

In The Tradition Of Roosevelt

Scott Ott of Scappleface urges the Democratic Party to adopt the war philosophy of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt:

"We are not a warlike people. We have never sought glory as a nation of warriors. We are not interested in aggression. We are not interested--as the dictators are-- in looting. We do not covet one square inch of the territory of any other nation. Our vast effort, and the unity of purpose which inspires that effort are due solely to our recognition of the fact that our fundamental rights are threatened...These rights were established by our forefathers on the field of battle. They have been defended--at great cost but with great success--on the field of battle, here on our own soil, and in foreign lands, and on all the seas all over the world. There has never been a moment in our history when Americans were not ready to stand up as free men and fight for their rights."
[Radio address from Hyde Park Library, September 1, 1941]

The contrast between Roosevelt's values and those of the inheritors of his party today is stark and depressing. One could equally well quote a **more recent President from the same party**:

The world is very different now. For man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life. And yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe--the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God.

We dare not forget today that we are the heirs of that first revolution. Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans--born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage--and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this nation has always been committed,

and to which we are committed today at home and

around the world.

Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty.

This much we pledge--and more. [President John F Kennedy, Inaugural Address, January 20, 1961.]

Some time between then and now, something terrible happened to the Democratic Party. And therefore to America, and the world.

Mon, 07/05/2004 - 13:27 | [digg](#) | [del.icio.us](#) | [permalink](#)

here's a difference

the second speech twice mentions enemy nations. it seems to take it for granted there are such things. this defeats JFK's message, because according to the message rather than talking to these enemy nations he ought to be blowing them up.

i think two major, related parts of what changed are: the left got friendly with atheism, and the left adopted mechanical pseudovalues and began trying to see the world in terms of them (this is evident when they try to analyse moral choices in terms of: greed, money, multilateral agreement, number of dead soldiers, number of dead civilians, or the root cause of terrorism is that we do things that upset their ideology. they don't seem to notice that the ideology itself is immoral and invalid.)

-- Elliot Temple
<http://www.curi.us/>

by [Elliot Temple](#) on Mon, 07/05/2004 - 16:41 | [reply](#)

Changes

I'd like to add another factor regarding this change. Whenever the Democratic Party is in power, the change is not as big as it may now seem. President Clinton was also prepared to defend liberty at home and abroad with military might. See Serbia and Somalia. Now the fact is, those were very bad choices for military interference, but it does demonstrate the principle that Democrats are not always pacifists. They are only pacifists when the Republicans are in power. Democrats do not oppose the war in Irak because they oppose the war in Irak. They oppose the ware in Irak because they oppose President Bush. If Clinton had gone to war in Irak, all of them would be cheering about the liberation of Irak.

A pacifist is someone who lets other people fight his wars.

A pacifist is someone who prefers slavery over war.

Henry Sturman

by [Henry Sturman](#) on Tue, 07/06/2004 - 10:54 | [reply](#)

Copyright © 2007 Setting The World To Rights