the late Robert W. Bingham, whose death on Dec. 18 in Baltimore was referred to in our issue of Dec. 25, page 4052. Mr. Kennedy is at present in San Francisco where he arrived yesterday. Assistant Secretary of State Wilson was nominated by President Roosevelt to succeed William E. Dodd, who resigned from the Berlin post early in December. Mr. Dodd had held the post for four and a half years. He returned to New York on Jan. 6 aboard the United States liner Washington, and was scheduled to leave this city last night for Washington.

Mr. Davies will succeed Hugh Gibson as Ambassador to Belgium sometime next Spring, and it is rumored that Mr. Gibson will be transferred to Spain as American Ambassador there. As Ambassador to Chile Mr. Armour will replace Hoffman Philip, of Washington, recently retired. The following Associated Press account was from Washington, last night (Jan. 7):

Mr. Kennedy, 49-year-old native of Boston, long has been a close friend of the President. His was a colorful career in business as a banker and corporation executive between his graduation from Harvard in 1912 until Mr. Roosevelt drafted him to organize the SEC in 1934.

He resigned in 1936 to return to private business, but was chosen early in 1937 to assume the difficult task of building up the nation's merchant marine as Administrator of the new subsidy act.

Mr. Davies was named to the Russian post more than a year ago when William C. Bullitt was transferred from Moscow to Paris. There had been rumors for some time that Mr. Davies, whose wife is the former Marjorie Post, was seeking a transfer.

Mr. Wilson is 52 and a diplomatic career man. After serving three years as chief of the division of current information at the State Department, he was named Minister to Switzerland in 1927.

He was secretary of the conferences for limitation of armaments at Geneva from 1928 to 1930 and was a delegate to the general disarmament conference at London in 1932. He is a native of Evanston, Ill.

Mr. Armour also has a long diplomatic record. Born in Brighton, England, in 1887, he took degrees at Princeton and Harvard and later practiced law in New Jersey before entering the foreign service in the American embassy at Vienna.

He has been counselor of embassies at Tokio and Paris and was Minister to Haiti five years ago. He was named Minister to Canada on May 29, 1935. He is a resident of New Jersey.

Kennedy, Joseph P.
Signatur P

09407-0004-000

Datum 14. Jan. 1938

The Journal of Commerce (New York)

Nr. 13526

**Kennedy Confirmed
As British Envoy**

WASHINGTON, Jan. 13 (UP).—The Senate late today confirmed the nomination of Joseph P. Kennedy of New York as Ambassador to Great Britain. It also confirmed Hugh R. Wilson of Illinois and Norman Armour of New Jersey to be Ambassadors to Germany and Chile, respectively.

Kennedy will resign the chairmanship of the Maritime Commission to become envoy to the Court of St. James.

Kennedy, Joseph P.
Signatur *J*
Datum 15. JAN. 1938

09407-0005-000

The Commercial and Financial Chronicle (New York)

Nr. 3786

United States Senate Confirms Nomination of Joseph
P. Kennedy As Ambassador to Great Britain

The United States Senate confirmed on Jan. 13 the nomination of Joseph P. Kennedy to be Ambassador to Great Britain, succeeding the late Robert W. Bingham. On the previous day the nomination of Mr. Kennedy was favorably reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Mr. Kennedy (who is at present Chairman of the Maritime Commission) was named as Ambassador by President Roosevelt on Jan. 7, as was noted in these columns Jan. 8, page 198.

Kennedy, Joseph P.
P

Signatur.....

09407-0006-000

Datum 27. Jan. 1938

The Journal of Commerce (New York)

15537

Nr.....

KENNEDY'S SAILING DELAYED FOR MONTH

Wife's Illness Postpones De- parture—Roosevelt Sees Grady on Vacancy

Departure of Chairman Joseph P. Kennedy of the Maritime Commission to become American Ambassador to Great Britain will be delayed somewhat owing to an appendicitis operation undergone by Mrs. Kennedy in Boston yesterday. It was learned last night. Friends of Mr. Kennedy indicated that he will probably remain in his present position until about the first of March. He previously had been scheduled to sail on the Washington, February 9.

Knowledge of this delay followed considerable speculation as to his possible successor in membership on the commission. Reports have been current for some weeks that President Roosevelt has asked Gerard Swope, president of the General Electric Co., to become chairman of the commission, at least until the expiration of the Kennedy term September 26. If this be true, it has been indicated in quarters close to Mr. Swope that he has not accepted the appointment.

Land Acting Head

More credence has been given reports that the vacancy created by Mr. Kennedy's departure may not be filled at once and that Commissioner Emory S. Land, who has served as acting head of the commission during Mr. Kennedy's frequent absences from Washington, will continue as acting chairman for an indefinite period.

Meanwhile, President Roosevelt has been asked to consider a number of names for the appointment and it has been learned that a list of persons deemed qualified to serve on the commission has been made up for the President by Mr. Kennedy. Identity of any of the persons mentioned has been kept a closely guarded secret, but it has been reported that it does not include any from the Pacific Coast.

Grady Supported

Representatives of the latter area, however, are pressing their claims for regional representation on the commission and cite many recent events tending to lessen the amount of American flag shipping serving West Coast ports as evidence of such need. Monday, it was reported here today, the President conferred with Henry Francis Grady, vice chairman of the Tariff Commission. Grady, a West Coast resident, is understood to have strong backing, including that of Senator William Gibbs McAdoo of California.

Other West Coast men being backed for the commission vacancy are Fred H. Marvin of Tacoma, Wash., and Ernest Johnson of San Francisco.

Kennedy, Joseph P.

Signatur

P

09407-0007-000

Datum

14. FEB. 1938

The Journal of Commerce (New York)

Nr. 13551

Kennedy Will Take Newsmen as Aides

(Special to Journal of Commerce)

WASHINGTON, Feb. 13.—When Chairman Joseph P. Kennedy of the Maritime Commission sails for England next week to become American Ambassador to the Court of St. James he will be accompanied by two secretaries taken from the newspaper world. Harvey Klemmer, who was formerly in charge of public relations at the State Department for the reciprocal trade agreement program and was once in charge of public relations for the American Steamship Owners' Association, and Harold Hinton of the New York Times Washington bureau will comprise his entire staff for the present.

Klemmer has been closely associated with Kennedy during the latter's service as head of the Maritime Commission and was in charge of the economic survey report upon which the commission's recommendation for legislative changes were based. It is understood he will retain his status with the commission. Hinton, who is assigned to cover the State Department, has been granted a year's leave of absence, a period which is reported to be about the length of time Mr. Kennedy plans to stay abroad.

Kennedy, Joseph P.

Signatur. P

09407 0008-000

Datum 19. FEB. 1938

The Journal of Commerce (New York)

Nr. 13556

Mr. Kennedy's Record

Joseph P. Kennedy yesterday resigned as chairman of the United States Maritime Commission to become Ambassador to Great Britain. It is timely, therefore, to appraise the record of his nine months' administration of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Unquestionably, Mr. Kennedy made several significant achievements. Perhaps most important was his ability to focus public attention on the shipping problem because of his colorful personality and the popular interest in his activities. Equally vital was the fact that he directed attention to the poor state of discipline among the personnel of American ships, and the need for immediate improvement in maritime industrial relations.

On other points there is ground for serious disappointment over the practical accomplishments of Mr. Kennedy's efforts to administer the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. While recognizing the urgent need for new ship construction, he reached the conclusion that existing private lines were not in position to proceed with such a program for the three following reasons:

1. Private shipowners cannot finance a new construction program unless they are reorganized and a number of consolidations take place.
2. The cost of construction of new vessels in American shipyards is excessive.
3. A number of modifications of the Merchant Marine Act are necessary before this legislation could effectively stimulate ship construction.

Mr. Kennedy leaned increasingly to the view that the Government must step in and build its own merchant fleet. This conclusion is diametrically opposed to the policy embodied in the Merchant Marine Act, which contemplates private ownership and operation.

If the modifications of the law suggested by Mr. Kennedy were enacted, and if the Maritime Commission were more liberal in dealing with private ship operators, there is good reason to believe that Government ownership would soon be proved unnecessary. But Mr. Kennedy preferred to drive hard bargains with the ship lines in the settlement of the ocean mail contracts and the negotiation of subsidy agreements. This weakened the ability of the lines to raise new capital, and made the launching

of a new building program so much more difficult. There is danger that Mr. Kennedy's successor as head of the Maritime Commission may go further with Government ownership, rather than the creation of conditions that would leave the merchant marine in private hands.

The labor problem also has yet to be solved. The Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation of the Department of Commerce probably could have solved this problem if left to itself. However, the Department of Labor, the National Labor Relations Board and even the Maritime Commission have interfered with and checked its efforts. Mr. Kennedy has proposed as a solution the establishment of a new Federal commission, to regulate maritime labor relations. This plan might complicate, rather than solve, the problem.

It is probable that no person could have placed the American merchant marine upon a sound basis within the short time that Mr. Kennedy headed the Maritime Commission. He has constructive accomplishments to his credit. However, it is to be hoped that his successor will reconsider the problem and adopt a more liberal policy toward existing shipping lines, so as to check the drift toward Government ownership that Mr. Kennedy encouraged in some measure.

09407-10009-000

Signatur

Datum 26. Feb. 1938

The Commercial and Financial Chronicle (New York)

Nr. 3792

Joseph P. Kennedy Sails for England to Assume Post as United States Ambassador to Great Britain—Letter to President Roosevelt Tendering Resignation as Chairman of Maritime Commission—Acceptance by President

Joseph P. Kennedy sailed for England on Feb. 23 on the United States liner Manhattan to assume his new duties as Ambassador to Great Britain, succeeding the late Robert W. Bingham whose death in Baltimore on Dec. 18 was indicated in these columns Dec. 25, page 4052. The nomination on Jan. 7 by President Roosevelt of Mr. Kennedy as Ambassador to the Court of St. James was referred to in our Jan. 8 issue, page 198, and on page 380 (Jan. 15) the confirmation of the nomination by the Senate was noted. In taking over his new duties Mr. Kennedy resigns as Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission. His letter to President Roosevelt tendering his resignation from that office, was made public as follows on Feb. 18, the date of its acceptance by the President:

My Dear Mr. President:

I hereby tender my resignation as Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, effective immediately.

I should like to report in relinquishing my post that the ills of American shipping had been cured and that the future is filled with promise. Candor compels me to say, however, that the shipping problem is far from solved, and that it is going to take some exceedingly strenuous measures on the part of the United States to preserve a fleet of anything like the present proportions in either foreign or domestic trade.

The present Commission has been in office about 10 months. We have endeavored to clear away the debris of the mail contract system, to evaluate the Merchant Marine as it is today, and to chart a course for its rehabilitation. There remain, however, several vital problems that must be solved before the United States can hope to get anywhere at sea.

One of the most disturbing problems with which the Commission has been confronted is the situation with regard to labor. The employer-employee relationship must be stabilized if American shipping is to survive.

The other major problem of our Merchant Marine is the urgent need for replacements. I have already discussed with you the dilemma presented by recent increases in shipbuilding costs. The Commission is making a careful study of this situation and will undoubtedly evolve a solution in the very near future.

I want to thank you, Mr. President, for giving me an opportunity to work on the shipping question. I hope that in my new post I may continue to merit your confidence.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH P. KENNEDY, Chairman

In accepting the resignation of Chairman Kennedy, the President wrote:

My dear Joe:

It is with real regret that I accept your resignation as Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission. This is tempered by the fact that you are staying in the family and taking over a new assignment.

I want to take this occasion to express my appreciation, so generally shared, for the fine work you have done. In both of your important Government assignments you have maintained your justly earned reputation of being a two-fisted, hard-hitting executive.

It may gratify you to know that in going to your new post, you carry with you our confidence and high wishes.

Very sincerely,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Before his departure for London Mr. Kennedy visited President Roosevelt at his Hyde Park (N. Y.) home, where the President had been staying since last Friday (Feb. 18). On Feb. 22 Mr. Kennedy was criticized by a group of C. I. O. maritime labor unions for his views on maritime labor as expressed before the Senate Committees on Commerce and Labor on Feb. 16 in Washington. Noting this, the New York "Times" of Feb. 23 said in part:

Mr. Kennedy's support of a program that would include the creation of an arbitration board for maritime labor along the lines of the Railway Labor Board was the principal target of the attack made by the New York Maritime Council. His defense of his views on the ground that American shipping had suffered severely from "quickie" and "sit down" strikes also was attacked.

The Council charged that compulsory arbitration, which would result from the operation of a board as proposed by Mr. Kennedy, would be tantamount to a denial to the seamen of their right to strike. It pointed out that agreements which the unions have made recently with ship lines provided arbitration of disputes by the parties to the contracts which it maintained was effective and satisfactory.

From the same paper on Feb. 24 we quote the following:

He departed on the United States liner Manhattan, manned 100% by American seamen, a majority of whom are members in the C. I. O. unions that have condemned him. Recognizing the presence of the man who directed the reorganization of Federal shipping policies, the National Maritime Union made it known that it would leave no task undone to present the merchant marine to Mr. Kennedy at its best.

His bedroom stewards, his dining-room waiter, the deck men and other members of the personnel coming in ordinary shipboard contact with Mr.

Kennedy will strive to demonstrate the efficiency and courtesy of American sea labor.

Interest in Shipping Continues

Mr. Kennedy, in a brief interview interrupted by scores of friends and associates who went to the pier to see him off, indicated that his interest in merchant-marine problems would continue officially in his new post. The merchant marine will be one of the important questions in the London Embassy, he said.

The new envoy talked at length with President Roosevelt at Hyde Park on Tuesday, but he denied yesterday that he had received "any instructions."

His five daughters and three of his four sons were at the pier to wish him bon voyage. John F. Kennedy, who is in Harvard, had caught cold while training for the swimming team and was not present.

Mr. Kennedy was accompanied on the liner by Harold B. Hinton, his new private secretary, and Harvey D. Klemmer, an aide of the Maritime Commission, who is being transferred to the Commission's London office. It was said that Mrs. Kennedy, who is recuperating in Florida, would follow in a few weeks.

In our issue of a week ago (page 1010) reference was made to a hearing on Feb. 4 before the Senate Commerce Committee on labor provisions of the pending maritime bill, and at the same time it was stated that the Committee on Feb. 2 made public a report of an executive hearing on Jan. 26, when Mr. Kennedy testified that the problem of how to get 500 merchant ships in 10 years as auxiliaries to the navy might partially be met by permitting the country's railway systems to build and operate merchant fleets.

09407-0010-000

Kennedy, Joseph P.
Signatur.....P

Datum 26. März 1938

The Commercial and Financial Chronicle (New York)

Nr. 3796

Ambassador Kennedy Declares United States Would Be Glad to Join in Peace Program—At Dinner of Pilgrims Society in London Indicates However Americans Oppose Entangling Alliances

Joseph P. Kennedy, who recently assumed his post as United States ambassador to the Court of St. James, speaking in London on March 18 at the dinner of the Pilgrims Society declared that "the United States desires peace, not only for itself, but for the rest of the world," and he added "it would be glad to join and encourage any Nation or group of Nations in a peace program based on economic recovery, limitation of armaments and a revival of the sanctity of international commitments." "We in the United States," he said "believe these three steps must be taken before permanent peace is assured." At the same time Ambassador Kennedy told the gathering that "it must be realized that the great majority of Americans oppose any entangling alliances," and he further said:

Most Americans insist that their country retain its independent and unmortgaged judgment as to the merits of world crises as and when they arise. This viewpoint has dominated the whole foreign policy of the United States and it endures to this day.

My country is unwilling to bind itself to any course of action in the future without an opportunity to examine the situation in the light which then envelops it.

It seems to me, to judge from conflicting and contradictory reports which reach us from abroad, that this attitude of the United States is not well understood. In some quarters it has been interpreted to mean that our country would not fight under any circumstances short of actual invasion.

That is not accurate, in my opinion, and it is a dangerous sort of misunderstanding to be current just now.

Others seem to imagine that the United States could never remain neutral in the event a general war should unhappily break out. That, I believe, is just as dangerously conceived a misapprehension as the other.

Both of these points of view have been expressed in Congress and elsewhere during the three years that our neutrality legislation has been under debate. But they emanate only from the extreme partisans on either side. The majority of our people, I believe, prefer the middle ground, as the Secretary Hull said yesterday.

Mr. Kennedy in his further remarks stated that "in the United States we want to preserve our present system by adding only such modifications as are needed from time to time to make it function more broadly in the general welfare. To President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull" he went on to say "there appears to be a remedy for the present impasse in world affairs. They call it economic peace. It is no panacea, to be sure. It is, moreover, difficult of realization, but it seems to offer ultimate hope of achieving a rational and enduring solution." In part he continued:

As we all know, Great Britain and the United States are even now trying to take a step together in that direction. This is an aspect of international relations in which America is prepared to take an active interest. We are acutely concerned with better economic relationships with the rest of the world and we have, I believe, amply demonstrated our willingness to collaborate with any Nation willing to do business on a fair, non-discriminatory basis.

In seeking to enlarge the flow of international trade, we must take care that our efforts are sufficiently broad. We must bear in mind that some stimulation of industrial production has been caused by the rearmament programs. Such stimuli cannot last indefinitely and we must now make economic provision for taking up the slack which may one day result.

I think no one of us would assert that we are out of the economic woods. Taxation has long weighed heavily on you here and it is a great burden in the United States. Expenditures for public works, armaments, unemployment relief and kindred items continue almost unabated in both nations. These things cannot continue indefinitely.

Sounder, more lasting methods must be found of assuring security to the average citizen that his job will remain his and that what he has accumulated by patient self-denial will not be swept away.

My country has decided that it must stand on its own feet, at least until regard for treaty obligations has again become fashionable. As a prudent guardian of his country's safety, President Roosevelt has urged a rearmament program.

In doing so he stated specifically that he knew of no one quarter from which danger is to be expected. He was actuated only by the obvious state of the world around us and the very apparent uncertainties of the future. His recommendation did not mean, by any stretch of the imagination, that he believes a general war to be inevitable. It was intended merely as a precautionary move in a time of general stress.

The United States has no intention of attacking any one. It does not expect to be attacked. It is now, and intends to remain, on friendly terms with every country in the world. If the force of events should make it impossible for us to follow this policy, my country will decide, when the time comes, what to do to preserve the welfare of its own citizens.

We expect that the rest of the world will do likewise. But surely it is not too much to hope that the collective intelligence of our two countries, together with that of the other nations, will seek and find a sure, permanent road to universal prosperity and peace.

In the earlier portion of his address Ambassador Kennedy said in part:

In taking up my duties here I am moved by one prime consideration. That is that we, of all peoples in the world, must be frank and straightforward with each other. I conceive it to be my duty to tell you, individually and collectively, as accurately as I possibly can, what is in the minds and hearts of my countrymen.

I hope to be able to tell the people of the United States, with equal freedom and honesty, what the people of Great Britain want and intend.

At this juncture of world affairs, it strikes me, the usual diplomatic niceties are not enough. I could talk to you for hours about the common heritage and the glorious traditions of the English-speaking peoples, but I believe we have come to take those things for granted.

Our two countries enjoy a relationship which is unique among the nations of the world. We should profit by that relationship. Few other nations can discuss their affairs without a mental reservation that war between them may one day be the deciding factor.

We are not compelled to weigh our words and actions in order to consider how they would affect our respective positions in the event of a conflict between us. Let us, therefore, avoid loose thinking and shun the use of subterfuge. We are friends, and as friends we should always be able to speak plainly, knowing that there can arise between us no misunderstanding that plain speaking will not clear away.

In that spirit, I feel that I should remind you of certain factors in American life which have a greater influence than some of you may realize on my countrymen's attitude toward the outside world.

We might just as well realize, at the outset, that the average American has little interest in the details of foreign affairs. One reason for this lack of interest is found in the ethnical and geographical peculiarities of our country.

Obviously, another factor of great importance at the present time is our own economic situation.

The average man wants to know whether he will be able to keep his job and his savings. The possibility of losing job and savings is of immediate and visible interest to him, whereas international developments, regardless of their importance, appear to be vague and far away.

When I was chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission in Washington one of the first things I had to do was make a comprehensive study of the operation of the various exchanges and speculative activities of our country. I learned, among other things, that speculation in foreign exchange is almost non-existent in the United States. The arbitrage dealers and the skilled professionals have this field practically to themselves.

Over here, men's minds inevitably incline toward their neighbor's affairs. In my country this is not true, and our collective interest in other nations is correspondingly less.

Ambassador Kennedy's speech was the first to be made by him since his arrival in London on March 2 to take up his new duties. His departure for England on Feb. 23 was noted in these columns Feb. 26, page 1341. His nomination as Ambassador by President Roosevelt on Jan. 7 was referred to in our Jan. 8 issue (page 198) and confirmation of the nomination by the Senate was reported on page 380 of our Jan. 15 issue.

Mr. Kennedy's wife and five of his nine children sailed on March 9 to join him in London. Ambassador Kennedy called on Prime Minister Chamberlain on March 4 and on March 8 presented his credentials to King George VI.

09407-0011-000

Datum 16. Juni 1938

The Journal of Commerce (New York)

Nr. 13654

KENNEDY IS SILENT AS HE SAILS FOR U.S.

Envoy Reported to Have War Debt Solution, Trade Pact Plan

SOUTHAMPTON, England, June 15 (UP).—Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy sailed for home today aboard the Queen Mary, silent amid a confusion of rumors that he was taking back a solution to the war debt problem and a plan for removing obstacles to an Anglo-American trade agreement to submit to President Roosevelt.

The Ambassador likewise remained entirely noncommittal on reports, current in American circles here, that he was returning to the United States in response to a "Kennedy for President" boom for 1940.

Believe Goal Reached

Mr. Kennedy's trip home ostensibly is to attend the graduation of his son from Harvard, but it was understood unofficially that he had accomplished the prime purpose of his Ambassadorial mission to England—a proposal for some kind of war debt payments and removal of obstacles to the Anglo-American trade agreement.

The Ambassador declined to comment on reports that he would resign his post if it appears, after his report to Washington, that his work is done.

Members of the American colony in England seriously discussed the purported "Kennedy boom," recalling that when he came to London early in March reports circulated that he regarded the Ambassadorship as a stepping-stone to the Presidency.

Among 100 guests who attended a dinner at the United States Embassy in London Monday night, including foreign ambassadors and British Government leaders, some were heard to say that "Kennedy is practically elected."

He refrained, as he boarded the Queen Mary, from discussing the advice and information he may offer Mr. Roosevelt but persons in a position to have authentic information surmised that he might try to "sell" Britain's new government and perhaps defend Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain's "realistic" efforts to reach appeasement agreements with Europe's dictators.

The tenor of what Mr. Kennedy may tell the President and the State Department might be deduced from what the Ambassador himself has described as his views on several occasions.

Holds U. S. Views Wrong

He was said to be convinced that United States opinion is wrong in so far as it suspects Britain of trying to buy peace at the expense of other nations.

He was represented as believing that Mr. Chamberlain is the first British statesman in a long time who is ready to pay for the agreements Britain wants.

Concerning Germany, Mr. Kennedy was reported to have shared the widespread impression that Mr. Chamberlain is ready to help Fuehrer Adolph Hitler get back some of Germany's war-lost colonies or at least replace them as part of a European new deal.

Ambassador Kennedy was said to be critical of the tendency of many Britons to expect too much from the United States.

He has told British statesmen and politicians that the United States refuses to consider any political entente with any foreign country.

09407-0012-000

3. Sep. 1938

Berliner Börsen-Zeitung

Nr. 412

Wen meint Kennedy?

Der amerikanische Botschafter in London, Kennedy, hielt anlässlich einer Denkmalsenthüllung für einen amerikanischen Bischof in Aberdeen eine Rede, in der er auch, nach kurzer Behandlung religiöser Fragen, auf politische Dinge zu sprechen kam. Er erklärte u. a., die Angelsachsen besäßen „noch gewisse, vielleicht veraltete, aber immer noch nützliche Eigenschaften, nämlich Achtung der Rechte anderer sowie die Heiligkeit eingegangener Verpflichtungen und schließlich echte Liebe für die Freiheit des einzelnen.“ Der Botschafter kam auf die Unruhen unserer Zeit zu sprechen: die Kämpfe und die Kriegsdrohungen rührten von der Ungeduld und der Unfähigkeit der Führer her, friedliche Uebereinkünfte zustande zu bringen. Diese Führer hätten den Eindruck, daß sie mit dem Vergangenen gewalttätig brechen müßten, in ihrem Eifer, das zu erreichen, was sie für die richtige Entwicklung hielten. Endlich erklärte der Botschafter, die Schwierigkeit scheine darin zu liegen, daß die Regierungen es nicht fertiggebracht hätten, in einem freundlichen und verständnisvollen Geist in den Anfangsstadien des jeweiligen Streitfalles zusammenzukommen, noch bevor die Angelegenheit sich psychologisch zu einer Frage von wirklicher Wichtigkeit entwickelt habe.

Wir kennen nicht das Milieu, in dem Botschafter Kennedy gesprochen hat, wissen auch nicht, wen er mit seinen Mahnungen, Hinweisen und Anspielungen gemeint hat. Wir haben nur Anhaltspunkte, um den Adressaten jeweils zu erraten. Was z. B. den Hinweis auf die „Achtung der Rechte anderer“ und auf die „Heiligkeit eingegangener Verpflichtungen“ anbelangt, so setzen wir bei dem Botschafter so viel Objektivität und Geschichtstreue voraus, daß er, als Mahnung für alle Zeiten, damit die Erinnerung an die schwerste Verletzung der Menschenrechte und der Heiligkeit eingegangener Verpflichtungen wecken will: an die Nichterfüllung der 14 Punkte des Präsidenten Wilson. Im gleichen Satz spricht Kennedy von der echten Liebe für die Freiheit des Einzelnen. Wir sind überzeugt, daß man in Prag diese amerikanische Mahnung versteht. Denn gewiß denkt Kennedy, um aus der Flut der Beispiele, die die Leidensgeschichte der Sudetendeutschen auch in dieser Beziehung bietet, nur ein Beispiel herauszunehmen, an die Gulbschiner Kinder und die Zehntausende andere sudetendeutscher Kinder, die unter Verhöhnung der primitivsten Freiheitsansprüche der Menschen gezwungen werden, in Schulen zu gehen, deren Aufgabe es ist, die Kinder dem überlieferten Volkstum und dem Vaterhaus zu entfremden. Wir sind auch überzeugt, daß mit seinem Hinweis auf die Unfähigkeit der Staatsmänner, friedliche Uebereinkünfte herbeizuführen und auf den „Eifer, das zu erreichen, was sie für die richtige Entwicklung halten“, der Botschafter an das so oft betätigte Entgegenkommen der Sudetendeutschen im Gegensatz zu der Halsstarrigkeit der Tschechen erinnert, die ihr Streben für richtig halten, die tschechische Volksgrenze gewalttätig zur Staatsgrenze zu machen — über die Leichen der Sudetendeutschen hinweg. Besondere Aufmerksamkeit verdient die Feststellung Kennedys von dem Mangel an gutem Willen und Verständigungsbereitschaft, um „in den Anfangsstadien des Streitfalles zusammenzukommen“. Immer wieder im Lauf dieser 20 Jahre haben die Sudetendeutschen maßvolle Forderungen gestellt, deren Inhalt nur die Wahrung selbstverständlicher Volksrechte war, immer wieder hat man sie mit Versprechungen — wir erinnern an den 18. Februar 1937! — getröstet, um sie durch Nichterfüllung und Gewalttaten dann um so schwerer zu enttäuschen und sie um so tiefer in die Verzweiflung zurückzu stoßen. Wenn also der amerikanische Botschafter in London, Kennedy, auch diesen letzten Hinweis mit der Loyalität, Objektivität und Wahrheitsliebe getan hat, die wir bei ihm voraussetzen möchten, so kann er den Hinweis nur an die tschechische Adresse gerichtet haben. Seine Worte wären somit die schärfste Verurteilung des tschechischen Verhaltens!

Dr. J.

09407-0013-000

Signatur

Kennedy
P. Joseph P.
Datum 12. Dez. 1938

The Times (London)

Nr. 48175

**MR. KENNEDY ON THE WAY
TO UNITED STATES**

Mr. Joseph P. Kennedy, the American Ambassador, left Southampton on Saturday in the Queen Mary to spend Christmas in the United States. He travelled with members of his secretariat and was seen off at Waterloo by his eldest son, Mr. Joseph Kennedy, jun. Members of the Embassy staff, and many prominent Americans in London were also present at Waterloo.

Mr. Kennedy said he expected to be back in February. His wife and children were going to Switzerland for Christmas.

Hamburger Fremdenblatt

Nr. 348

Kennedy Nachfolger Roosevelts?

Seine Prognose für Europa

Meldung unseres Vertreters

pt. London, 17. Dezember

Mit größtem Interesse wird in London die Reise des amerikanischen Botschafters in London, Kennedy, nach Washington verfolgt. Man glaubt in London, Anhaltspunkte dafür zu haben, daß die mehrmals aufgetauchten Vermutungen, Kennedy könnte im Einvernehmen mit Roosevelt als Kandidat der Demokraten für die Präsidentenwahl aussersehen werden, Gestalt annehmen könnten.

Kennedy hat diese Gerüchte mit der Bemerkung dementiert, daß er Roosevelt versprochen habe, seinen Auftrag in London zu Ende zu führen. Man weiß aber, daß die amerikanischen Botschafter in der Regel nicht auf bestimmte Zeit ernannt werden und auch keine feste Altersgrenze kennen. Das größte Hindernis für die Kandidatur Kennedys bleibt darum seine Zugehörigkeit zur katholischen Kirche.

Kennedy ist bei seiner Ankunft von der amerikanischen Presse bestürmt worden, Äuße-

rungen über seine Eindrücke in Europa zu geben. Er antwortete ausweichend. Über seine Stellungnahme zur Politik Chamberlains befragt, erklärte er, daß er ihr zustimme. Man müsse den Versuch zur Friedenserhaltung weiterführen, im anderen Falle gäbe es nur zwei Auswegmöglichkeiten, beide gleich ernst, nämlich wirtschaftliches Chaos oder Krieg. Kennedy beteuerte, daß er nach wie vor der Überzeugung sei, daß für den Fall eines Kriegsausbruches in Europa Amerika sich außerhalb halten müsse.

ins. Washington, 17. Dezember

Präsident Roosevelt hat im Weißen Hause mit dem Kabinett eine längere Besprechung über die außenpolitische Lage abgehalten, bei der die Panamerikanische Konferenz in Lima, die Beziehungen zu Deutschland und Italien und die Rüstungsfrage besprochen wurden.

Der Präsident hielt auch eine Besprechung mit dem Londoner amerikanischen Botschafter J. Kennedy ab. Der Botschafter erstattete dem Präsidenten einen eingehenden Bericht über die Lage in Europa.

09407-0015-000

Signatur

Datum 19. April 1939

Völkischer Beobachter (Berlin)

Nr. 109

Englands zweiter Außenminister

USA.-Botschafter J. P. Kennedy

Dr. Th. B. London, 18. April.

Wohl in keiner anderen Hauptstadt wird es dem neu ernannten Vertreter einer fremden Macht so schwer gemacht, festen Fuß zu fassen, wie den Botschaftern und Gesandten am Hofe von St. James. Die Zurückhaltung, die der Engländer jedem Fremden gegenüber beweist, wird auch dem Diplomaten in gleicher Weise entgegengebracht, und immer währt es eine geraume Zeit, ehe glatte Höflichkeit und kühle Zuvorkommenheit freundschaftlichem Vertrauen Platz machen.

Es mag daher das Londoner Diplomatische Korps nicht wenig erstaunt haben, wie schnell sich der neue Botschafter der Vereinigten Staaten, Joseph Patrick Kennedy, der im Januar 1938 den kühlen und trockenen Robert W. Bingham ablöste, eine Stellung nicht nur innerhalb der „Gesellschaft“, sondern auch in allen Kreisen des öffentlichen Lebens zu schaffen wußte. Kennedy besitzt heute in London einen Einfluß, der weit über den des Vertreters einer befreundeten Macht hinausgeht. Sein Rat wird in Whitehall nicht nur gehört, sondern oft genug auch befolgt. Welche Rolle er spielt, das hat zuletzt die Aufnahme bewiesen, die das amtliche England der „Botschaft“ Roosevelts bereitet hat. Und man übertreibt nicht, wenn man den amerikanischen Botschafter in London den Männern zurechnet, die England Schritt für Schritt in die Frontstellung gegen Deutschland hineingezogen haben.

Ein enger Vertrauter Roosevelts, ist Kennedy doch mehr als nur dessen diplomatisches Werkzeug; einem zweiten Oberst House vergleichbar, ist seine Persönlichkeit der des amerikanischen Präsidenten ebenbürtig, an Härte und Zielstrebigkeit sogar überlegen. Die Beliebtheit, deren er sich in England erfreut, ist ein von Kennedy gern gebrauchtes Mittel seiner Diplomatie.

Der heute 50jährige amerikanische Botschafter ist kein Berufsdiplomate. Als ihn Roosevelt Ende 1937 auf seinen neuen

Posten berief, hatte sich Kennedy als vielfacher Millionär gerade aus dem Geschäftsleben zurückgezogen. 25 Jahre lang hatte er sich mit den Finanzhyänen und „Haifischen“ der Wall Street herumgeschlagen, erst in kleineren Stellungen, später dann als stellvertretender Generaldirektor der Bethlehem Stahl Co., später als Leiter von großen Filmgesellschaften. 1934 berief ihn Roosevelt in die Börsenuntersuchungskommission. Kurz darauf hatte er sich mit den Ansprüchen der amerikanischen Handels- und Schifffahrtsgesellschaften auseinanderzusetzen.

Im Mai 1932 traf Kennedy mit Roosevelt zusammen. Beide verstanden sich schnell. Obwohl rücksichtsloser Geschäftsmacher, war Kennedy Anhänger des „New Deal“. Seine Bemühungen gingen jetzt dahin, Roosevelt zur Wahl zu verhelfen. Er gab Geld, er steckte sich hinter die Großfinanz — Roosevelt wurde gewählt.

Kennedy ist irischer Abstammung und römischer Katholik. Sein Vater war demokratischer Senator in Boston. Auch der junge Kennedy verließ nicht gegen den „guten Ton“ Amerikas. Er verkaufte Zeitungen und Süßigkeiten auf Ausflugsdampfern. Als Student der Harvard-Universität gründete er eine Omnibuslinie und verdiente damit seine ersten tausend Dollar. Mit 25 Jahren heiratete er die Tochter des Bürgermeisters von Boston. Neun Kinder kamen zur Welt, sieben davon leben mit den Eltern zusammen in England.

Es gibt kaum einen Empfang, kein Festessen und keine Feier, auf der man die breit-schultrige, nicht sehr große Gestalt Herrn Kennedys nicht erblickt. Das Gesicht erinnert an Wilson. Über einer hohen Stirn liegt hellblondes dünnes Haar. Hinter einer Hornbrille blicken etwas milde und blasse Augen. Der Ausdruck des Gesichts ist kühl, aber nicht frei von einem gewissen religiösen Fanatismus.

Das ist Mr. Kennedy. Etwas von diesem Manne zu wissen, bedeutet, einen der vielen Schlüssel zur heutigen weltpolitischen Lage in der Hand zu haben.

09407-0016-000

Signatur

Kennedy, Joseph P.

Datum

20. April 1939

Hamburger Tageblatt

Nr. 109

USA.-Botschafter Kennedy soll abtreten

Tageblatt-Auslandsdienst

New York, 20. April.

Der frühere Gouverneur von Wisconsin, Philip La Follette, hielt hier im „Wirtschafts-Klub“ eine Rede, in der er sich in scharfer Form gegen die „reaktionären Kräfte“ wandte, die England und Frankreich beherrschten und versuchten, die Vereinigten Staaten für ihre Interessen zu gewinnen. Er forderte Präsident Roosevelt auf, den derzeitigen Londoner amerikanischen Botschafter Kennedy abzuberufen.

*Kennedy,
P. Joseph P.*

09407-0017-000

Datum 20. Apr. 1939

News Review(London)

16-



"JOE" KENNEDY

09407-0018-000

Signatur

Datum 22. Apr. 1939

The Times (London)

Nr. 48286

COUNTING OUR BLESSINGS

MR. KENNEDY'S FAITH IN THE FUTURE

EDINBURGH CEREMONIES

FROM OUR CORRESPONDENT

EDINBURGH, APRIL 21

Three thousand citizens assembled in the Usher Hall, Edinburgh, to-day accorded an ovation to the American Ambassador when he received the freedom of the city. Mr. Kennedy was accompanied by his eldest son, Mr. Joseph P. Kennedy.

LORD PROVOST HENRY STEELE, presenting the burgess ticket in a silver casket, said:—"We confer this honour on Mr. Kennedy in recognition of his notable qualities and the weighty responsibilities which he carries in this country, and we also honour him as the representative of that union of people speaking the same tongue as ourselves on the great continent across the Atlantic."

When Mr. Kennedy was signing the burgess roll a leader of the Protestant Action Society, who was seated at the rear of the hall, rose and shouted, "My Lord Provost, I protest," but he was conducted outside before he could complete his remarks. A man and a woman in the gallery also shouted unintelligible remarks and were ejected.

In his address Mr. KENNEDY said he should not wish to be put in the position of minimizing the tragic implications of the present situation. Nevertheless, he sometimes wondered if—in our concern over the possibility of war—we had not lost sight of some of the blessings which we still enjoyed.

HOPEFUL ASPECT

In the first place, let us not forget that we still had peace. Many, in anxiety about the possibility of war, had lost sight of the fact that, technically, at least, the world was still at peace. Open warfare raged in at least one country; covert warfare burned fitfully beneath the surface of international relationships throughout the world. Trade was slowly being strangled, diplomacy was on the defensive, and ill will which it would take generations to eradicate was being recklessly engendered. Perhaps never in history had nations been so bitter, for so long a time, without coming to open conflict. That was the most hopeful aspect of the whole situation. War was the work of men, and, being the work of men, was not inevitable. There was plenty of evidence to show that those on whom the final decision rested were fully alive to the consequences that would devolve not only upon those who did the actual fighting, but upon the civil population, and, in the final analysis, upon the foundations of civilization itself. The fact that we had been able to escape war thus far should encourage us to hope that, somehow, we should be able to win through to a just and durable peace.

We still had freedom. That was a blessing that was very important in these troubled times. The people of other lands might see fit to yield their liberties. We should be grateful that we were still able to retain the way of life which we had found, after centuries of experience, to be the most suitable for us.

We still had faith. Let us cherish it. The

even hate. The future of our loved ones might be beset with uncertainties and danger. That meant only that we should love them the more. We still had compassion. We should thank Heaven that, no matter how black the outlook, we had not lost the priceless gift of human sympathy.

DESIRE FOR FRIENDSHIP

We still had friendship. Fortunately, neither internal cares nor external dangers could extinguish the flame of friendship. We beheld, on every hand, evidences that loyalty had not disappeared from the lexicon of human values. There was a deep though unspoken confidence in the basic integrity of man. We still had hospitality. The fact that we did this was not nearly so important as the fact that we wanted to do it. The desire for companionship was one of the finer instincts of man. The uncertainties of to-day had, if anything, strengthened this desire.

We still had ambition. The problems of to-day should serve as a challenge to each of us to make the most of his own life and, in so doing, contribute to the welfare of all. We still had ability. Some creations might be used for purposes of destruction, but the majority of them would go into the pathways of peace.

We still had knowledge. In thousands of colleges and universities, in the cities of every land, the quest for knowledge went on. Therein lay the hope of man. Through education we should yet conquer the problems that beset us, whether they be problems of the intellect or of the material world. We were the inheritors of the wisdom of the ages. We must use that wisdom to make the world a better place in which to live.

We still had courage. Business was bad; millions of men and women were unable to find work; we were wasting our substance in armaments; over all hung the dread spectre of war. The calm courage with which people were going about their business was, to him, one of the most hopeful aspects of the present situation.

THE WILL TO SERVE

We still had the will to serve. As long as we had men willing, like Lister, to devote themselves to the pursuit of science; as long as men and women would toil and struggle so that the truth, as they saw it, might prevail; as long as we could rise above self and dedicate ourselves to the service of our fellow men—that long the future was not without hope. It behoved us not to underestimate the dangers with which we were confronted. At the same time, let us not lose sight of the eternal verities, timeless and indestructible, which were with us yet.

The degree of Doctor of Laws was conferred on Mr. Kennedy in the Old College at Edinburgh University before the freedom ceremony. PROFESSOR WILLIAM WILSON, Dean of the Faculty of Law, presented Mr. Kennedy to the Vice-Chancellor, Principal Sir Thomas Holland.

In his address after being formally capped by the Vice-Chancellor Mr. KENNEDY said scholarship could not be provincial, nor a question of nationalities. It must remain always universal. The ideal of scholarship, the ideal of universities, was not to break up humanity but to unify it. For scholarship the world was one, in history and progress. To-day no university could remain withdrawn within its walls, cloistered from a hurrying world, any more than a nation might remain isolated in thought or problems from its neighbours. To-day youth growing up might well face us with questions difficult to answer, questions which had in fact the quality of accusation. "We of an older generation sow. If our children and our children's children reap a bitter harvest we shall stand condemned. It is therefore our obligation—and the task of the universities—to do our utmost, all of us, so that in the final reckoning our integrity and effort be not found wanting."

COUNTING OUR BLESSINGS

MR. KENNEDY'S FAITH IN THE FUTURE

EDINBURGH CEREMONIES

FROM OUR CORRESPONDENT

EDINBURGH, APRIL 21

Three thousand citizens assembled in the Usher Hall, Edinburgh, to-day accorded an ovation to the American Ambassador when he received the freedom of the city. Mr. Kennedy was accompanied by his eldest son, Mr. Joseph P. Kennedy.

LORD PROVOST HENRY STEELE, presenting the burgess ticket in a silver casket, said:—"We confer this honour on Mr. Kennedy in recognition of his notable qualities and the weighty responsibilities which he carries in this country, and we also honour him as the representative of that union of people speaking the same tongue as ourselves on the great continent across the Atlantic."

When Mr. Kennedy was signing the burgess roll a leader of the Protestant Action Society, who was seated at the rear of the hall, rose and shouted, "My Lord Provost, I protest," but he was conducted outside before he could complete his remarks. A man and a woman in the gallery also shouted unintelligible remarks and were ejected.

In his address Mr. KENNEDY said he should not wish to be put in the position of minimizing the tragic implications of the present situation. Nevertheless, he sometimes wondered if—in our concern over the possibility of war—we had not lost sight of some of the blessings which we still enjoyed.

HOPEFUL ASPECT

In the first place, let us not forget that we still had peace. Many, in anxiety about the possibility of war, had lost sight of the fact that, technically, at least, the world was still at peace. Open warfare raged in at least one country; covert warfare burned fitfully beneath the surface of international relationships throughout the world. Trade was slowly being strangled, diplomacy was on the defensive, and ill will which it would take generations to eradicate was being recklessly engendered. Perhaps never in history had nations been so bitter, for so long a time, without coming to open conflict. That was the most hopeful aspect of the whole situation. War was the work of men, and, being the work of men, was not inevitable. There was plenty of evidence to show that those on whom the final decision rested were fully alive to the consequences that would devolve not only upon those who did the actual fighting, but upon the civil population, and, in the final analysis, upon the foundations of civilization itself. The fact that we had been able to escape war thus far should encourage us to hope that, somehow, we should be able to win through to a just and durable peace.

We still had freedom. That was a blessing that was very important in these troubled times. The people of other lands might see fit to yield their liberties. We should be grateful that we were still able to retain the way of life which we had found, after centuries of experience, to be the most suitable for us.

We still had faith. Let us cherish it. The blacker the road, the more we should need it. We still had love. There was no woe that could banish love from the human heart. Not

even hate. The future of our loved ones might be beset with uncertainties and danger. That meant only that we should love them the more. We still had compassion. We should thank Heaven that, no matter how black the outlook, we had not lost the priceless gift of human sympathy.

DESIRE FOR FRIENDSHIP

We still had friendship. Fortunately, neither internal cares nor external dangers could extinguish the flame of friendship. We beheld, on every hand, evidences that loyalty had not disappeared from the lexicon of human values. There was a deep though unspoken confidence in the basic integrity of man. We still had hospitality. The fact that we did this was not nearly so important as the fact that we wanted to do it. The desire for companionship was one of the finer instincts of man. The uncertainties of to-day had, if anything, strengthened this desire.

We still had ambition. The problems of to-day should serve as a challenge to each of us to make the most of his own life and, in so doing, contribute to the welfare of all. We still had ability. Some creations might be used for purposes of destruction, but the majority of them would go into the pathways of peace.

We still had knowledge. In thousands of colleges and universities, in the cities of every land, the quest for knowledge went on. Therein lay the hope of man. Through education we should yet conquer the problems that beset us, whether they be problems of the intellect or of the material world. We were the inheritors of the wisdom of the ages. We must use that wisdom to make the world a better place in which to live.

We still had courage. Business was bad; millions of men and women were unable to find work; we were wasting our substance in armaments; over all hung the dread spectre of war. The calm courage with which people were going about their business was, to him, one of the most hopeful aspects of the present situation.

THE WILL TO SERVE

We still had the will to serve. As long as we had men willing, like Lister, to devote themselves to the pursuit of science; as long as men and women would toil and struggle so that the truth, as they saw it, might prevail; as long as we could rise above self and dedicate ourselves to the service of our fellow men—that long the future was not without hope. It behoved us not to underestimate the dangers with which we were confronted. At the same time, let us not lose sight of the eternal verities, timeless and indestructible, which were with us yet.

The degree of Doctor of Laws was conferred on Mr. Kennedy in the Old College at Edinburgh University before the freedom ceremony. PROFESSOR WILLIAM WILSON, Dean of the Faculty of Law, presented Mr. Kennedy to the Vice-Chancellor, Principal Sir Thomas Holland.

In his address after being formally capped by the Vice-Chancellor Mr. KENNEDY said scholarship could not be provincial, nor a question of nationalities. It must remain always universal. The ideal of scholarship, the ideal of universities, was not to break up humanity but to unify it. For scholarship the world was one, in history and progress. To-day no university could remain withdrawn within its walls, cloistered from a hurrying world, any more than a nation might remain isolated in thought or problems from its neighbours. To-day youth growing up might well face us with questions difficult to answer, questions which had in fact the quality of accusation. "We of an older generation sow. If our children and our children's children reap a bitter harvest we shall stand condemned. It is therefore our obligation—and the task of the universities—to do our utmost all of us, so that in the final reckoning our integrity and effort be not found wanting."

09407-0019-000

Signatur *P. Kennedy, Joseph P.*
Datum **23. April 1939**

Frankfurter Zeitung (Frankfurt a. M.)

Nr. **207**

**Botschafter Kennedy
Ehrenbürger von Edinburgh.**

London, 22. April. (Europapress.) Der amerikanische Botschafter Kennedy wurde am Freitag von der Universität Edinburgh zum Ehrendoktor der Rechte promoviert. Anschließend wurde ihm der Ehrenbürgerbrief der Stadt in der Festhalle des Rathauses überreicht. In seiner Rede drückte sich Kennedy sehr optimistisch über die gegenwärtige Lage aus. Bei der Ueberreichung des Ehrenbürgerbriefes kam es zu einem Zwischenfall. Als der Oberbürgermeister seine Ansprache beendet hatte, erhoben sich mehrere Anwesende unter Protest von ihren Plätzen. Ein Stadtrat rief: „Herr Oberbürgermeister! Ich protestiere!“ Die Kundgeber wurden aus dem Saal entfernt. Auch auf der Galerie kam es zu Störungen.

09407-0020-000

Datum 19. Mai 1939

The Times (London)

-48309

A DILEMMA FOR YOUTH

UNCERTAINTIES OF AN ARMED WORLD

MR. KENNEDY'S WARNING

The difficulties that faced youth in a world where the economic outlook was clouded, and there was the ever-present possibility of war, were emphasized by Mr. Joseph Kennedy, the American Ambassador, at Liverpool last night. He was speaking at a dinner at the Adelphi Hotel given by the University Association of the University of Liverpool.

Recalling that he had just received an honorary degree from Liverpool University, Mr. Kennedy said:—

Everywhere I go these days I find men and women gravely disturbed over the effect of current conditions upon the young people of the world. The outlook has not been too bright for any of us during the past few years. It has been especially unpromising for those just coming of age. The question that is uppermost in the minds of all who have given any thought to the problem is: "What will be the effect of these conditions upon the rising generation?" I find your leaders, like those with whom I have talked elsewhere, greatly concerned over the answer to this question.

We have come to realize that the difficulties of to-day, as serious as they are for adults, are of even greater significance to youth. Will these difficulties warp the outlook of the young? Will they make our children sceptical of the manner in which we have handled the affairs of the world? Will they, finally, cause youth to revolt against established institutions and perhaps result in a new form of society? This, it seems to me, is an aspect of the current situation that can be hardly over-emphasized.

OUTLOOK OF THE YOUNG

As you have probably heard, Mrs. Kennedy and I are endeavouring to raise a family of nine children. I think therefore that I may speak as something of an expert on the outlook of youth. I have a couple of boys and two or three daughters who think that they know what's wrong with the world. One of my boys has just come back from Spain; another is now in Warsaw, on his way to Russia. They are quite outspoken in their opinion of the way we old folks have been doing things. I shouldn't want them to know it, but I must admit, just between us, that I can't blame them.

The youth of to-day, it seems to me, is confronted with a disturbing dilemma. One horn of the dilemma is the clouded economic outlook in most countries; the other is the ever-present possibility of war. Either is sufficient excuse for a very critical attitude on the part of the young.

Young men and young women, approaching maturity, are naturally concerned with the part they are to play in life. After spending a third of their lives in preparation for a career they expect to have an opportunity to make use of their abilities and the knowledge they have acquired. As things are to-day they are likely to encounter a great deal of

relatively undeveloped; for another, they have not learned to sell themselves. All in all, the lot of a young man or a young woman reaching maturity at a time of widespread unemployment is not an enviable one.

WEAKENING OF TIES

Unemployment, of course, is but one manifestation of the disturbed state of affairs now prevailing throughout the world. There are other, less tangible, results of which we should not lose sight. Some of these latter results, like unemployment, tend to fall most heavily upon younger people.

Economic disturbances almost invariably are accompanied by disturbances in other fields of human activity. There is apt to be a general weakening of the ties which bind us to the past, a reappraisal of old values, a loss of faith in established institutions. This is true, to some extent, of all of us. It is especially true of youth.

When living was simpler the fate of an individual was much less dependent upon others than it is to-day. The cave man existed, or failed to exist, by the strength of his own right arm. The farmer in an agricultural civilization could produce everything he needed. Few of us are able to do that to-day, either as individuals, as communities, or even as nations. Our welfare has become bound up with the welfare of others. It is therefore obvious that, although opportunities exist to-day as always, these opportunities depend to a great extent upon the operation of factors beyond the control of the individual.

Our failure to meet the demands of the times internally is matched, in the eyes of youth, by our failure in the realm of international affairs. The young men and women of every country behold a hostile world. They see nations armed to the teeth. They see the normal processes of trade perverted and all but destroyed in a mad rush for military supremacy. They see international relations reduced to the level of the jungle. It is no wonder that they want to know how things got this way and what those who are responsible intend to do about it.

MAD COMPETITION

War, like unemployment, bears most heavily upon the young. All over the world we find young men under arms. I do not know what any one nation can do to arrest this mad competition in armaments. I am afraid, however, that it is a tragedy for which all of us will some day be called to account.

One of the greatest tragedies of war, so far as the young are concerned, is the effect which it has upon their outlook in later life. Cynicism and disillusionment are by-products of every war. It is especially true with regard to the young. The World War was followed by a terrible deterioration in faith among the young people of the world. The consequences of another war would be even worse.

There is grave danger not only for our sons and daughters but for ourselves as well, in the chaotic conditions which now prevail in the majority of nations. Youth does not have the patience of age. Young people, denied an opportunity to achieve the things of which they are capable, want to know the reason why. Nor will they wait long for an answer. They do not think that the world owes them a living, but they certainly do think that the world owes them a chance to make a living. And, if that chance is not forthcoming, they are quite likely to demand that we do something about it.

The young are very pragmatic. The danger is that they may decide to dispense with the painfully evolved experience of centuries because, in their opinion, it fails to meet the needs of the moment. It is significant that most of the post-War movements that have done so much to alter the complexion of the earth began as youth movements. Unfortunately youth is also receptive to the doctrines of false leaders. It is up to us to provide leadership that works and in which the young people of

A DILEMMA FOR YOUTH

UNCERTAINTIES OF AN ARMED WORLD

MR. KENNEDY'S WARNING

The difficulties that faced youth in a world where the economic outlook was clouded, and there was the ever-present possibility of war, were emphasized by Mr. Joseph Kennedy, the American Ambassador, at Liverpool last night. He was speaking at a dinner at the Adelphi Hotel given by the University Association of the University of Liverpool.

Recalling that he had just received an honorary degree from Liverpool University, Mr. Kennedy said:—

Everywhere I go these days I find men and women gravely disturbed over the effect of current conditions upon the young people of the world. The outlook has not been too bright for any of us during the past few years. It has been especially unpromising for those just coming of age. The question that is uppermost in the minds of all who have given any thought to the problem is: "What will be the effect of these conditions upon the rising generation?" I find your leaders, like those with whom I have talked elsewhere, greatly concerned over the answer to this question.

We have come to realize that the difficulties of to-day, as serious as they are for adults, are of even greater significance to youth. Will these difficulties warp the outlook of the young? Will they make our children sceptical of the manner in which we have handled the affairs of the world? Will they, finally, cause youth to revolt against established institutions and perhaps result in a new form of society? This, it seems to me, is an aspect of the current situation that can be hardly over-emphasized.

OUTLOOK OF THE YOUNG

As you have probably heard, Mrs. Kennedy and I are endeavouring to raise a family of nine children. I think therefore that I may speak as something of an expert on the outlook of youth. I have a couple of boys and two or three daughters who think that they know what's wrong with the world. One of my boys has just come back from Spain; another is now in Warsaw, on his way to Russia. They are quite outspoken in their opinion of the way we old folks have been doing things. I shouldn't want them to know it, but I must admit, just between us, that I can't blame them.

The youth of to-day, it seems to me, is confronted with a disturbing dilemma. One horn of the dilemma is the clouded economic outlook in most countries; the other is the ever-present possibility of war. Either is sufficient excuse for a very critical attitude on the part of the young.

Young men and young women, approaching maturity, are naturally concerned with the part they are to play in life. After spending a third of their lives in preparation for a career they expect to have an opportunity to make use of their abilities and the knowledge they have acquired. As things are to-day they are likely to encounter a great deal of difficulty in finding an occupation that will give scope to their individual talents.

It must be recognized that unemployment falls heavily upon the young. When the competition for jobs is excessively keen, those who have already made a start in life tend to monopolize the opportunities for employment. Those who are about to enter the field labour at a terrific disadvantage. They have youth and zeal and energy, to be sure, but they lack experience, and they are not yet versed in the technique of competition. For one thing, their competitive instincts are

relatively undeveloped; for another, they have not learned to sell themselves. All in all, the lot of a young man or a young woman reaching maturity at a time of widespread unemployment is not an enviable one.

WEAKENING OF TIES

Unemployment, of course, is but one manifestation of the disturbed state of affairs now prevailing throughout the world. There are other, less tangible, results of which we should not lose sight. Some of these latter results, like unemployment, tend to fall most heavily upon younger people.

Economic disturbances almost invariably are accompanied by disturbances in other fields of human activity. There is apt to be a general weakening of the ties which bind us to the past, a reappraisal of old values, a loss of faith in established institutions. This is true, to some extent, of all of us. It is especially true of youth.

When living was simpler the fate of an individual was much less dependent upon others than it is to-day. The cave man existed, or failed to exist, by the strength of his own right arm. The farmer in an agricultural civilization could produce everything he needed. Few of us are able to do that to-day, either as individuals, as communities, or even as nations. Our welfare has become bound up with the welfare of others. It is therefore obvious that, although opportunities exist to-day as always, these opportunities depend to a great extent upon the operation of factors beyond the control of the individual.

Our failure to meet the demands of the times internally is matched, in the eyes of youth, by our failure in the realm of international affairs. The young men and women of every country behold a hostile world. They see nations armed to the teeth. They see the normal processes of trade perverted and all but destroyed in a mad rush for military supremacy. They see international relations reduced to the level of the jungle. It is no wonder that they want to know how things got this way and what those who are responsible intend to do about it.

MAD COMPETITION

War, like unemployment, bears most heavily upon the young. All over the world we find young men under arms. I do not know what any one nation can do to arrest this mad competition in armaments. I am afraid, however, that it is a tragedy for which all of us will some day be called to account.

One of the greatest tragedies of war, so far as the young are concerned, is the effect which it has upon their outlook in later life. Cynicism and disillusionment are by-products of every war. It is especially true with regard to the young. The World War was followed by a terrible deterioration in faith among the young people of the world. The consequences of another war would be even worse.

There is grave danger not only for our sons and daughters but for ourselves as well, in the chaotic conditions which now prevail in the majority of nations. Youth does not have the patience of age. Young people, denied an opportunity to achieve the things of which they are capable, want to know the reason why. Nor will they wait long for an answer. They do not think that the world owes them a living, but they certainly do think that the world owes them a chance to make a living. And, if that chance is not forthcoming, they are quite likely to demand that we do something about it.

The young are very pragmatic. The danger is that they may decide to dispense with the painfully evolved experience of centuries because, in their opinion, it fails to meet the needs of the moment. It is significant that most of the post-War movements that have done so much to alter the complexion of the earth began as youth movements. Unfortunately youth is also receptive to the doctrines of false leaders. It is up to us to provide leadership that works and in which the young people of to-day can have confidence; if we do not, our boys and girls are apt to follow the first demagogue who comes along with a panacea for the ills to which they are heir.

STANDARD OF LIVING

I believe that somehow or other we shall find a way out of our internal difficulties. As I said the other day at Edinburgh, I dare to hope that we shall be spared the calamity of war. I find encouragement in the fact that the majority of our ills, both internal and external, spring from one cause—our failure to achieve a better standard of living for the

earth's peoples. That is a matter of economics; being a matter of economics, it is—in my opinion—capable of treatment.

There was a time in human history when man had to fight to live. There were not enough of the necessities to go round. That is no longer true. To-day we have everything that is needed to provide a decent standard of living for all. It is purely a question of exploiting the resources with which we have been endowed and assuring a just distribution of the proceeds. Few people, young or old, ask for more than an opportunity to make a living, to express themselves in creative effort, to live in peace. Surely a race which has learned how to crack the atom should be able to achieve these simple objectives.

The important thing to remember is that the majority of our difficulties are man-made. They are not the result of the penury of nature; nor are they visited upon us by a vindictive fate. They are the result of human carelessness, human short-sightedness, human greed.

Earlier in his speech Mr. Kennedy recalled some of the sons of Liverpool to whom America owed much. Among these was Ronald Ross, who, by discovering the manner

in which malaria was transmitted, made possible the checking of this disease, and thereby the construction of the Panama Canal.

09407-0021-000

Kennedy,
P Joseph P.
Signatur
Datum 9. Dez. 1939

Dammann.13.12.39.

Kennedy in Washington.

(Mr, Kennedy in Washington)

"The Times", London, 48484/9.12.39. (Washington Korr)

Nach einem eingehenden Gespräch mit dem USA Bot-

schafter in London, Kennedy, empfing Roosevelt die Presse, ohne aber dabei mehr über die Besprechung mitzuteilen, als dass Kennedy, der frühere Leiter der USA Maritime Commission, Mittel und Wege diskutiert habe, um die nunmehr durch das Neutralitätsgesetz untätig gewordene amerikan. Handels-

schifffahrt wieder in Betrieb zu setzen. Zweifellos bringt Kennedy Nachrichten darüber mit, die sich mit den Routen befassen, die wenn auch nicht heute, so doch späterhin nicht mehr befahren werden, wobei dann die Frage bleibt, wie sich das Neutralitätsgesetz auswirkt auf jeden Plan, ~~der~~ eine amerikan. Aktivität in den betreffenden Meeresgebieten zu eröffnen. Man hält es z.B. gegenwärtig für möglich, ~~xxxxxxx~~/arbeitslose amerikan. Schiffe in den Handelsverkehr mit Australien und anderen engl. Besitzungen einzusetzen, die nicht innerhalb der Kriegszonen liegen, von wo aus dann die USA Waren in nicht amerikan. Schiffen nach Europa weitertransportiert werden könnten. Es handelt sich dabei ebenfalls um die spezielle Frage, ob das USA Holz nicht an die Stelle des skandinavischen Holzes treten könnte, das doch durch

Dammann.13.12.39.

Kennedy in Washington.

(Mr. Kennedy in Washington)

"The Times", London, 48484/9.12.39. (Washington Korr)

~~Nach~~ Nach einem eingehenden Gespräch mit dem USA Bot-

schafter in London, Kennedy, empfing Roosevelt die Presse, ohne aber dabei mehr über die Bespre-
chung mitzuteilen, als dass Kennedy, der frühere
Leiter der USA Maritime Commission, Mittel und Wege
diskutiert habe, um die nunmehr durch das Neutra-

litätsgesetz untätig gewordene amerikan. Handels-
schifffahrt wieder in Betrieb zu setzen. Zwei-
fello bringt Kennedy Nachrichten darüber mit,
die sich mit den Routen befassen, die wenn auch
nicht heute, so doch späterhin nicht mehr befahren
werden, wobei dann die Frage bleibt, wie sich das
Neutralitätsgesetz auswirkt auf jeden Plan, ~~der~~
eine amerikan. Aktivität in den betreffenden
Meeresgebieten zu eröffnen. Man hält es z.B.
gegenwärtig
für möglich, ~~xxxxxxx~~/arbeitslose amerikan. Schiffe
in den Handelsverkehr mit Australien und anderen
engl. Besitzungen einzusetzen, die nicht inner-
halb der Kriegszonen liegen, von wo aus dann die
USA Waren in nicht amerikan. Schiffen nach Europa
weitertransportiert werden könnten. Es handelt
sich dabei ebenfalls um die spezielle Frage,
ob das USA Holz nicht an die Stelle des skan-
dinavischen Holzes treten könnte, das doch durch
den gegenwärtigen Krieg schwer betroffen ist.
Über die weitgreifenden Fragen des Krieges
und seiner Führung ^{ist} ~~Kennedy~~ Kennedy sowohl Roose-
velt wie auch Hull gegenüber mitteilksam gewesen.

wenden

-2-

und vor seiner Abreise aus Washington zu einem kurzen Urlaub wird Kennedy auch die Leiter der Maritime Commission sprechen. Über die Fragen der Schifffahrt hat er sich der Presse gegenüber sehr freimütig geäußert und er hat auch nicht gezögert darauf zu drängen, dass Roosevelt noch ein drittes Mal zum Präsidenten gewählt werden sollte. Dies hat er schon vor seinem Eintreffen in Washington geäußert und er erweiterte heute seine Erklärungen dahingehend, dass angesichts der Probleme, die sich der Nation ~~xxxxxxx~~ bieten, sowie auch deren Akzentuierung durch den Krieg, ein neuer Mann "so brilliant oder von ernsten Willem dieser auch erfüllt sein mag" nicht vor Ablauf von zwei Jahren erlernen kann, wie die nationalen Fragen gehandhabt werden müssen.

"Niemand in Europa wünschte den Krieg und man kann dort auch keinen Fehler auf Seiten der USA finden, wenn diese darauf bestehen, neutral zu bleiben und aus dem Kriege herauszubleiben wünschen"

"Hinsichtlich unserer Einstellung sind die Engländer niemals irregeführt worden".

09407-0022-000

Kennedy, Joseph P.

Signatur

J

Datum

15. Jan. 1940

USA Botschafter kauft Baseball-Team ?

The Daily "elegraph", London, 26 400/15.1.40

(New York Korr.): Nach dem "American Journal" soll der USA Botschafter in London, Mr. Kennedy, die Absicht haben, sich die teuerste Baseball-Mannschaft der Welt, die New York Yankees, zu kaufen. Es wird behauptet, dass diese Meldung aus zuverlässiger Quelle stammt und dass Kennedy daran denkt, von seinem diplomatischen Posten in London zurückzutreten. Kennedy weilt gegenwärtig in Florida auf Urlaub.

09407-0023-000

Hamburger Fremdenblatt

Nr. 280 A

Kennedys Abberufung?

Meldung unseres Vertreters
we. Kopenhagen, 10. Oktober

Das Skandinavische Telegrammbüro meldet aus Washington, in politischen Kreisen halte sich hartnäckig das Gerücht, Botschafter Kennedy solle von London abberufen werden, um eine mit übergeordneten Ministerposten im Kabinett zur Bearbeitung aller englisch-amerikanischen Fragen zu übernehmen. Präsident Roosevelt habe, so heißt es, am Mittwoch bis spät in den Abend hinein in fast ununterbrochener telephonischer Verbindung mit Kennedy gestanden. Als neuen Botschafter beabsichtige er, den früheren Vertreter der Vereinigten Staaten in Paris, William Bullitt, nach London zu schicken.

09407-0024-000

Signatur

Kennedy,
Joseph P.

Datum

25. Okt. 1940

INT.

Bartelt.
28.10.40.

Gesandter Kennedy tritt zurück.

(Ambassadør Kennedy traeder tilbage.)

"Berlingske Tidende", Kopenhagen, 296., 25.10. (STB aus Milano):

In einem Telegramm aus New York an den "Corriere della Sera" wird mitgeteilt, dass man in amerikanischen politischen Kreisen mit Sicherheit erwartet, dass der amerikanische Gesandte in London, Kennedy, der sich gegenwärtig auf den Heimreise nach den U.S.A. befindet, unmittelbar nach seiner Ankunft sein Rücktrittsgesuch einreichen wird.

Es wird behauptet, dass er mit den für einen Friedensschluss arbeitenden britischen Politikern sympathisiere. Ebenso wie diese sehe er die Lage Grossbritanniens für hoffnungslos an und er fasse es als eine Katastrophe an, wenn es Grossbritannien glücken sollte die Vereinigten Staaten mit in den Krieg hineinzuziehen.

Man erwartet, dass Kennedy eine Vortragsreise unternehmen wird um der Kriegspolitik Roosevelts entgegenzuarbeiten.

Kennedy, Joseph P.
P

Signatur

09407-0625-000

Datum

30. Okt. 1940

New York Herald Tribune

№34317

Kennedy Backs Roosevelt, Ends Reports of Rift

Envoy, on Air, Assails Talk
of Secret Pacts, Asserts
3d-Term Issue Is Minor

Joseph P. Kennedy, American Ambassador to the Court of St. James's, urged the re-election of President Roosevelt last night in an address in which he said there was little likelihood of the United States being drawn into the war if the rearmament program is continued, and branded as "false" charges that President Roosevelt has made secret commitments likely to lead to war.

Mr. Kennedy spoke from station WABC over a nation-wide hookup of the Columbia Broadcasting System from 9 to 9:30 p. m. He said his address was sponsored by "Mrs. Kennedy and the nine Kennedy children."

Mr. Kennedy's declaration ended reports of a rift between the ambassador and the President, which developed after he arrived in this country on Sunday. Referring to these reports, he admitted that he had disagreed sharply with Mr. Roosevelt on some issues, but pointed out that "these are times which clamor for national unity."

Mr. Kennedy based his indorsement of the President for a third term on an analysis of America's position in world affairs and Mr. Roosevelt's accomplishments in building national defense. He said that the problems facing the next President will be gigantic, and will demand the utmost in governmental experience from the Chief Executive. In the face of this necessity, he said, the third-term issue is "the least of many considerations."

Calls for Preparedness

Mr. Kennedy began his speech by restating his conviction that this country must and will stay out of war, and amplified it by the statement that "what counts in this hour of crisis is what we in the United States of America are prepared to do in order to make ourselves strong."

Defending the President against the charge of trying to involve this country in the war, he asserted that to do so would contradict the President's purpose, in which the nation overwhelmingly supports him, of giving all possible aid to Great Britain. If the United States entered the war, Mr. Kennedy said, it would be necessary to keep war materials for our own use instead of

against our own interests because we need more time to prepare.

To the President's denial of any secret commitments likely to lead to war he added his own denial, observing that as Ambassador to Great Britain he would necessarily learn sooner or later of any such commitment.

The impossibility of transporting large bodies of troops across the Atlantic Ocean under the present circumstances and the lack of any landing ports in Europe free from Hitler's domination were also cited by Mr. Kennedy as reasons why the United States must stay out of the war. He added that the problem of attacking the United States presents the same problems to Germany, so long as we are well armed.

Giving President Roosevelt credit for taking every possible step to further national defense, Mr. Kennedy said that if there be any blame for defense delays "we must all share in the inherent weakness of our democratic system where force and propaganda have no place, even in the vital job of rearming."

He cited as constructive steps toward national defense the President's actions in bringing industrial experts to Washington to assist in mobilizing the nation's resources; and in sending experts to England to study the problems of modern warfare, including air raid precautions and economic and social adjustments.

Calls War Stand Vital

Recognizing that tremendous domestic problems face the United States, Mr. Kennedy said they must depend for their solution on "where we stand in this horrible war." The course and outcome of the war will deeply affect such questions as foreign trade and all the economic problems affected by foreign trade, including agriculture, finance and labor, he said.

"The President must watch every move abroad to judge by what action he can serve the United States best," he said. "Events move so quickly—the man of experience is our man of the hour." Later he added: "No matter who is President, make up your minds, the problems will be terrific."

Turning to the third-term issue before announcing his support of the President for re-election, Mr. Kennedy said:

"It is true that there is nothing in our Constitution which limits the term of service of our President. It is true that the tradition really represents the preference of earlier Presidents. Nonetheless, in normal times, I might be persuaded that the best interests of the country called for no third term."

"But the third term is the least of the many considerations which the American people should take into account in exercising their choice a week hence. The gigantic issues which must be faced

Kennedy Backs Roosevelt, Ends Reports of Rift

Envoy, on Air, Assails Talk of Secret Pacts, Asserts 3d-Term Issue Is Minor

Joseph P. Kennedy, American Ambassador to the Court of St. James's, urged the re-election of President Roosevelt last night in an address in which he said there was little likelihood of the United States being drawn into the war if the rearmament program is continued, and branded as "false" charges that President Roosevelt has made secret commitments likely to lead to war.

Mr. Kennedy spoke from station WABC over a nation-wide hookup of the Columbia Broadcasting System from 9 to 9:30 p. m. He said his address was sponsored by "Mrs. Kennedy and the nine Kennedy children."

Mr. Kennedy's declaration ended reports of a rift between the ambassador and the President, which developed after he arrived in this country on Sunday. Referring to these reports, he admitted that he had disagreed sharply with Mr. Roosevelt on some issues, but pointed out that "these are times which clamor for national unity."

Mr. Kennedy based his indorsement of the President for a third term on an analysis of America's position in world affairs and Mr. Roosevelt's accomplishments in building national defense. He said that the problems facing the next President will be gigantic, and will demand the utmost in governmental experience from the Chief Executive. In the face of this necessity, he said, the third-term issue is "the least of many considerations."

Calls for Preparedness

Mr. Kennedy began his speech by restating his conviction that this country must and will stay out of war, and amplified it by the statement that "what counts in this hour of crisis is what we in the United States of America are prepared to do in order to make ourselves strong."

Defending the President against the charge of trying to involve this country in the war, he asserted that to do so would contradict the President's purpose, in which the nation overwhelmingly supports him, of giving all possible aid to Great Britain. If the United States entered the war, Mr. Kennedy said, it would be necessary to keep war materials for our own use instead of supplying them to Great Britain, and our obligations in this hemisphere would be so greatly expanded as to limit drastically our power to aid Great Britain. He added that a declaration of war now would be

against our own interests because we need more time to prepare.

To the President's denial of any secret commitments likely to lead to war he added his own denial, observing that as Ambassador to Great Britain he would necessarily learn sooner or later of any such commitment.

The impossibility of transporting large bodies of troops across the Atlantic Ocean under the present circumstances and the lack of any landing ports in Europe free from Hitler's domination were also cited by Mr. Kennedy as reasons why the United States must stay out of the war. He added that the problem of attacking the United States presents the same problems to Germany, so long as we are well armed.

Giving President Roosevelt credit for taking every possible step to further national defense, Mr. Kennedy said that if there be any blame for defense delays "we must all share in the inherent weakness of our democratic system where force and propaganda have no place, even in the vital job of rearming."

He cited as constructive steps toward national defense the President's actions in bringing industrial experts to Washington to assist in mobilizing the nation's resources; and in sending experts to England to study the problems of modern warfare, including air raid precautions and economic and social adjustments.

Calls War Stand Vital

Recognizing that tremendous domestic problems face the United States, Mr. Kennedy said they must depend for their solution on "where we stand in this horrible war." The course and outcome of the war will deeply affect such questions as foreign trade and all the economic problems affected by foreign trade, including agriculture, finance and labor, he said.

"The President must watch every move abroad to judge by what action he can serve the United States best," he said. "Events move so quickly—the man of experience is our man of the hour." Later he added: "No matter who is President, make up your minds, the problems will be terrific."

Turning to the third-term issue before announcing his support of the President for re-election, Mr. Kennedy said:

"It is true that there is nothing in our Constitution which limits the term of service of our President. It is true that the tradition really represents the preference of earlier Presidents. Nonetheless, in normal times, I might be persuaded that the best interests of the country called for no third term."

"But the third term is the least of the many considerations which the American people should take into account in exercising their choice a week hence. The gigantic issues which must be faced, arising out of the world crisis, make the third-term opposition seem insignificant by comparison. The question still remains—which of the two men can best serve the nation."

Erklärungen Kennedys

Washington, 30. Okt. (Exchange) Ueber den Rundfunk hielt der soeben nach den Vereinigten Staaten zurückgekehrte amerikanische Botschafter Kennedy eine Rede über die Haltung Amerikas. Er betonte wiederholt sein Eintreten für die Wiederwahl Roosevelts.

„Es ist meine feste Ueberzeugung, daß Amerika in diesen Krieg nicht einbezogen werden wird, aber wir müssen darauf vorbereitet sein, daß er uns schwer in Mitleidenschaft zieht. Mit dieser Ueberzeugung bin ich aus London zurückgekehrt, und von dem Tag an, an dem ich meine Dienste als Botschafter in London antrat, bis zu diesem Augenblick habe ich niemals irgend jemandem die Hoffnung gegeben, daß Amerika in den Krieg eingreifen werde. In der Tat könnte nichts — und dies vor allem auch vom Standpunkt Großbritanniens aus gesehen — so schädlich für die Sache Englands und des britischen Empire sein, als wenn wir uns jetzt zu einer Kriegserklärung entscheiden würden. In dem Augenblick, in dem wir dies tun, müßten die Materiallieferungen an Großbritannien zu einem Stillstand kommen, weil wir vorerst unsere eigene Armee und Marine ausstatten müßten. Großbritannien braucht keine Unterstützung in Mannschaften, es hat nicht einmal alle wehrfähigen Jahrgänge aufzurufen brauchen. Dieser Krieg ist nicht ein Krieg der Feldarmeen, sondern ein Krieg der Maschinen und des Materials. Es ist vor

allem die Schnelligkeit der Aufrüstung, auf die es jetzt ankommt. Ich habe den großartigen Kampfsgeist und die Tapferkeit der Männer der Royal Air Force kennen gelernt, die sich gegen eine erhebliche Uebermacht siegreich geschlagen hat, und der Geist dieser Männer, der britischen Seeleute und die Entschlossenheit eines Winston Churchill haben die deutschen Invasionspläne zunichte gemacht. Man muß die Eigenschaften kennen, die die britische Nation besitzt — dann darf man vertrauensvoll in die Zukunft blicken.“

„Ich habe“, fuhr Kennedy fort, „im letzten Jahr viel kritisches Gerede über den Pakt von München gehört, aber wir wissen heute, daß, während Chamberlain den Frieden wollte, jede Hoffnung von den Männern gebrochen wurde, die den Krieg längst in ihrem Geist und Herzen geplant hatten. Chamberlain und fast jeder in Großbritannien wußte, daß München letzten Endes dann doch nichts brachte, als einen Waffenstillstand und damit die letzte Chance, auszugleichen, was durch tragisches Nichtverstehen versäumt wurde. Heute kann man sich vorstellen, was geschehen wäre, wenn dieser Blitzkrieg schon im September 1938 losgebrochen wäre. Wenn einst die traurige Geschichte der Verwandlung Europas in ein einziges Kriegslager geschrieben wird, dann wird es die Geschichte der geringen Vorbereitungen der Diktaturen und der gläubigen Nachlässigkeit und Oberflächlichkeit der Demokratien gegenüber der Gefahr sein. Diese Geschichte wird erzählen von den neuen diplomatischen Waffen, die die Diktaturen erfanden, von beschwichtigenden Verhandlungen, von gebrochenen Versprechen und Verträgen.“

Kennedy schloß: „Erst gestern wieder bin ich von einem diplomatischen Kollegen gefragt worden, welche geheimen Verpflichtungen wir eingegangen sind, von denen weder der Kongreß noch die Nation etwas weiß. Ich möchte deshalb noch einmal feststellen, wie es auch bereits Präsident Roosevelt getan hat, daß keinerlei geheime Verpflichtungen bestehen. Mir als dem Botschafter der Vereinigten Staaten in Großbritannien könnte eine solche nicht entgangen sein. In der überwältigenden Mehrzahl sind die Bürger Amerikas entschlossen, dem Krieg fernzubleiben, aber Großbritannien alle nur irgendwie erdenkliche Hilfe zu geben. Darüber besteht keine Meinungsverschiedenheit zwischen den beiden Präsidentschaftskandidaten. Beide stehen aufrecht und entschlossen für die Sache der Demokratie ein und stehen den Diktatoren feindlich gegenüber.“

09407-0027-000

Hamburgisches
Welt-Wirtschafts-Archiv

Signatur

Kennedy
Joseph P.

Datum

11. Nov. 1940

Faerber
14.12.40

Kennedy warnt USA. vor dem Kriegseintritt
(Kennedy Warns US. Must Not Enter War)

"New York Journal and American", New York
Nr. 19321, 11.11.1940 (Louis M. Lyons):
Joe Kennedy gefiel dem Schriftleiter der
"St. Louis Post-Dispatch", Ralph Cogan,
der auch am Interview teilgenommen hat,
auf den ersten Blick. Und in den
nächsten
halb Stunden, in denen uns Kennedy mit
seinen Ansichten über Amerika und den
Krieg wie ein Sturzbach überschüttete,
gefiel er ihm mit jedem Wort besser.

Der Gedanke überkam mich, dass sich
in Joe Kennedy, der in Boston geboren
ist, die Ansichten des Mississippi, des
grossen Herzens Amerikas, nahezu ver-
körperten. Er hat bereits einen stillen,
aber entschlossenen Kampf begonnen, uns
aus dem Krieg "herauszuhalten". Er hat
mit einem der einflussreichen Zeitungs-
verleger der USA. und mit Kongressmitgli-
edern gesprochen und ist höchst erstaunt,
wie wenig sie den Krieg und Amerikas Bezi-
hungen zum Kriege begreifen.

"Es freut mich, dass Sie nicht ein-
zweiter Walter Hines Page sind", sagt ihm
der Schriftleiter aus St. Louis, als wir
gehen. (Page war amerikanischer Botschafter
in London in den entscheidenden Jahren)

Faerber
14.12.40

Kennedy warnt USA. vor dem Kriegseintritt
(Kennedy Warns US. Must Not Enter War)

"New York Journal and American", New York
Nr.19321, 11.11.1940 (Louis M.Lyons):
Joe Kennedy gefiel dem Schrifteleiter der
"St.Louis Post-Dispatch", Ralph Cogan,
der auch am Interview teilgenommen hat,
auf den ersten Blick. Und in den ändert=
halb Stunden, in denen uns Kennedy mit
seinen Ansichten über Amerika und den
Krieg wie ein Sturzbach überschüttete,
gefiel er ihm mit jedem Wort besser.

Der Gedanke überkam mich, dass sich
in Joe Kennedy, der in Boston geboren
ist, die Ansichten des Mississippials,
des grossen Herzens Amerikas, nahezu ver=
körpern. Er hat bereits einen stillen,
aber entschlossenen Kampf begonnen, uns
aus dem Krieg "herauszuhalten". Er hat
mit einem der einflussreichen Zeitungs=
verleger der USA. und mit Kongressmitglie=
dern gesprochen und ist höchst erstaunt,
wie wenig sie den Krieg und Amerikas Bezie=
hungen zum Kriege begreifen.

"Es freut mich, dass Sie nicht ein
zweiter Walter Hines Page sind", sagt ihm
der Schrifteleiter aus St.Louis, als wir
gehen. (Page war amerikanischer Botschaf=
ter in London in den entscheidenden Jahren
1916/17, der sich dafür eingesetzt hat,
Präsident Wilson die britische ^{amicht} Seite von
Kriege nahe zu bringen.)

"Vor einigen Jahren", sagte Kennedy, "habe ich meinem Freund Joe Patterson (Verleger in New York) gesagt, dass die englisch~~e~~ Königin eine der intelligentesten Frauen ist, die ich je kennengelernt habe. Wenn der Krieg endlich vorbei ist und es für England zu retten gilt, was übrig geblieben ist, wird es die Königin sein und nicht ihre Politiker, die die Sache in die Hand nimmt. Sie hat mehr Verstand als das ganze Kabinett. Z.T. kommt das daher, weil sie nicht aus königlichem Hause stammt. Sie steht dem Volk näher.

Eine andere wundervolle Frau ist Eleanor fabelhaft Roosevelt, /hilfreich und so voller Mitgefühl. In Washington hat sie uns dauernd gestört und gequält, uns der armen kleinen Unbekannten, die keine Beziehungen haben, anzunehmen."

Das letzte Mal als ~~in~~ Kennedy mir ein Interview gab i.J. 1936, hat er sich ^{gequält} mit ^{ausgesprochen} auch so ~~ausgesprochen~~, und mir keinerlei Beschränkungen auferlegt. Ich habe jedes bischen aufgeschrieben und es wurde im ganzen Land verbreitet. Das war das Interview, in dem er mitteilte, warum er Roosevelt unterstützte. Er sagte, es sei das beste Interview, das er je ^{gehabt} ~~gehabt~~ hat. Aber er war damals noch nicht Botschafter.

"An das unaufhörliche Bombardieren gewöhnt man sich nicht. Es gibt in England

keinen Ort, der davor verschont geblieben ist. Die Bevölkerung steht ihren Mann. Sie geht am nächsten Tag zur Arbeit und hört zwei Stunden früher auf, damit sie noch in die Schutzräume kommt. Der Verkehr ist natürlich gestört. Es dauert manchmal sieben Stunden, ehe ein Telegramm ausgetragen wird. Davon könnte ich Euch genug erzählen. Aber es hat keinen Zweck, weiter darüber zu ~~s~~prechen."

den Engländer

"Die ~~englischen~~ Schiffahrtsverluste sind in diesem Kriege grösser, weil sie nicht so viele Zerstörer haben. Und die, die vorhanden sind, müssen auf die Verteidigung Englands, auf die des Mittelmeers und auf Geleitzüge verteilt werden. Unsere fünfzig Zerstörer haben da eine grosse Lücke ausgefüllt. Die dt.U-Bootstützpunkte sind dieses Mal näher an den Schiffahrtsstrassen. Die Engländer haben die irischen Häfen nur mit Rücksicht auf die öffentliche Meinung in USA. nicht besetzt."

"Man nennt mich einen Pessimisten. Ich frage: wo liegt denn hier Grund zur Heiterkeit? Die Demokratie ist erledigt."

"Sie meinen in England, oder auch hier in USA.?"

"Ich weiss nicht recht."

"Was bedeutet es, dass Mitglieder der Arbeiterpartei in der ^{*englischen*} Regierung sitzen

"Es bedeutet, dass daraus der Nationalsozialismus folgt," erwidert Kennedy rundweg.

"Sie halten anscheinend nicht viel von dem Bild, das H.G.Wells und Harold Baski uns von der Demokratie in England entwerfen? "

"Die Demokratie ist in England erledigt. Vielleicht auch hier. Weil ~~es~~ ^{alles} darauf hinausläuft, das Volk zu ernähren. Es ist letzten Endes ein Wirtschaftsproblem. Ich habe dem Präsidenten gesagt, 'Schicken Sie mir anstelle von fünfzig Admirälen oder Generälen lieber ein Dutzend wirklicher Volkswirte.' Es ist der Rückgang unseres Aussenhandels, verbunden mit den Kontrollmassnahmen, der unsere Regierungsform bedroht. Noch haben wir das nicht gespürt. Es wird aber kommen."

"Roosevelt ist der einzige, der die Kreise, auf die es in Zukunft ankommt (die mitmachen müssen), in der Hand hat. Ich meine da die Habenichtse, die keinen Anteil oder Besitz haben, für den sie kämpfen müssen~~x~~. Sie müssen aushalten, was uns auch bevorsteht."

"England kämpft nicht für die Demokratie. Das ist Kohl. ~~Es~~ ^{Es} kämpft für ~~seine~~ ^{seine} ~~seine~~ Selbsterhaltung, genau wie wir, sollten wir an die Reihe kommen. Der einzige Grund für eine Unterstützung Englands ist, ~~um~~ Zeit zu gewinnen. Wir dürfen nicht da-

mit rechnen, dass wir~~x~~ das, was wir England geben, jemals wiederbekommen. Es ist eine Versicherungsprämie. Wir können auch dem William Allen White Komitee und den anti-englischen Kreisen die Zähne ziehen."

"Ich setze unserer Hilfe für England keine Grenze. Sie hängt davon ab, wie lange England aushält. Beteiligt~~n~~ wir uns aber am Krieg, so wären ~~sie~~~~x~~ wir die Dummen. Wir müssen aufpassen, dass ^{am Schluss} wir dieses Mal/nicht wieder auf faulen Forderungen sitzen bleiben. Solange die Engländer bezahlen können, nehmen wir es ihnen ab. Aber wenn sie durchkommen, können wir ihnen den Rest ruhig schenken als Versicherungsprämie. "

"Der Blitzkrieg wird die Briten nicht niederwerfen", sagte Kennedy bestimmt. "Die Gefahr kommt für sie von Angriffen auf Gibraltar, ^{den} Irak und Kairo".

"Was wird aus Kanada, wenn es in England zum Ärgsten kommt?"

"Dann bleibt uns nichts weiter ^{uns} übrig, wir müssen/an die Monroe-Doktrin halten."

"Darauf kommt es an, wie wir die nächsten sechs Monate ausnutzen. Wir tun nicht unser Möglichstes. Und das müssen wir. Mit den gesetzlichen Vollmachten, ~~die~~ wir jetzt geben wollen, könnte keiner

- ausser vielleicht der Herrgott selbst -
die wirtschaftliche Mobilmachung durch-
führen."

"Kann die Unterstützung Englands
uns nicht - wie 1917 - in den Krieg hinein-
ziehen?"

"Nicht, wenn wir nüchterne Realisten
sind und das amerikanische Wohl in den
Vordergrund stellen."

"Wie können wir unsere Truppen
hinüber schicken, wenn Hitler alle euro-
päischen Häfen besetzt hat? Warum bitten
die Engländer um Soldaten, wenn sie noch
nicht mal alle ihre eigenen wehrfähigen
Männer aufgerufen haben? Wollen sie, dass
wir den Atlantik patrouillieren, indem wir
unsere Schiffe aus dem Pazifik ziehen,
so antworten wir, dass das einen Schrei
der Empörung in ganz Amerika auslösen wür-
de. Wenn sie Flieger wollen, wo sind die
Flugzeuge, in denen sie fliegen können?
Was Schiffe anlangt, wir haben keine. Ich
weiss mit Schiffen Bescheid. Wir könnten
eine Armee jetzt nirgends hinschicken.
Es wäre Unsinn, in den Krieg zu gehen.
Wofür würden wir denn kämpfen?"

"Unterstützung Englands so weit es
in unseren Kräften steht, das ist unsere
Parole. Solange England standhalten kann,
gebt ihm was dazu notwendig ist, soweit
wir es nicht selber benötigen. Aber erwar-
tet nichts davon zurück. Kredite dürfen

nicht mit dem Zollstock gemessen werden. Die Schuldengrenze kann so weit erhöht werden, bis das Volk darunter leidet und nicht mehr mitmachen will. Hitler hat alle Wirtschaftstheorien zum Fenster hinausgeworfen."

"Ich habe mir die britische Kriegswirtschaft nach allen Seiten hin angesehen. Das erste ~~XXII~~ Kriegsjahr hat England die Hälfte des Nationaleinkommens gekostet. Für uns würde das bedeuten: 35 Mrd. £. Und was hätten wir dafür? Lindbergh ist gar nicht so verrückt."

"Ich sage, dass wir nicht in den Krieg gehen dürfen. Nur über meine Leiche. Ich werde alles tun, um uns herauszuhalten. Ich weiss besser als alle anderen in USA. über Europa Bescheid, weil ich länger dagewesen bin. Ich werde Amerika über die Lage aufklären."

Kennedy, Joseph P
P

Signatur.....

Datum

13. Nov. 1940

Koch
15.11.1940

Aufsehenerregende Aeusserungen des amerikanischen Botschafters in London.

Opsigtvaekkende Udtalalser af U.S.A.s London Ambassador
"Nationaltidende", Kopenhagen, Nr. 315, 13.11.1940
(STB aus New York):

Das "New York Journal" veröffentlicht ein sensationelles Interview, in dem der jetzige amerikanische Botschafter in London, Joseph Kennedy, die Vereinigten Staaten warnt, in den Krieg einzutreten. Kennedy unterstrich wiederum, dass England nicht für die Demokratie kämpft, sondern für seine Existenz.

Weiter sagte er, dass er es zu seiner Aufgabe gemacht hätte, die Vereinigten Staaten daran zu hindern, in den Krieg zu ziehen und er wäre bereit, alles für dieses Ziel zu opfern.

Als wahrscheinliches Ergebnis des Krieges bezeichnete Kennedy den Untergang der demokratischen Weltordnung und die allgemeine Verbreiterung des Nationalsozialismus. Im Anschluss hieran sagte er, dass die Demokratie in England und vielleicht auch in Amerika zum Untergang verurteilt sei. "Die ganze Entwicklung ist letzten Endes eine wirtschaftliche Angelegenheit. Ich habe Roosevelt anheingestellt, mir weder Admirale noch Generale nach London zu schicken, sondern statt dessen ein Dutzend Wirtschafts-Sachverständige."

Im weiteren Verlauf des Interviews sagt Kennedy, dass er den Zusammenbruch Englands für durchaus möglich nicht hält. "Wenn die U.S.A. zu dem jetzigen Zeitpunkt eine Intervention vornehmen, werden sie die Verlierer sein, denn die Kriegsschuld wird dann nie bezahlt werden."

Kennedy bezeichnete einen eventuellen Angriff auf Gibraltar und die Entwicklung im Osten als die grösste Gefahr, die England droht, und deutete an, dass die nächsten sechs Monate ~~das Ende~~ des Krieges bringen müssten. Er bezeichnete die Gerüchte, dass die Vereinigten Staaten im Falle eines deutschen Sieges die Handelsverbindungen mit Europa abbrechen würden, als "Nonsense".

Die englischen Schiffbauverluste seien...

die Entscheidung

Koch
15.11.1940

Aufsehenerregende Aeusserungen des amerikanischen Botschafters in London.

Opsigtvaekkende Udtalalser af U.S.A.s London Ambassador
"Nationaltidende", Kopenhagen, Nr. 315, 13.11.1940

(STB aus New York):

Das "New York Journal" veröffentlicht ein sensationelles Interview, in dem der jetzige amerikanische Botschafter in London, Joseph Kennedy, die Vereinigten Staaten warnt, in den Krieg einzutreten. Kennedy unterstrich wiederum, dass England nicht für die Demokratie kämpft, sondern für seine Existenz.

Weiter sagte er, dass er es zu seiner Aufgabe gemacht hätte, die Vereinigten Staaten daran zu hindern, in den Krieg zu ziehen und er wäre bereit, alles für dieses Ziel zu opfern.

Als wahrscheinliches Ergebnis des Krieges bezeichnete Kennedy den Untergang der demokratischen Weltordnung und die allgemeine Verbreiterung des Nationalsozialismus. Im Anschluss hieran sagte er, dass die Demokratie in England und vielleicht auch in Amerika zum Untergang verurteilt sei. "Die ganze Entwicklung ist letzten Endes eine wirtschaftliche Angelegenheit. Ich habe Roosevelt anheimgestellt, mir weder Admirale noch Generale nach London zu schicken, sondern statt dessen ein Dutzend Wirtschafts-Sachverständige."

Im weiteren Verlauf des Interviews sagt Kennedy, dass er den Zusammenbruch Englands für durchaus möglich ~~nicht~~ hält. "Wenn die U.S.A. zu dem jetzigen Zeitpunkt eine Intervention vornehmen, werden sie die Verlierer sein, denn die Kriegsschuld wird dann nie bezahlt werden."

Kennedy bezeichnete einen eventuellen Angriff auf Gibraltar und die Entwicklung im Osten als die grösste Gefahr, die England droht, und deutete an, dass die nächsten sechs Monate ~~das Ende~~ des Krieges bringen müssten. Er bezeichnete die Gerüchte, dass die Vereinigten Staaten im Falle eines deutschen Sieges die Handelsverbindungen mit Europa abbrechen würden, als "Nonsense".

Die englischen Schiffahrtsverluste seien "bedeutend", die Lage in London "ernst". Das ständige Bombardement sei unerträglich. Es sei irreleitend, Parallelen mit dem letzten ~~XX~~ ~~XXXXX~~ Krieg zu ziehen, da alle jetzigen Geschehnisse

die Entscheidung

0481.von.87

Neue Zürcher Zeitung

"grundlegende Neuheiten" seien.

In dieser Verbindung sagte er, Hitler hätte "alle bisherigen Wirtschafts-Theorien über den Haufen geworfen". Die einzige Aufgabe Amerikas sei die Selbsterhaltung und die Hilfe für England sei nur ein Mittel dazu.

Kennedys Interview steht in direktem Gegensatz zu der Rede des Präsidenten am Waffenstillstandstage und wirkte wie eine Bombe in politischen Kreisen in Washington.

Es wird als ausgeschlossen angesehen, dass Kennedy nach diesem Interview wieder als Botschafter nach London zurückkehren wird.

14. Nov. 1940

Datum

Faerber
28.11.40Der Pessimismus des Herrn Kennedy
(Mr. Kennedy's Pessimism)"New York Herald Tribune," New York, Nr.
34332, 14.11.40 (Leitartikel):

Die veröffentlichten Äusserungen des Botschafters Joseph P. Kennedy, der die Wiederwahl Roosevelts so kräftig unterstützt hat, lassen den Botschafter - selbst wenn er nicht ausgesprochener Vertreter einer Versöhnungspolitik ist - als Defaitisten ersten Ranges erscheinen. Er hat dementiert, das besagte Interview genehmigt zu haben, hat es als voller Ungenauigkeiten hingestellt, legt aber grösstes Gewicht darauf, dass die Veröffentlichung ein Vertrauensbruch gewesen ist. Leider ist seine Erklärung angesichts des Ernstes der Lage nicht zufriedenstellend. Vor einem Jahr wurde allgemein als seine Auffassung bezeichnet, es sei besser, Hitler zu besänftigen, als den Krieg zu riskieren. Heute berichtet man von ihm, er habe gesagt, die Demokratie sei in England erledigt, und vielleicht auch bald in USA. In Dtld. wird man einen derartigen Ausspruch des amerikanischen Botschafters in Grossbritannien und Vertrauten Roosevelts dahingehend auslegen, dass die Regierung Roosevelt in der Hilfeleistung für Grossbritannien nicht zum Äussersten gehen wird

Faerber
28.11.40

Datum.....

Der Pessimismus des Herrn Kennedy
(Mr. Kennedy's Pessimism)

"New York Herald Tribune," New York, Nr.
34332, 14.11.40 (Leitartikel):

Die veröffentlichten Äusserungen des Botschafters Joseph P. Kennedy, der die Wiederwahl Roosevelts so kräftig unterstützt hat, lassen den Botschafter - selbst wenn er nicht ausgesprochener Vertreter einer Versöhnungspolitik ist - als Defaitisten ersten Ranges erscheinen. Er hat dementiert, das besagte Interview genehmigt zu haben, hat es als voller Ungenauigkeiten hingestellt, legt aber grösstes Gewicht darauf, dass die Veröffentlichung ein Vertrauensbruch gewesen ist. Leider ist seine Erklärung angesichts des Ernstes der Lage nicht zufriedenstellend. Vor einem Jahr wurde allgemein als seine Auffassung bezeichnet, es sei besser, Hitler zu besänftigen, als den Krieg zu riskieren. Heute berichtet man von ihm, er habe gesagt, die Demokratie sei in England erledigt, und vielleicht auch bald in USA. In Dtld. wird man einen derartigen Ausspruch des amerikanischen Botschafters in Grossbritannien und Vertrauten Roosevelts dahingehend auslegen, dass die Regierung Roosevelt in der Hilfeleistung für Grossbritannien nicht zum Äussersten gehen ~~wird~~ und einer britischen Niederlage untätig zusehen werde.

09407-0030-000

Hamburgisches
Welt-Wirtschafts-Archiv

Kennedy, Joseph P.

Signatur.....

Datum 16. Nov. 1940

Frankfurter Zeitung (Frankfurt a. M.)

Nr. 586

Kennedy und die amerikanische Hilfe für England

■ Bern, 15. November. Wie aus Los Angeles gemeldet wird, hielt dort der amerikanische Botschafter in London, **Kennedy**, eine auffallend zurückhaltende Rede über die amerikanische Unterstützung für England. Er erklärte, daß für die Vereinigten Staaten nicht die geringste Notwendigkeit bestehe, in den europäischen Krieg einzutreten, ja es sei eine unumgängliche nationale Pflicht, Amerika aus dem überseeischen Kriege herauszuhalten. Kennedy versicherte, er werde alles in seinen Kräften stehende tun, um die Vereinigten Staaten vor dem Kriege zu bewahren. Er erklärte schließlich, daß die verstärkte Hilfeleistung für England die amerikanische Aufrüstung nicht behindern dürfe.

09407-0031-000

Hamburgisches
Welt-Wirtschafts-Archiv

Kennedy, Joseph P.

Signatur. *P*

Datum

2. Dez. 1940

Neue Zürcher Zeitung
335
Nr.

Vereinigte Staaten

Der Rücktritt Kennedys

Washington, 2. Dez. (Exchange) Joseph Kennedy, der amerikanische Botschafter in London, ist von seinem Posten zurückgetreten und wird sich in Zukunft, wie er Pressevertretern zu verstehen gab, „ganz in den Dienst der augenblicklich höchsten Sache der Welt stellen“, als welche er die „Wahrung der amerikanischen Form der Demokratie“ betrachtet.

Kennedy steht im Alter von 52 Jahren und wurde im März 1938 zum amerikanischen Botschafter in London ernannt, von wo er Ende Oktober nach den Vereinigten Staaten zurückkehrte.

09407-0032-000

Hamburgisches
Welt-Wirtschafts-Archiv

Signature

Kennedy, Joseph P.

Datum 2. Dez. 1940

Hamburger Fremdenblatt

Nr. 332

Kennedy geht

Auslandsdienst des Hamburger Fremdenblattes
ins. Washington, 2. Dezember

Der langjährige Botschafter der Vereinigten Staaten in England, Kennedy, gibt bekannt, daß er dem Präsidenten Roosevelt am 6. November sein Rücktrittsgesuch unterbreitet habe. Er habe sich bereit erklärt, formell noch seinen Posten beizubehalten, bis ein Nachfolger ernannt sei. Er werde jedoch nicht auf seinen Posten in London zurückkehren.

Botschafter Kennedy hat durch offene Darlegung der Lage Englands Aufsehen erregt. Seine Äußerungen deckten sich mit den Enthüllungen des englischen Botschafters Lord Lothian und anderer englischer Minister.

H. Green
7.12.40

Kennedys zukünftige Aufgabe.

" Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant " , Rotterdam , Nr. 557
3.12.40 (S.P.T.)

Joseph Kennedy hat sofort nach Bekanntwerden seines Rücktritts der Presse eine Erklärung überreicht, worin mitgeteilt wird , dass er nach einem kurzen Urlaub , sich der für den Augenblick wichtigsten Aufgabe seiner ganzen Laufbahn widmen werde , nämlich der Regierung und Präsident Roosevelt als Ratgeber in europäischen Fragen zu dienen.

In amerikanischen Kreisen sieht man in dieser Erklärung den Grund warum Kennedy bis jetzt noch gewillt war, das Amt als Botschafter in London zu bekleiden. Es ist klar , dass dies auf Wunsch von Präsident Roosevelt erfolgte , der Kennedy zu Rate zu ziehen wünscht über die zwischen Washington und London zu erledigenden Fragen. Man erinnert in Verbindung hiermit auch an den Besuch einer britischen Finanzkommission in den USA , die zur Besprechung der englischen Kreditwünsche nach Amerika kommt. Man glaubt , dass Kennedy bei diesen Verhandlungen eine aktive Rolle spielen wird.

09407-0036-000

Hamburgisches
Welt-Wirtschafts-Archiv

Kennedy, Joseph P.

Signatur.....

Datum 20. Jan. 1941

Arndt.
7.2.41.

Kennedys Ansichten.

(Mr. Kennedy: U.S. Views)

"Daily Telegraph", London, Nr. 26715, 20.1.41.

(N.Y. Korr.): Alle amerik. Blätter bringen die Rundfunkrede Kennedys vom 18.1. in grosser Aufmachung. Seine Befürwortung der Engld. zu leistenden Hilfe wird begrüsst. Die amerik. Zeitung "P.M." enthält sich eines Kommentars zu der Rede, bringt aber dafür ein Interview zwischen dem Herausgeber, Ralph Ingersoll, und seinem soeben von London zurückgekehrten Berichterstatter Ben ~~Robertson~~ Robertson. Der Dialog enthält ein paar Nämlich: - hält ~~zwei~~/interessante Sätze./ Robertson: "Mr. Kennedy rief in mir und den anderen Korrespondenten den Eindruck hervor, dass er hinsichtlich Englds. Aussicht sehr skeptisch dachte."

Ingersoll: "Der amerik. Botschafter sagte den Engländern das Eine und den amerik. Korrespondenten etwas anderes?" Robertson: "Jawohl".

Ingersoll: "Hat er jemals zu Ihnen gesagt, was die Kriegsziele Englds. nach seiner Ansicht wären?" Robertson: "Er sagte: "Ich kann nicht klug daraus werden, um was dieser Krieg eigentlich geht. Wenn Sie herausfinden können, warum die Engländer sich den Nazis entgegenstellen, sind Sie ein besserer Kopf als ich."".

Datum 20. Jan. 1941

The Times (London)

**MR. KENNEDY
EXPLAINS****KEEPING AMERICA OUT
OF WAR****UTMOST AID TO BRITAIN**

Recalling the fact that when he returned from London he declared that the United States ought to stay out of the war and could stay out of the war, and that he urged the United States to give England all possible aid, Mr. Joseph Kennedy, the retiring Ambassador to Britain, declared in a broadcast on Saturday night (according to Reuter):—

I feel the same way about it to-day. Since my return there have been "many false statements" regarding my views on foreign policy. Moreover, there is a growing confusion and reliance upon emotion which strikes me as altogether unnecessary and extremely harmful. Many Americans, including myself, have been subjected to deliberate smear campaigns merely because we differed from an articulate minority.

The favourite device of this aggressive minority is to call any American questioning the likelihood of a British victory an apostle of gloom—a defeatist. I never thought that it was my function [as Ambassador] to report pleasant stories that were not true. I am aware of, and have reported on, serious obstacles to the British victory. I know many of Britain's weaknesses, but a prediction can be based only on complete knowledge of the strength and weaknesses of both sides. The moral of the British nation defies description. It is as fine a display of human courage as was ever witnessed. But what do we know about the moral of the German Army or of the German people? Thus the prediction now of England's defeat would be a senseless one. One can recognize the enormous difficulties facing Britain without foreseeing her defeat.

If by the word "appeaser," now possessed of hateful implications, it is charged that I advocate a deal with the dictators contrary to British desires or that I advocate the placing of any trust or confidence in their promises, the charge is false and malicious. The word of these tyrants has been shown to be worthless. They themselves proclaim that their promises are sham. But if I am called an appeaser because I oppose the entry of this country into the present war, I cheerfully plead guilty. So must every one of you who wants to keep America out of war.

DOOR ON PEACE SLAMMED

Hitler, the man who wanted the war, has slammed the door on peace to all the world. He has proclaimed that he, Hitler, is waging a total war for a new world order—a new world where our society of justice according to law cannot even exist.

If one emphasizes aid to Britain, he thereby risks entering the war. If, on the other hand, he emphasizes avoidance of war he minimizes aid to Britain. I think that these policies can be applied without confusion and without risk of contradiction. We need but apply the test which should motivate every one of us. Whenever the issue is raised, whether for President, Congress, Army or Navy, the test for any proposals should be—what is best for the United States?

I favour now, as I did in my talk with the President, that we give the utmost aid to England. By so doing, we shall assist the

rearm. But this aid should not and must not go to the point where war becomes inevitable.

If after the resources of Great Britain were used up it were still sound American policy to assist them, I would prefer it to be done through outright gifts, since I would not expect that loans would be repaid. If—and God forbid—England were to be defeated quickly and the Germans succeeded to the British Navy, this country now is not prepared to defend its own shores, let alone the North American continent.

England's spirited defence is affording us precious time for rearming. It is consequently to our interest that England be aided in her courageous battle. No one will seriously urge that we should give beyond the absolute minimum necessary for our own protection. Where that line is to be drawn is to be determined by the President acting with our trained experts of the Army and the Navy. Under our policy we can give them guns, ammunition, and aeroplanes; we can give them everything that does not make war inevitable. Because aid for England is part of a constructive American policy to safeguard America, we should go to the very limit of our assistance, but not to a point which would endanger our own protection.

Many Americans fear that Hitler will declare war on us if we continue to aid Britain. To declare war is a bit outmoded in these days of unbridled force. Do not forget that Hitler will declare war on this country or will make an attack only when he thinks such action is in his best interests. This country is certainly committed to acts sufficiently unneutral to justify a less despotic tyrant than Hitler in declaring war. The American people obviously have not the slightest desire to remain neutral in face of the aggression of the Axis Powers.

It is not surprising that we desire Hitler's defeat. The English are defending a society which respects law, which upholds the dignity of the individual. All of us want very much to see destroyed once and for all the attempted decivilization of the world in the name of Nazi pagan philosophy. Unless we are attacked, the American people will not have to go to war. They will not go to war if they will to stay out of war.

After the retreat from Dunkirk and the fall of France, the English defences were in a deplorable state. Even "hunting rifles" were being collected in England in order to equip part of their fighting forces. In spite of such handicaps, in spite of the fact that the conquest of the British Isles would have given Hitler domination over Europe, the Germans have never been able to secure a foothold on that island.

UNPREPARED TO FIGHT

Frankly, if I could be assured that America, unprepared as she is now, could, by declaring war on Germany, within the space of, say, a year, end the threat of German domination, I should favour declaring war right now. The inescapable point is, however, that we are not prepared to fight a war, even a defensive one, at the moment. Further, I really do not know where our Army would go if we started to fight a war. Just as I regard it impossible for a foreign power to invade this country, so I regard it impossible for us to invade Europe. To me, we either go all the way into the war or all the way out of it. If we go into war, our man-power cannot be preserved from battle. Only yesterday Mr. Churchill said, "We do not require in 1941 large armies from overseas." Does that mean that our boys are expected over there in 1942? England is not fighting our battle. This is not our war. We were not consulted when it began.

With regard to the "lease-and-lend" Bill, it has not yet been shown that the United States is facing such immediate danger as to justify the surrender of the authority and responsibility of Congress.

Our friends across the water want more than words. Words will not give them armaments. They will not make us strong. Now we must resolve that our lot must be toil and sweat. Then and only then can we hope to spare ourselves and our children from a dismal destiny

MR. KENNEDY EXPLAINS

KEEPING AMERICA OUT OF WAR

UTMOST AID TO BRITAIN

Recalling the fact that when he returned from London he declared that the United States ought to stay out of the war and could stay out of the war, and that he urged the United States to give England all possible aid, Mr. Joseph Kennedy, the retiring Ambassador to Britain, declared in a broadcast on Saturday night (according to Reuter):—

I feel the same way about it to-day. Since my return there have been "many false statements" regarding my views on foreign policy. Moreover, there is a growing confusion and reliance upon emotion which strikes me as altogether unnecessary and extremely harmful. Many Americans, including myself, have been subjected to deliberate smear campaigns merely because we differed from an articulate minority.

The favourite device of this aggressive minority is to call any American questioning the likelihood of a British victory an apostle of gloom—a defeatist. I never thought that it was my function [as Ambassador] to report pleasant stories that were not true. I am aware of, and have reported on, serious obstacles to the British victory. I know many of Britain's weaknesses, but a prediction can be based only on complete knowledge of the strength and weaknesses of both sides. The moral of the British nation defies description. It is as fine a display of human courage as was ever witnessed. But what do we know about the moral of the German Army or of the German people? Thus the prediction now of England's defeat would be a senseless one. One can recognize the enormous difficulties facing Britain without foreseeing her defeat.

If by the word "appeaser," now possessed of hateful implications, it is charged that I advocate a deal with the dictators contrary to British desires or that I advocate the placing of any trust or confidence in their promises, the charge is false and malicious. The word of these tyrants has been shown to be worthless. They themselves proclaim that their promises are sham. But if I am called an appeaser because I oppose the entry of this country into the present war, I cheerfully plead guilty. So must every one of you who wants to keep America out of war.

DOOR ON PEACE SLAMMED

Hitler, the man who wanted the war, has slammed the door on peace to all the world. He has proclaimed that he, Hitler, is waging a total war for a new world order—a new world where our society of justice according to law cannot even exist.

If one emphasizes aid to Britain, he thereby risks entering the war. If, on the other hand, he emphasizes avoidance of war he minimizes aid to Britain. I think that these policies can be applied without confusion and without risk of contradiction. We need but apply the test which should motivate every one of us. Whenever the issue is raised, whether for President, Congress, Army or Navy, the test for any proposals should be—what is best for the United States?

I favour now, as I did in my talk with the President, that we give the utmost aid to England. By so doing, we shall assist the nation which the American people want to see win. But more than that, by helping Britain we shall be securing for ourselves the most precious commodity we need—time—time to

rearm. But this aid should not and must not go to the point where war becomes inevitable.

If after the resources of Great Britain were used up it were still sound American policy to assist them, I would prefer it to be done through outright gifts, since I would not expect that loans would be repaid. If—and God forbid—England were to be defeated quickly and the Germans succeeded to the British Navy, this country now is not prepared to defend its own shores, let alone the North American continent.

England's spirited defence is affording us precious time for rearming. It is consequently to our interest that England be aided in her courageous battle. No one will seriously urge that we should give beyond the absolute minimum necessary for our own protection. Where that line is to be drawn is to be determined by the President acting with our trained experts of the Army and the Navy. Under our policy we can give them guns, ammunition, and aeroplanes; we can give them everything that does not make war inevitable. Because aid for England is part of a constructive American policy to safeguard America, we should go to the very limit of our assistance, but not to a point which would endanger our own protection.

Many Americans fear that Hitler will declare war on us if we continue to aid Britain. To declare war is a bit outmoded in these days of unbridled force. Do not forget that Hitler will declare war on this country or will make an attack only when he thinks such action is in his best interests. This country is certainly committed to acts sufficiently unneutral to justify a less despotic tyrant than Hitler in declaring war. The American people obviously have not the slightest desire to remain neutral in face of the aggression of the Axis Powers.

It is not surprising that we desire Hitler's defeat. The English are defending a society which respects law, which upholds the dignity of the individual. All of us want very much to see destroyed once and for all the attempted decivilization of the world in the name of Nazi pagan philosophy. Unless we are attacked, the American people will not have to go to war. They will not go to war if they will to stay out of war.

After the retreat from Dunkirk and the fall of France, the English defences were in a deplorable state. Even "hunting rifles" were being collected in England in order to equip part of their fighting forces. In spite of such handicaps, in spite of the fact that the conquest of the British Isles would have given Hitler domination over Europe, the Germans have never been able to secure a foothold on that island.

UNPREPARED TO FIGHT

Frankly, if I could be assured that America, unprepared as she is now, could, by declaring war on Germany, within the space of, say, a year, end the threat of German domination, I should favour declaring war right now. The inescapable point is, however, that we are not prepared to fight a war, even a defensive one, at the moment. Further, I really do not know where our Army would go if we started to fight a war. Just as I regard it impossible for a foreign power to invade this country, so I regard it impossible for us to invade Europe. To me, we either go all the way into the war or all the way out of it. If we go into war, our man-power cannot be preserved from battle. Only yesterday Mr. Churchill said, "We do not require in 1941 large armies from overseas." Does that mean that our boys are expected over there in 1942? England is not fighting our battle. This is not our war. We were not consulted when it began.

With regard to the "lease-and-lend" Bill, it has not yet been shown that the United States is facing such immediate danger as to justify the surrender of the authority and responsibility of Congress.

Our friends across the water want more than words. Words will not give them armaments. They will not make us strong. Now we must resolve that our lot must be toil and sweat. Then and only then can we hope to spare ourselves and our children from a dismal destiny of blood and tears.

Datum 20. Jan. 1941

Neue Zürcher Zeitung

Nr. 19

Radioansprache Kennedys

New York, 19. Jan. (United Press) Der frühere Botschafter der Vereinigten Staaten in London, Kennedy, hat eine Radioansprache an das amerikanische Volk gehalten, in der er u. a. ausführte:

Nachdem ich aus London zurückgekehrt war, sprach ich über das Radio für die Wiederwahl Roosevelts. Ich erklärte damals, es sei meine ehrliche Überzeugung, daß wir dem Kriege fern bleiben sollten. Ich empfahl damals dringend, daß wir England alle mögliche Hilfe leisten. Ich bin heute noch genau der gleichen Ansicht. Seit jener Radiorede hat man viele unrichtige Erklärungen über meine Ansichten über die Außenpolitik gehört. Es ist die Lieblingsmethode einer aggressiven Minderheit, jedesmal, wenn jemand in Amerika sich getraut, die Wahrscheinlichkeit eines britischen Sieges wenn nicht gerade zu bezweifeln, so doch zu prüfen, von „Unheilsaposteln“ zu reden. Als Stütze des Arguments, ich sei ein „Unheilsapostel“, ist schon gesagt worden, ich hätte die Niederlage Großbritanniens vorausgesagt. Dies ist nicht wahr. Ich bin mir dessen bewußt, daß ich von ernststen Hindernissen sprach, die einem britischen Sieg im Wege stehen. Ich weiß von vielen Schwächen Großbritanniens; aber eine Voraussage kann nur auf einer erschöpfenden Kenntnis der Stärke und Schwäche beider Seiten basieren. Es gibt in diesem Kriege manches Phänomen, das die gründlichsten Erklärungen der Experten Lügen straft. Warum ist die deutsche Luftwaffe nicht imstande gewesen, die Industriezentren Englands zu zerstören? Warum hat die deutsche Luftwaffe ihre Anstrengungen nicht darauf konzentriert, die britischen Häfen durch Bombardierungen aus der Luft zu zerstören? Die Moral Großbritanniens ist eine Manifestation menschlichen Mutes, wie man sie bisher noch nie erlebt hat. Aber was wissen wir über die Moral des deutschen Volkes? Verfügen die Deutschen über die gleiche Fähigkeit oder sind sie nach acht Jahren der Tyrannei schon etwas schwächer geworden? Dies sind nur wenige der unbekannten Elemente, die sehr wohl einen entscheidenden Einfluß auf den Ausgang des gegenwärtigen Kampfes haben können. Es wäre daher unsinnig, jetzt Englands Niederlage voraussagen zu wollen.

Ein anderes Wort, das gern für Leute gebraucht wird, die dafür eintreten, daß Amerika sich von diesem Kriege fernhält, ist das Wort „Befrieder“. Ich bin auch schon ein Befrieder genannt worden. Wenn man mir damit vorwerfen will, ich trete dafür ein, daß man mit den Diktatoren verhandle oder daß man den Versprechen der Diktatoren Glauben und Vertrauen schenke, dann ist dies falsch und böse.

artig. Es hat sich mehr als einmal herausgestellt, daß das Wort dieser Tyrannen nichts wert ist; sie selber haben ihre Versprechen als Täuschung bezeichnet. Wenn man mich aber einen Befrieder nennt, weil ich mich gegen den Eintritt dieses Landes in den Krieg ausspreche, dann gebe ich gerne zu, daß ich schuldig bin. Der Ausdruck „Kriegsbekehrer“ ist ein anderes Beispiel dieser unglücklichen Tendenz, die sich hier bemerkbar macht.

Es ist leider nur zu wahr, daß diesmal ein gerechter Friede nicht in Frage zu stehen scheint. Hitler, der Mann, der den Krieg wollte, hat vor dem Frieden die Türen zugeschlagen. Er hat der ganzen Welt gesagt, daß er den totalen Krieg führe, um eine neue Weltordnung zu schaffen, eine neue Welt, in der eine Gemeinschaft der Gerechtigkeit nicht existieren kann.

Wenn wir uns damit befassen, was am besten ist für die Vereinigten Staaten, dann müssen wir das Problem der Hilfe an Großbritannien studieren. Ich stelle mich nach wie vor auf den Standpunkt, daß wir England alle mögliche Hilfe leisten, und wenn wir dies tun, helfen wir einer Nation, die die Vereinigten Staaten gern als Sieger sehen würden. Aber noch mehr als das: dadurch, daß wir England helfen, verschaffen wir uns Zeit, um aufzurüsten. Wenn — möge Gott dies verhüten — England geschlagen werden sollte, schnell geschlagen, meine ich, und es den Deutschen gelingen sollte, die britische Flotte zu nehmen, dann wäre unser Land nicht vorbereitet, die eigenen Küsten zu schützen, vom ganzen nordamerikanischen Kontinent gar nicht zu reden. Englands fluge Verteidigung bietet uns Zeit, aufzurüsten, und es ist daher ganz in unserem Interesse, daß England geholfen wird, seinen heldenhaften Kampf zu gewinnen. Niemand wird im Ernst den Vorschlag machen, daß wir mehr geben als absolut nötig ist für unsern Schutz. Wo die Grenzlinie gezogen wird, wird vom Präsidenten bestimmt.

Was die Frage einer Invasion unseres Landes betrifft: Überlegt euch, was es bedeutet, Truppen und Waffen über dreitausend Meilen eines stürmischen Ozeans zu transportieren; überlegt euch, was für Risiken es bedeutet, zu versuchen, unsere Flotten- und Luftverteidigung zu durchbrechen.

Je mehr wir aufrüsten, je größer unser Arsenal wird, desto mehr werden wir England zur Verfügung stellen können. Unsere Freunde über dem Wasser wollen von uns mehr als leere Worte. Ich rede niemandem ein, daß wir, wenn wir dem Krieg fernbleiben, einen leichten Weg vor uns haben. Aber ich stelle fest, daß wir, wenn wir dem Krieg fernbleiben, weit eher in der Lage sein werden, die gigantischen Probleme zu lösen, die sich uns stellen.“

09407-0039-000

Signatur

Kennedy,
Joseph P.
Datum 22. Jan. 1941

Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung (Berlin)

Nr. 37

Rundfunkansprache Kennedys

Der frühere USA.-Botschafter über den Krieg

dnb. Berlin, 21. 1.

Nach einer längeren Unterredung mit Roosevelt befürwortete der ehemalige USA.-Botschafter in London, Kennedy, in einer Rundfunkansprache zwar die Hilfe für England, um für die Vereinigten Staaten die so dringend notwendige Zeit zur Wiederaufrüstung zu gewinnen, erklärte jedoch im Gegensatz zu den Beteuerungen Roosevelts, daß die Vereinigten Staaten keine Kriegsziele hätten und wandte sich mit Nachdruck gegen das Argument, daß England Amerikas Krieg führe. „Das ist nicht unser Krieg“, sagte er, „wir wurden bei Beginn nicht gefragt, wir hatten kein Veto hinsichtlich der Fortsetzung.“

In gleichem Atemzug gab Kennedy unumwunden zu, daß die Vereinigten Staaten sich häufig unneutraler Handlungen schuldig gemacht hätten. Zum Englandhilfs-gesetz, das von den Amerikanern riesige Opfer fordere, erklärte er, daß die Gefahr nicht so groß sei, als daß man dem Präsidenten die von ihm verlangten Vollmachten einräumen sollte. Als Gegenleistung fordere er, daß die Engländer zunächst alle Guthaben zur Verfügung stellen müßten, die Amerika brauchen könne. Später aber sollte man gleich direkte Geschenke machen, da man auf eine Rückzahlung von Anleihen ja doch nicht rechnen könne.

Kennedy stellte sodann eindeutig fest, daß das USA.-Volk keinen Krieg wolle. Die Kriegsteilnahme würde, wie in England, auch in den Vereinigten Staaten die Demokratien vernichten. „Sollten“, so fragte Kennedy, „die Kinder und Kindeskinde der Vereinigten Staaten in Europa Wache stehen, während der Himmel wissen mag, was aus Amerika werden mag?“

Entschieden wandte er sich gegen die Roosevelt'sche Theorie von der Möglichkeit eines Angriffes auf die Vereinigten Staaten.

09407-0040-000

Signatur

Datum 22. Jan. 1941

Frankfurter Zeitung (Frankfurt a. M.)

Nr. 40

„Das ist nicht unser Krieg.“

Eine Rundfunkrede Kennedys.

New York, 21. Januar. (DNB.) Nach einer längeren Unterredung mit Roosevelt befürwortete der ehemalige Botschafter der Vereinigten Staaten in London, Kennedy, in einer Rundfunkansprache zwar die Hilfe für England, um für die Vereinigten Staaten die so dringend notwendige Zeit zur Wiederaufrüstung zu gewinnen, erklärte jedoch (im Gegensatz zu Roosevelt), daß die Vereinigten Staaten keine Kriegsziele hätten, und wandte sich mit Nachdruck gegen das Argument, daß England Amerikas Krieg führe. „Das ist nicht unser Krieg“, sagte er, „wir wurden bei seinem Beginn nicht gefragt. Wir hatten kein Veto gegenüber seiner Fortsetzung.“ Kennedy gab unumwunden zu, daß die Vereinigten Staaten sich häufig „unneutralen Handlungen“ schuldig gemacht hätten. Zum Hilfsgezet für England, das von den Amerikanern

sehr große Opfer fordere, erklärte er, daß die Gefahr nicht so groß sei, als daß man dem Präsidenten die von ihm verlangten Vollmachten einräumen sollte. Als Gegenleistung forderte er, daß die Engländer zunächst alle Guthaben zur Verfügung stellten, die Amerika brauchen könne. Später aber sollte man gleich direkte Geschenke machen, da man auf eine Rückzahlung von Anleihen ja doch nicht rechnen könne. Kennedy stellte sodann fest, daß das amerikanische Volk keinen Krieg wolle. Die Kriegsteilnahme würde wie in England so auch in den Vereinigten Staaten die Demokratie vernichten. „Sollten“, so fragte Kennedy, „die Kinder und Kindeskin der Vereinigten Staaten in Europa Wache stehen, während der Himmel wissen mag, was aus Amerika werden wird?“ Kennedy wandte sich auch entschieden gegen die Rooseveltische Theorie von der Möglichkeit eines Angriffes auf die Vereinigten Staaten.

09407-0041-000

Signature *P*

Kennedy
Joseph P.

Datum 22. Jan. 1941

Neue Zürcher Zeitung

Nr. 22

Kennedy über die Kriegsaussichten

Washington, 21. Jan. (United Press) Heute wurde der ehemalige Botschafter in London, Kennedy, vom Auswärtigen Ausschuss des Repräsentantenhauses einvernommen. Er erklärte, wenn Großbritannien in diesem Jahr nicht mehr Schiffe zur Verfügung gestellt würden, so werde das Problem der britischen Schifffahrt und der Lebensmittelversorgung ernst und vital. Wenn die britischen Schiffsverluste weiterhin so groß seien wie im vorletzten und letzten Monat, so werde sich die Situation noch mehr verschlimmern.

Der ehemalige Botschafter erklärte, er könne einige Phasen der deutschen Kampagne nicht verstehen. „Wenn die Deutschen wirklich so stark sind, wie sie sagten, dann kann ich es nicht verstehen, warum sie es geschehen ließen, daß sich britische Streitkräfte in der Stärke von 300 000 Mann aus Dünkirchen zurückziehen konnten. Damals hätten die Deutschen eine Gelegenheit gehabt, der britischen Armee einen vernichtenden Schlag zu versetzen.“

Kennedy gab seiner Meinung Ausdruck, daß die britische Ballonsperrre und Fliegerabwehr nie sehr wirksam gewesen sei. „Wenn die Deutschen stark genug sind, um die Herrschaft in der Luft an sich zu reißen, dann kann die Krise jeden Moment kommen. Aber die Deutschen haben bisher nicht bewiesen, daß sie diese Stärke haben.“

Kennedy erklärte, er habe den Engländern niemals Anlaß gegeben, anzunehmen, daß die Vereinigten Staaten ihnen helfen würden, Europa zu besiegen. Die Engländer wüßten, daß Amerika ihnen helfe; es gebe aber Leute, und zwar solche an der Spitze, die der Auffassung seien, daß die Vereinigten Staaten England nicht genügend Hilfe leisteten.

Ein Fragesteller wollte wissen, was Kennedy von der Möglichkeit eines britischen Sieges über die Achse halte. „Ich kann mir nicht vorstellen“, meinte Kennedy, „wie anderthalb Millionen Soldaten eine Armee von sechs Millionen bis

an die Zähne bewaffneter Soldaten von irgend einem Punkt vertreiben können, es sei denn, daß in jenen Ländern, wo diese sechs Millionen Truppen verteilt sind, eine Revolution ausbricht.“

Kennedy lehnte es ab, sich dazu zu äußern, ob England bereit sei, weitere Luftflottenstützpunkte abzutreten, ohne als Gegenleistung weitere Zerstörer zu erhalten.

Nach Kennedys Ansicht ist die britische Industrie durch die ständigen feindlichen Luftangriffe stark beeinträchtigt worden, besonders durch die nächtlichen Angriffe.

Kennedy erklärte, er befürworte restlos „alles, was der Kongreß beschließt und mit dem sich Roosevelt einverstanden erklärt“. Er teile die Auffassung, daß es einen Kriegsakt darstellen würde, wenn die Vereinigten Staaten Flottengeleitzüge nach den britischen Inseln einrichten würden. Wenn man mir die Zusicherung geben könnte, daß unser Volk nicht den Krieg erklären würde, wenn eines unserer Schiffe unterwegs in die Luft fliegen sollte, dann würde ich mich den Geleitzügen nicht widersetzen; aber ich kann das nicht glauben.“ Kennedy erklärte auf eine andere Frage, daß die Vereinigten Staaten so rasch als möglich aufrüsten müssen. „Nachdem ich in London gewesen bin, kann ich dies nicht dringend genug empfehlen.“ Kennedy, der erst vor kurzem aus England nach den Vereinigten Staaten zurückgekehrt ist, betonte, daß die Moral des britischen Volkes ausgezeichnet sei. „Das britische Volk ist viel weniger aufgeregter als gewisse Leute, denen ich hier in den Vereinigten Staaten begegnet bin.“

Kennedy machte schließlich den Vorschlag, daß aus den Reihen der Kongreßmitglieder eine Kommission gebildet werde, die mit Roosevelt zusammen arbeiten solle, um das Programm der Hilfe an Großbritannien wirkungsvoll durchzuführen. Ungefähr gleichzeitig hat Gouverneur Staffen von Minnesota in einer Rede vor den Staatsgouverneuren die Schaffung eines Obersten Wehrrates vorgeschlagen, der aus dem Präsidenten und den demokratischen und republikanischen Führern des Repräsentantenhauses und des Senats zusammengesetzt sein sollte.

09407-0042-000

Signatur.....

Datum

29. Apr. 1943

LA DOCUMENTATION
HEBDOMADAIRE

17-

Joseph P. Kennedy

Les journaux ont signalé, ces temps derniers, que le sieur Joseph P. Kennedy, citoyen américain, gros négociant de son état, et ancien diplomate, avait été convoqué à la Maison Blanche par le tout-puissant Roosevelt. Aux journalistes qui l'interrogeaient sur le motif de cette entrevue avec le président il répondit qu'il n'avait accepté aucun poste ni aucune mission spéciale du gouvernement des U.S.A. Mais on prétend, dans les milieux bien informés, que Roosevelt aurait tenté de charger Kennedy, qui jouit d'une grande autorité dans le monde des isolationnistes, de réduire l'opposition qui se manifeste de plus en plus aux Etats-Unis contre la politique du gouvernement. Mais l'ex-diplomate aurait refusé énergiquement de collaborer dans ce sens avec la Maison Blanche.

Il fut un temps où Kennedy s'était laissé prendre aux boniments de Roosevelt. C'était en 1930. Kennedy, qui appartenait depuis cette époque au cercle des intimes du président, avait vigoureusement soutenu celui-ci dans sa campagne électorale de 1932. En 1934, Roosevelt, qui n'avait pas encore oublié ses promesses de candidat au fauteuil présidentiel, lui confia la présidence de la Com-

mission boursière d'Etat, dont la mission consistait à mettre un terme aux pratiques commerciales trop peu orthodoxes de Wall Street. Kennedy, qui avait pris son rôle au sérieux et tenté réellement d'épurer l'atmosphère du monde de la haute finance, ne réussit qu'à y acquérir le surnom de bull-dog. En 1935, l'ambassadeur des Etats-Unis à Londres, Bingham, étant mort, Roosevelt désigna Kennedy pour succéder à ce diplomate.

L'activité que Kennedy déploya dans la capitale britannique est restée assez mystérieuse. Mais un fait apparaît certain : s'il ne fit aucune promesse formelle quant à la future participation des Américains à la guerre, du moins donna-t-il au gouvernement anglais les plus grands espoirs en ce qui concerne une aide matérielle de la part des Etats-Unis. On peut supposer qu'en octobre 1940 Kennedy croyait encore en la sincérité de Roosevelt, lorsque celui-ci déclarait qu'il était résolu à maintenir son pays en dehors du grand conflit.

Kennedy jouissait d'un grand crédit auprès du public américain. La meilleure preuve en est fournie par le fait qu'avant d'être réélu, Roosevelt crut devoir invoquer l'activité diplomatique de Kennedy à Londres pour prouver « à quel point lui, Roosevelt, avait travaillé pour le maintien de la paix en Europe ». Mais lorsqu'il eut obtenu le renouvellement de son mandat, le perfide président laissa tomber son masque. Quant à Kennedy, il en tira les conclusions logiques et, pour bien montrer qu'il se désolidarisait du chef du gouvernement des U.S.A., remit à celui-ci sa démission d'ambassadeur, le 6 novembre 1940, à l'occasion d'un voyage à Washington. Depuis cette époque, il se consacre à ses propres affaires, et ne paraît pas près d'oublier le bon tour que lui a joué son « ami » Roosevelt.

Joseph P. Kennedy, qui a cinquante-cinq ans, est né à Boston, d'une famille originaire d'Irlande. En tant qu'homme d'affaires, il possède de gros intérêts dans l'industrie cinématographique et passe pour un homme extrêmement riche. — F.

09407-0043-000

Kennedy, Joseph P.

Signatur

Datum

26. Mai 1941

Wientapper
4.6.41

Amerikanische "Prosperität" durch Isolation.

Kennedys Behauptung.

(American "Prosperity" in Isolation.

Mr. Kennedy's Claim).

"Times", London, Nr. 48 935, 26.5.41.

(New York - Korr.) : Der frühere amerikanische Botschafter in London, Joseph P. Kennedy, hielt gestern in Atlanta eine Rede, in der er ausführte, dass es "Unsinn" sei, zu behaupten, der Sieg der Achsenmächte würde der Ruin der ~~der~~/Vereinigten Staaten ~~Verder~~ sein. Hierfür brachte er dieselben Beweise vor wie die Isolationisten, die behaupten, dass die Vereinigten Staaten nicht erfolgreich vom Feind besetzt werden könnten und dass sie wirtschaftlich nahezu unabhängig wären, so dass, "wenn der schlimmste Fall eintreten sollte", das Land sich auf seinen Binnenhandel stützen könnte, wobei es ihm immerhin noch ganz gut gehen würde. Er sagte jedoch, dass man jenen "schlimmsten Fall" niemals zulassen dürfe, dass die Achsenmächte niemals irgend einen Gebiet auf der westlichen Halbkugel wirtschaftlich, militärisch oder geistig beherrschen dürften. Weiter sagte Kennedy, dass die USA. niemals in den Krieg eintreten sollten, " nur weil wir Hitler hassen und Churchill lieben". " Wir brauchen Tatsachen, keine Redensarten. Wie weit ist unser ^{eigenes} Verteidigungs-system?

Was können wir unternehmen, wenn wir den Krieg erklärt haben? Wo werden wir Truppen landen? Wie ist es mit Japan? Welchen Einfluss wird unsere Kriegserklärung auf die ~~King~~ Englandhilfe haben? " ~~Kennedy~~ Kennedy sagte, es wäre eine Verspottung der Freiheit, wenn einem demokratischen Volk die wesentlichen Tatsachen vorenthalten werden, auf denen sich dieser schwerste Entschluss unseres Lebens, ob wir eingreifen sollen oder nicht, gründet. "Uns fehlt dreierlei: rückhaltlose Offenheit, umfassende Angaben, und grösste Redefreiheit."

09407-0044-000

Hamburgisches
Welt-Wirtschafts-Archiv

Signatur

Datum

Kennedy
Joseph P.
26. Mai 1941

The Times (London)

Nr.

AMERICAN "PROSPERITY"
IN ISOLATION

MR. KENNEDY'S CLAIM

FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT

NEW YORK, MAY 25

Mr. Joseph P. Kennedy, the former United States Ambassador to Great Britain, asserted at Atlanta last night that it was "nonsense" to say that an Axis victory in the war would mean ruin for the United States.

Arguing in much the same manner as the out-and-out Isolationists are doing, he said that the United States could not be successfully invaded, and that, economically, she was so nearly self-contained that if "the worst came to the worst" she could depend upon her internal trade and still enjoy a fair degree of prosperity. He said, however, that that worst must never be permitted to include Axis domination—social, economic, or military—of any spot in the Western Hemisphere.

The United States, Mr. Kennedy said, should not become a belligerent "just because we hate Hitler and love Churchill. Facts [he went on] are what the country needs, not slogans. What is the state of our own defence? What can we do if we declare war? Where shall we land troops? What about Japan? What will be the result of declaring war in terms of our ability to help England?"

It was a "mockery of liberty," he declared, to "withhold from a democratic people the essential facts upon which this, the most awful decision of our times [the decision whether or not to intervene] must be based. We must have the most complete candour, we must have the fullest disclosure, we must have the freest debate."

Kennedy,
Joseph
2. Juni 1944

Nachrichten für Außenhandel (Berlin)

Nr. 126

Verein. Staaten — Verschrottung überflüssiger Tonnage

— Le. Zürich — Joseph E. Kennedy, der frühere amerikanische Botschafter in London, hat vorgeschlagen, daß nach dem Kriege ein Teil der gewaltigen amerikanischen Handelsflotte verschrottet werde, nachdem sämtliche Schiffe, die irgendwelchen militärischen Wert haben, den zuständigen Stellen übergeben worden seien. Kennedy, der früher Vorsitzender der Schifffahrtskommission war, hält es auch für angebracht, einige der Schiffe, die die Verein. Staaten nach dem Kriege nicht mehr brauchen, anderen Ländern zu überlassen. Er schlägt schließlich vor, daß die amerikanische Handelsflotte nach dem Kriege mit einer Gesamttonnage von 10 Mill. t zu operieren beginne.

Duplikat

✓
6/15 2132 2135

The Wall Street Journal (New York)

№ 1 3 9

Joseph P. Kennedy Says: Get Out Of Korea, Leave Europe to Europeans, Arm The Western Hemisphere

Lincoln in his famous Springfield speech said: "If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it."

Where are we now? Beginning with intervention in the Italian elections and financial and political aid to Greece and Turkey, we have expanded our political and financial programs on an almost unbelievably wide scale. Billions have been spent in the Marshall plan, further billions in the occupation of Berlin, Western Germany and Japan. Military aid has been poured into Greece, Turkey, Iran, the nations of the North Atlantic Pact, French Indo-China, and now in Korea we are fighting the fourth greatest war in our history.

What Kind of Friends?

What have we in return for this effort? Friends? We have far fewer friends than we had in 1945. In Europe they are still asking for our dollars but what kind of friendship have we bought there? Is Western Europe determined to preserve for itself those ideals of democracy that we have been preaching? Put to the test now as to whether she will arm herself effectively, even with our aid, to deal with the Russian threat, is she showing the kind of determination and the kind of will that amounts to anything?

Plans for economic unification have fallen apart in the light of nationalistic difference. French military power is only a shadow of its former self, and a strong minority of Communist sympathizers keeps France in endless political turmoil. The military strength of Britain is one-fourth of what it was in 1946 and she shows every inclination to avoid the heavy burdens that would be involved in rebuilding it. West Germany, to date, has revealed no disposition to develop effective military strength. Italy is hopelessly ineffective and Greece can hardly police her own small territory. Where is there in all Europe any buffer against a massed Russian onslaught? Worse than this, where is any determination to create such a buffer?

What should our foreign policy be? In a speech on Tuesday before the University of Virginia Law School Forum, Joseph P. Kennedy, former U. S. ambassador to Great Britain, gave his views. Here is a condensed version of his speech.

In the Middle East we have oil but no friends. Iran, Pakistan, even Egypt, seek neither our protection nor our influence. In Asia, China, whose friendship with us seemed deep-seated and enduring, is now massed against us with men, powerful armies and new vengeful hatreds. Indonesia, Malay, Indo-China, are in revolt or heavy with discontent at the influences we represent. India is showing signs of succumbing to influences other than ours, more indigenous and more palatable to her desires. In Korea we are spending thousands of American lives to accomplish some unknown objective. Assume we stop the Reds somewhere across the belt of that peninsula, are we to continue fighting there indefinitely?

Russia's Strength

On the other side of the Iron Curtain are massed manpower and military strength of a type that the world has never seen. Divisions which total in the many hundreds and which we know are well equipped and have the capacity to fight, can be thrown into battle anywhere on that great land mass that stretches from the Atlantic to the Pacific. They are backed by planes of high quality and great quantity. Russia's navy includes a powerful fleet of submarines, and in all probability she too has the atomic bomb.

To engage these vast armies on the European or the Asian continent is foolhardy, but that is the direction towards which our policy has been tending.

That policy is suicidal. It has made us no foul weather friends. It has kept our armament scattered over the globe. It has picked one battlefield and threatens to pick others impossibly removed from our sources of supply. It has not contained Communism. By our methods of opposition it has solidi-

fied Communism, where otherwise Communism might have bred within itself internal dissensions. Our policy today is politically and morally a bankrupt policy.

I can see no alternative other than having the courage to wash up this policy and start with the fundamentals I urged more than five years ago. It is absurd to believe that the United Nations can lead us out of this situation. The veto power alone makes it a hopeless instrumentality for world peace. The unwillingness of half the world to want world peace makes impossible effective organization to impose any such peace. In short, our chief source of reliance must be ourselves and we cannot sacrifice ourselves to save those who do not seem to wish to save themselves.

Get Out of Korea

A first step in the pursuit of this policy is to get out of Korea—indeed, to get out of every point in Asia which we do not plan realistically to hold in our own defense. Such a policy means that in the Pacific we will pick our own battlegrounds if we are forced to fight and not have them determined by political and ideological considerations that have no relationship to our own defense.

The next step in pursuit of this policy is to apply the same principle to Europe. Today it is idle to talk of being able to hold the line of the Elbe or the line of the Rhine. Why should we waste valuable resources in making such an attempt? If the weakened European nations wish to hold that line and demonstrate a determination to do so, it may be that we can afford them some help. But to pour arms and men into a Quixotic military adventure makes no sense whatever. What have we gained by staying in Berlin? Everyone knows we can be pushed out the moment the Russians choose to push us out. Isn't it better to get out now and use the resources, that would otherwise be sacrificed, at a point that counts?

wenden!

The billions that we have squandered on these enterprises could have been far more effectively used in this hemisphere and on the seas that surround it. Had we the defenses in Iceland today that one-hundredth of the money spent in Berlin could have built, we would have purchased safety with our money rather than added danger. We need defenses in this hemisphere, in Canada, in the Caribbean and in Latin America. After all, these are our neighbors whose security is inevitably tied up with our own. We have no reason to believe that cooperation on their part will not be forthcoming and we can, and should, insist upon it.

Make Communism Costly

People will say, however, that this policy will not contain Communism. Will our present policy do so? Can we possibly contain Communist Russia, if she chooses to march, by a far flung battle line in the middle of Europe? The truth is that our only real hope is to keep Russia, if she chooses to march, on the other side of the Atlantic and make Communism much too costly for her to try to cross the seas.

It may be that Europe for a decade or a generation will turn Communist. But in doing so, it may break of itself as a unified force. Communism still has to prove itself to its peoples as a government that will achieve for them a better way of living. The more people that it will have to govern, the more necessary it becomes for those who govern to justify themselves to those being governed. The more peoples that are under its yoke, the greater are the possibilities of revolt. Moreover, it seems certain that Communism spread over Europe will not rest content with being governed by a handful of men in the Kremlin. French or Italian Communists will soon develop splinter organizations that will destroy the singleness that today characterizes Russian Communism. Tito in Yugoslavia is already demonstrating this fact. Mao in China is not likely to take his orders too long from Stalin, especially when the only non-Asiatics left upon Asiatic soil to fight are the Russians.

This policy will, of course, be criticized as appeasement. No word is more mistakenly used. Is it appeasement to withdraw from unwise commitments, to arm yourself to the teeth and to make clear just exactly how and for what you will fight? If it is wise in our interest not to make commitments that endanger our security, and this is appeasement, then I am for appeasement. I can recall only too well the precious time bought by Chamberlain at Munich. I applauded that purchase then; I would applaud it today. Today, however, while we have avoided a Munich, we are coming perilously close to another Dunkirk. Personally, I should choose to escape the latter.

We Pay the Cost

Finally, people will say this policy is turning our back on the United Nations. To do this there are two answers. Firstly, we cannot bear substantially the whole burden of the United Nations. In Korea, we have nine times as many troops in the field as all the United Nations put together. We have suffered ninety times the number of casualties that all the other United Nations have suffered, excluding only the South Koreans. And note the billions that we have advanced these nations as against the help they are giving us in Korea.

Secondly, we must recognize that the United Nations is not at present a vehicle to enforce peace. If half of the world does not wish it to operate in this fashion, as is true of Russia and China, it is idle to pretend that it can operate in that fashion. The United Nations still has a purpose for voluntary organization and as a forum in which to air international issues. Looking at the United Nations in that role, the admission of Red China or any nation presents wholly different issues than are presented if we look upon the United Nations as a type of governing body, with governing powers. But half of this world will never submit to dictation by the other half. The two can only agree to live next to each other because for one to absorb the other becomes too costly.

A Realistic Approach

An attitude of realism such as this is, I submit, in accord with our historic traditions. We have never wanted a part of other peoples' scrapes. Today we have them and just why, nobody quite seems to know. What business is it of ours to support French colonial policy in Indo-China or to achieve Mr. Syngman Rhee's concepts of democracy in Korea? Shall we now send the marines into the mountains of Tibet to keep the Dalai Lama on his throne? We can do well to mind our business and interfere only where somebody threatens our business and our homes.

An Atlas, whose back is bowed and whose hands are busy holding up the world, has no arms to lift to deal with his own defense. Increase his burdens and you will crush him, or attack him from behind and he cannot turn. This is our present posture. It strangles our might. The suggestions I make would unleash our strength. They would, I am sure, give considerable pause to the strategists and planners of the Kremlin. They would—and I count this most—conserve American lives for American ends, not waste them in the freezing hills of Korea or on the battle-scarred plains of Western Germany.

-70420