

our freedom from any commitments and our effort to maintain a position of neutrality did not prevent us from being forced in 1917 to abandon neutrality and enter the war that was then raging in Europe.

The fact that we were drawn into the World War, although we had no entangling alliances and although we had proclaimed our neutrality, must be kept in the forefront of our minds in considering our present policy in the light of past experience and in the light of changed physical conditions.

In my opinion it should be possible for the United States, which has a vital interest in world peace and stability, to cooperate in an endeavor to promote peace and solve such questions of international concern as can only be dealt with effectively by concerted effort, and to do this without sacrificing our independence of judgment and our freedom of action.

Within the modest limits of my ability I have been endeavoring, in furtherance of the aims of the President, to help mitigate prevailing fears and to find more rational ways of promoting security than by piling up aggressive armaments, which create political tension between neighboring nations and impose an undue burden on world economy. I continue to hope that definite progress can be made. Indeed, the growing pressure of nationalism has begun to force the issue in making plain to the peoples most vitally concerned the alternatives which they face of either preparing to destroy each other by conflict or of endeavoring to save themselves by cooperation. I agree wholeheartedly with President Roosevelt that the vast majority of the peoples are in favor of disarmament and a peaceful settlement of international controversies. It is for the statesmen to find the means of giving effect to the will of mankind.

The prospect of a world of ultra-nationalistic nations provides serious problems for those who conduct the foreign relations of the United States. It is, therefore, a great satisfaction to the Council on Foreign Relations to have this opportunity to hear the views of a statesman like Senator Borah on this question. As former Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and at present the ranking Republican member of that Committee, he has for many years had much to do with questions relating to our foreign policy. He represents a section of the country and of public opinion that we in the East ought to know much more about. Those who may not always find themselves in accord with the views of Senator Borah cannot but admire his ability, his courage and his independence of thought.

Since this is the first time we have had the honor to greet Senator Borah as our guest, I should like, as Chairman this evening, to say a word to him about ourselves. The Council on Foreign Relations is a non-partisan body of American citizens of many professions and interests. We are bound together by our desire to study, without passion or prejudice, the position of the United States in world affairs, in the hope of contributing toward a reasoned American foreign policy. We believe in enlightenment, but not in propagating any particular point of view. Hence we like to hear all points of view. That is the policy which is followed by our quarterly review, FOREIGN AFFAIRS. The public, both here and abroad, has sensed this policy and has come to regard that review as the leading publication of its kind in the world. Independence and sincerity are the hallmark of real research, and we like to feel that it is imprinted on all our work.