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Tonight you and I join forces for the 1936 campaign.
We enter it with confidence. Never was there greater need for
fidelity to the underlying conception of Americanism than there
is today. And once again it is given to our Party to carry the
message of that Americanism to the people.

The task on our part is twofold: First, as simple
patriotism requires, to separate the false from the real issues;
and, secondly, with facts and without rancor, to clarify the
real problems for the American public.

There will be -- there are -- many false issues. In
that respect, this will be no different from other campaigns.
Partisans, not willing to face realities, will drag out red
herrings -- as they have always done -- to divert attention from
the trail of their own weaknesses.
This practice is as old as our democracy. Avoiding the facts — fearful of the truth — a malicious opposition charged that George Washington planned to make himself king under a British form of government; that Thomas Jefferson planned to set up a guillotine under a French Revolutionary form of government; that Andrew Jackson soaked the rich of the Eastern seaboard and planned to surrender American democracy to the dictatorship of a frontier mob. They called Abraham Lincoln a Roman Emperor; Theodore Roosevelt a Destroyer; Woodrow Wilson a self-constituted Messiah.

In this campaign another herring turns up. It has been British and French — and a variety of other things. This year it is Russian. Desperate in mood, angry at failure, cunning in purpose, individuals and groups are seeking to make communism an issue in an election where communism is not a controversy between the two major parties.

Here and now, once and for all, let us bury that red herring, and destroy that false issue. You are familiar with
my background, you know my heritage, and you are familiar, especially in the State of New York, with my public service extending back over a quarter of a century. For nearly four years I have been President of the United States. A long record has been written. In that record, both in this State and in the National Capitol, you will find a simple, clear and consistent adherence not only to the letter but to the spirit of the American form of government.

To that record, my future and the future of my Administration will conform. I have not sought, I do not seek, I repudiate the support of any advocate of communism or of any other alien "ism" which would by fair means or foul change our American Democracy.

That is my position. It always has been my position. It always will be my position.

There is no difference between the major parties as to what they think about communism.

But there is a very great difference between the two parties in what they do about communism.
Communism is a manifestation of the social unrest which always comes with widespread economic maladjustment. We in the Democratic party have not been content merely to denounce this menace. We have been realistic enough to face it. We have been intelligent enough to do something about it. And the world has seen the results of what we have done.

In the Spring of 1933 we faced a crisis which was the ugly fruit of twelve years of neglect of the causes of economic and social unrest. It was a crisis made to order for all those who would overthrow our form of government. Do I need to recall to you the fear of those days -- the reports of those who piled supplies in their basements, who laid plans to get their fortunes across the border, who got themselves hideaways in the country against the impending upheaval? Do I need to recall the law-abiding heads of peaceful families, who began to wonder, as they saw their children starve, how they could get the bread they saw in the bakery window? Do I need to recall the homeless boys who were traveling in gangs through the country seeking work and food --
desperate because they could find neither? Do I need to recall the farmers who banded together with pitchforks to keep the Sheriff from selling the farm home under foreclosure? Do I need to recall the powerful leaders of industry and banking who came to me in Washington in those early days of 1933 pleading to be saved?

Most people in the United States remember today the fact that starvation was averted, that homes and farms were saved, that banks were reopened, that crop prices rose, that industry revived, and that the dangerous forces subversive of our form of government were turned aside.

A few people — a few only — unwilling to remember, seem to have forgotten those days.

In the summer of 1933, a nice old gentleman wearing a silk hat, fell off the end of a pier. He was unable to swim. A friend ran down the pier, dived overboard, and pulled him out, but the silk hat floated off with the tide. After the old gentleman had been resuscitated he was effusive in his thanks.
He praised his friend for saving his life. Today, three years later, the old gentleman is berating his friend because the silk hat was lost.

Why did the crisis of 1929 to 1932 pass without disaster?

The answer is found in the record of what we did. Early in the campaign of 1932 I said: "To meet by reaction that danger of radicalism is to invite disaster. (Reaction is no barrier to the radical -- it is a challenge, a provocation.) The way to meet that danger is to offer a workable program of reconstruction, and the party to offer it is the party with clean hands." We met the emergency with emergency action. But far more important than that, we went to the roots of the problem, and attacked the cause of the crisis. We were against revolution. Therefore, we waged war against those conditions which make revolutions -- against the inequalities and resentments which breed them. In America in 1933 the people did not attempt to remedy wrongs by overthrowing their institutions. Americans were made to realize that wrongs could and would be set right within their institutions. We proved that Democracy CAN work.
I have said that there is a very great difference between the two parties in what they do about communism. Conditions congenial to communism were being bred and fostered throughout the Nation up to the very day of March 4, 1933. Hunger was breeding it, loss of homes and farms was breeding it, closing banks were breeding it, a ruinous price level was breeding it. Discontent and fear were spreading through the land. The previous national administration, bewildered, did nothing.

In their speeches they deplored it but by their actions they encouraged it. The injustices, the inequalities, the downright suffering out of which revolutions come -- what did they do about these things? Lacking courage, they evaded. Being selfish, they neglected. Being short-sighted, they ignored. When the crisis came -- as these wrongs made it sure to come -- America was unprepared.

The lack of preparation for it was best proved by the cringing and the fear of the very people whose indifference helped to make the crisis. They came to us pleading that we
should do, overnight, what they should have been doing through the years.

And the simple causes of our unpreparedness were two: First, a weak leadership, and, secondly, an inability to understand the reasons for social unrest -- the tragic plight of ninety per cent of the men, women and children who made up the population of the United States.

It has been well said - "The most dreadful failure of which any form of government can be guilty is simply to lose touch with reality, because out of this failure all imaginable forms of evil grow. Every empire that has crashed has come down primarily because its rulers didn't know what was going on in the world and were incapable of learning."

It is for that reason that our American form of government will continue to be safest in Democratic hands. The real, actual, undercover Republican leadership is the same as it was four years ago. That leadership will never comprehend the need for a program of social justice and of regard for the well-being of the masses of our people.
I have been comparing leadership in Washington.

This contrast between Democratic and Republican leadership holds true throughout the length and breadth of the State of New York. As far back as the year 1910, the old Black Horse Cavalry in Albany was failing to meet changing social conditions by appropriate social legislation. Here was a State noted for its industry and noted for its agriculture -- a State with the greatest mixture of population -- where the poorest and the richest lived, literally, within a stone's throw of each other -- in short a situation made to order for unrest. And yet in this situation the best the Republican leaders of those days could say was: "Let them eat cake." What would have happened if that reactionary domination had continued through all these hard years?

Starting in 1911, a Democratic leadership came into power, and with it a new philosophy of government. I had the good fortune to come into public office at that time. I found other young men in the Legislature -- men who held the same
philosophy — one of them was Bob Wagner; another was Al Smith. We were all joined in a common cause. We did not look on government as something apart from the people. We thought of it as something to be used by the people for their own good.

New factory legislation setting up decent standards of safety and sanitation; limitation of the working hours of women in industry; a workmen's compensation law; a one day rest in seven law; a full train crew law; a direct primary law — these laws and many more were passed which were called radical and alien to our form of government. Would you or any other Americans call them radical and alien today?

In later years, first under Governor Smith, then during my Governorship, this program of practical intelligence was carried forward over the typical and unswerving opposition of Republican leaders throughout the State.

Today the great tradition of a liberal, progressive Democratic Party has been carried still further by your present Governor, Herbert H. Lehman. He has begun a program of insurance
to remove the spectre of unemployment from the working people of the State. He has broadened our labor legislation. He has extended the supervision of public utility companies. He has proved himself an untiring seeker for the public good; a doer of social justice; a wise, conscientious, clear-headed and businesslike administrator of the executive branch of our government. And be it noted that his opponents are led and backed by the same forces and the same individuals, who, for a quarter of a century, have tried to hamstring progress within our State. The overwhelming majority of our citizens, regardless of party, propose to return him and his administration to Albany for another two years.

His task in Albany, like my task in Washington, has been to maintain contact between statecraft and reality. In New York and in Washington, government which has rendered more than lip service to our constitutional democracy has done a work for the protection and preservation of our institutions that could not have been accomplished by repression and force.
Let me warn you and let me warn the Nation against the smooth evasion which says "Of course we believe all these things; we believe in social security; we believe in work for the unemployed; we believe in saving homes. Cross our hearts and hope to die, we believe in all these things; but we do not like the way the present administration is doing them. Just turn them over to us. We will do all of them -- we will do more of them -- we will do them better; and, most important of all, the doing of them will not cost anybody anything."

But, my friends, these evaders are banking too heavily on the shortness of our memories. No one will forget that they had their golden opportunity -- twelve long years of it.

Remember that the first essential of doing a job well is to want to see the job done. But make no mistake about this: The Republican leadership today is not against the way we have done the job. The Republican leadership is against the job being done.
Look to the source of the promises of the past. Governor Lehman knows and I know how little legislation in the interests of the average citizen would be on the statute books of the State of New York, and of the Federal Government, if we had waited for Republican leaders to pass it.

The same lack of purpose of fulfillment lies behind the promises of today. You cannot be an Old Guard Republican in the East, and a New Deal Republican in the West. You cannot promise to repeal taxes before one audience and promise to spend more of the taxpayers' money before another audience. You cannot promise tax relief for those who can afford to pay, and, at the same time, promise more of the taxpayers' money for those who are in need. You simply cannot make good on both promises at the same time.

Who is there in America who believes that we can run the risk of turning back our Government to the old leadership which brought it to the brink of 1933? Out of the strains and stresses of these years we now come to see that the true conservative is the man who has a real concern for injustices...
and takes thought against the day of reckoning. The true conservative seeks to protect the system of private property and free enterprise by correcting such injustices and inequalities as arise from it. The most serious threat to our institutions comes from those who refuse to face the need for change. Liberalism becomes the protection for the far-sighted conservative.

Never has a Nation made greater strides in the safeguarding of Democracy than we have made during the past three years. Wise and prudent men - intelligent conservatives - have long known that in a changing world worthy institutions can be conserved only by adjusting them to the changing time. In the words of the great essayist - "The voice of great events is proclaiming to us - Reform if you would preserve."

I am that kind of a conservative because I am that kind of a liberal.

*************
ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT
TO THE DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION
108TH INFANTRY ARMORY, SYRACUSE, NEW YORK

Tuesday, September 29, 1936, 9.00 P.M.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

From force of long habit I almost said, "My fellow delegates."

Tonight you and I join forces for the 1936 campaign. (Applause) We are entering it with confidence. Never was there greater need for fidelity to the underlying conception of Americanism than there is today. And once again it is given to our Party to carry the message of that Americanism to the people.

The task on our part is twofold: First, as simple patriotism requires, to separate the false from the real issues; and, secondly, with facts and without rancor, to clarify the real problems for the American public. (Applause)

There will be -- there are -- many false issues. In that respect, this will be no different from other campaigns. Partisans, not willing to face realities, will drag out red herrings -- as they have always done -- to divert attention from the trail of their own weaknesses. (Applause)

This practice is as old as our democracy. Avoiding the facts -- fearful of the truth -- a malicious opposition charged
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that George Washington planned to make himself king under a British form of government; that Thomas Jefferson planned to set up a guillotine in every section under (a) the French Revolutionary form of government; that Andrew Jackson soaked the rich of the Eastern seaboard (applause) and planned to surrender American democracy to the dictatorship of a frontier mob. They called Abraham Lincoln a Roman Emperor; Theodore Roosevelt a Destroyer; Woodrow Wilson a self-constituted Messiah.

And in this campaign another herring turns up. (Laughter, applause) In former years it has been British (and) or French -- and a variety of other things. This year it is Russian. (Laughter, applause) Desperate in mood, angry at failure, cunning in purpose, individuals and groups are seeking to make communism an issue in an election where communism is not a controversy between the two major parties. (Applause)

Here and now, once and for all, let us bury that red herring, and destroy that false issue. You are familiar with my background, you know my heritage, and you are familiar, especially in the State of New York, with my public service extending back over a quarter of a century. For nearly four years I have been President of the United States. A long record has been written. In that record, both in this State and in the National Capital, you will find a simple, clear and consistent adherence not only to the letter but to the spirit of the American form of government. (Applause)
To that record, my future and the future of my Administration will conform. I have not sought, I do not seek, I repudiate the support of any advocate of communism or of any other alien "ism" which would by fair means or foul change our American Democracy.

That is my position. It always has been my position. It always will be my position. (Applause)

There is no difference between the major parties as to what they think about communism.

But there is a very great difference between the (two) parties in what they do about communism.

I must tell you why: Communism is a manifestation of the social unrest which always comes with widespread economic maladjustment. We in the Democratic party have not been content merely to denounce this menace. We have been realistic enough to face it. We have been intelligent enough to do something about it. And the world has seen the results of what we have done. (Applause)

What happened a year and a half ago? In the Spring of 1933 we faced a crisis which was the ugly fruit of twelve years of neglect of the causes of economic and social unrest. It was a crisis made to order for all those who would overthrow our form of government. Do I need to recall to you the fears of those days -- the reports of those who piled supplies in their basements, who laid plans to get their fortunes across the border, who got themselves hideaways in the country
against the impending upheaval? Do I need to recall the law-abiding heads of peaceful families, who began to wonder, as they saw their children starve, how they would get the bread they saw in the bakery window? Do I need to recall the homeless boys who are traveling in bands through the countryside seeking work, (and) seeking food -- desperate because they could find neither? Do I need to recall the farmers who banded together with pitchforks to keep the Sheriff from selling the farm home under foreclosure? Do I need to recall the powerful leaders of industry and banking who came to me in Washington in those early days of 1933 pleading to be saved? (Applause)

Most people in the United States remember today the fact that starvation was averted, that homes and farms were saved, that banks were reopened, that crop prices rose, that industry revived, and that the dangerous forces (subversive) of subversion of our form of government were turned aside.

A few (people) -- a few only -- unwilling to remember, seem to have forgotten those days. (Applause)

In the Summer of 1933, a nice old gentleman wearing a silk hat, fell off the end of a pier. He was unable to swim. A friend ran down the pier, dived overboard and pulled him out, but the silk hat floated off with the tide. After the old gentleman had been (resuscitated) revived he was effusive in his thanks. He praised his friend for saving his life. Today, three years later, the old gentleman is berating his
friend because (the) his silk hat was lost. (Prolonged applause)

Why did (the) that crisis of 1929 to 1933 (1932) pass without disaster?

The answer is found in the record of what we did. Early in the campaign of 1932 I said: "To meet by reaction that danger of radicalism is to invite disaster. (Reaction is no barrier to the radical -- it is a challenge, a provocation.) The way to meet that danger is to offer a workable program of reconstruction, and the party to offer it is the party with clean hands." We met the emergency with emergency action. But far more important than that, we went to the roots of the problem, and attacked the cause of the crisis. We were against revolution. Therefore, we waged war against those conditions which make revolutions -- against the inequalities and resentments which breed them. In America in 1933 the people did not attempt to remedy wrongs by overthrowing (their) institutions. Americans were made to realize that wrongs could and would be set right within their institutions. We proved that Democracy CAN work. (Applause)

I have said to you that there is a very great difference between the two parties in what they do about communism. Conditions congenial to communism were being bred and fostered throughout this Nation up to the very day of March 4, 1933. Hunger was breeding it, loss of homes and farms was breeding it, closing banks were breeding it, a ruinous price level was
breeding it. Discontent and fear were spreading throughout the land. The previous National administration, bewildered, did nothing. (Applause)

In their speeches they deplored it but by their actions they encouraged it. The injustices, the inequalities, the downright suffering out of which revolutions come -- what did they do about these things? Lacking courage, they evaded. Being selfish, they neglected. Being short-sighted, they ignored. When the crisis came -- as these wrongs made it sure to come -- America was unprepared.

(Ours) The lack of preparation for it was best proved by the cringing and the fear of the very people whose indifference helped to make the crisis. They came to us pleading that we should do, overnight, what they should have been doing through the years.

And the simple causes of our unpreparedness were two: First, a weak leadership, and, secondly, an inability to see causes, to understand the reasons for social unrest -- the tragic plight of ninety per cent of the men, women and children who made up the population of the United States.

It has been well said that ( - "The most dreadful failure of which any form of government can be guilty is simply to lose touch with reality, because out of this failure all imaginable forms of evil grow.) every empire that has crashed has come down primarily because its rulers didn't know what was going on in the world and were incapable of learning."
It is for that reason that our American form of government will continue to be safest in Democratic hands. The real, actual, undercover Republican leadership is the same as it was four years ago. That leadership will never comprehend the need for a program of social justice and of regard for the well-being of the masses of our people.

(Applause)

I have been comparing leadership in Washington. This contrast between Democratic and Republican leadership holds true throughout the length and breadth of the State of New York. As far back as the year 1910, the old Black Horse Cavalry, which we old people will remember, in Albany was failing to meet changing social conditions by appropriate social legislation. Here was a State noted for its industry and noted for its agriculture -- a State with the greatest mixture of population -- where the poorest and the richest lived, literally, within a stone's throw of each other -- in short a situation made to order for potential unrest.

And yet in this situation the best that the Republican leaders of those days could say was: "Let them eat cake." (Applause)

What would have happened if that reactionary domination had continued through all these hard years?

Starting in 1911, a Democratic leadership came into power, and with it a new philosophy of government. I had the good fortune to come into public office at that time. I found other young men in the Legislature -- men who held the same
philosophy -- and one of them was Bob Wagner; (applause) another was Al Smith. (Applause, boos) We were all joined in a common cause. We did not look on government as something apart from the people. We thought of it as something to be used by the people for their own good.

New factory legislation setting up decent standards of safety and sanitation; limitation of the (working) hours of women in industry, mind you to 54 hours a week; a workmen's compensation law; a one-day rest in seven law; a full train crew law; a direct primary law -- these laws and many more that were passed, (which) they were then called radical and alien to our form of government. Would you or any other Americans call them radical (and) or alien today? ("No", applause)

In later years, first under Governor Smith, then during my Governorship, this program of practical intelligence was carried forward over the typical and unswerving opposition of Republican leaders throughout (the) our State.

And today the great tradition of a liberal, progressive Democratic Party has been carried still further by (your) our present great Governor, Herbert H. Lehman. (Applause) He has begun a program of social insurance to remove the spectre of unemployment from the working people of the State. He has broadened our labor legislation. He has extended the supervision of public utility companies. He has proved himself an untiring seeker for the public good; a doer of
social justice, a wise, conscientious, clear-headed and businesslike administrator of the executive branch of our government. And be it noted that his opponents are led and backed by the same forces and, in many cases, by the same individuals who, for a quarter of a century, have tried to hamstring progress (within our) in this State. The overwhelming majority of our citizens, up-State and down-State, regardless of party, propose to return him and his administration to Albany for another two years. (Applause)

His task in Albany, like my task in Washington, has been to maintain contact between statecraft and reality. In New York and in Washington, government which has rendered more than lip service to our constitutional democracy has done a work for the protection and preservation of our institutions that could not have been accomplished by repression and force.

Let me warn you and let me warn the Nation against the smooth evasion which says, "Of course we believe (all) these things we believe in social security; we believe in work for the unemployed; we believe in saving homes. Cross our hearts and hope to die, we believe in all these things; but we do not like the way the present administration is doing them. Just turn them over to us. We will do all of them -- we will do more of them -- we will do them better; and, most important of all, the doing of them will not cost anybody anything."

(Laughter, prolonged applause)
But, my friends, these evaders are banking too heavily on the shortness of our memories. No one will forget that they had their golden opportunity -- twelve long years of it.

And remember too, that the first essential of doing a job well is to want to see the job done. (But) Make no mistake though about this: The Republican leadership today is not against the way we have done the job. The Republican leadership is against the job being done. (Applause)

Look to the source of the promises of the past. Governor Lehman knows and I know how little legislation in the interests of the average citizen would be on the statute books of the State of New York, and of the Federal Government, if we had waited for Republican leaders to pass it.

The same lack of purpose of fulfillment lies behind the promises of today. You cannot be an Old Guard Republican in the East, and a New Deal Republican in the West. You cannot promise to repeal taxes before one audience and promise to spend more of the taxpayers' money before another audience. You cannot promise tax relief for those who can afford to pay, and, at the same time, promise more of the taxpayers' money for those who are in need. You simply cannot make good on both promises at the same time. (Applause)

Who is there in America who believes that we can run the risk of turning back our Government to the old leadership which brought it to the brink of 1933? Out of the strains
and stresses of these years we now come to see that the true conservative is the man who has a real concern for injustices and takes thought against the day of reckoning. The true conservative seeks to protect the system of private property and free enterprise by correcting such injustices and inequalities as arise from it. The most serious threat to our institutions comes from those who refuse to face the need for change. Liberalism becomes the protection for the far-sighted conservative.

Never has a Nation made greater strides in the safeguarding of Democracy than we have made during the past three years. Wise and prudent men -- intelligent conservatives -- have long known that in a changing world worthy institutions can only be conserved (only) by adjusting them to the changing time. In the words of the great essayist -- "The voice of great events is proclaiming to us -- Reform if you would (preserve) conserve."

I am that kind of a conservative because I am that kind of a liberal. (Prolonged applause)
Tonight you and I join forces for the 1936 campaign. We enter it with confidence. Never was there greater need for fidelity to the underlying conception of Americanism than there is today. And once again it is given to our Party to carry the message of that Americanism to the people.

The task on our part is twofold: First, as simple patriotism requires, to separate the false from the real issues; and, secondly, with facts and without rancor, to clarify the real problems for the American public.

There will be -- there are -- many false issues. In that respect, this will be no different from other campaigns. Partisans, not willing to face realities, will drag out red hERRINGS -- as they have always done -- to divert attention from the trail of their own weaknesses.

This practice is as old as our democracy. Avoiding the facts -- fearful of the truth -- a malicious opposition charged that George Washington planned to make himself king under a British form of government; that Thomas Jefferson planned to set up a guillotine under a French Revolutionary form of government; that Andrew Jackson sought the rich of the Eastern seaboard and planned to surrender American democracy to the dictatorship of a Frontier mob. They called Abraham Lincoln a Roman Emperor; Theodore Roosevelt a Destroyer; Woodrow Wilson a self-constituted Messiah.

In this campaign another herring turns up. It has been British and French -- and a variety of other things. This year it is Russian. Desperate in mood, angry at failure, cunning in purpose, individuals and groups are seeking to make communism an issue in an election where communism is not a controversy between the two major parties. (1)

Here and now, once and for all, let us bury that red herring, and destroy that false issue. You are familiar with my background. You know my heritage, and you are familiar, especially in the State of New York, with my public service extending back over a quarter of a century. For nearly four years I have been President of the United States. A long record has been written. In that record, both in this State and in the National Capital, you will find a simple, clear and consistent adherence not only to the letter but to the spirit of the American form of government.

To that record, my future and the future of my Administration will conform. I have not sought, I do not seek, I repudiate the support of any advocate of communism of any other alien influence which would by fair means or foul change our American Democracy.
That is my position. It always has been my position, and always will be my position.

There is no difference between the major parties as to what they think about communism.

There is a very great difference between the parties in what they do about communism.

Communism is a manifestation of the social unrest which always comes with widespread economic maladjustment. We in the Democratic party have not been content merely to denounce this menace. We have been realistic enough to face it. We have been intelligent enough to do something about it. And the world has seen the results of what we have done.

In the Spring of 1933 we faced a crisis which was the ugly fruit of twelve years of neglect of the causes of economic and social unrest. It was a crisis made to order for all those who would overthrow our form of government. Do I need to recall to you the fear of those days -- the reports of those who piled supplies in their basements, who laid plans to get their fortunes across the border, who got themselves hidden away in the country against the impending upheaval? Do I need to recall the law-abiding heads of peaceful families, who began to wonder, as they saw their children starve, how they would get the bread they saw in the bakery window? Do I need to recall the homeless boys who were traveling in bands through the country seeking work and food -- desperate because they could find neither? Do I need to recall the farmers who banded together with pitchforks to keep the Sheriff from selling the farm home under foreclosure? Do I need to recall the powerful leaders of industry and banking who came to me in Washington in those early days of 1933 pleading to be saved?

Most people in the United States remember today the fact that starvation was averted, that homes and farms were saved, that banks were reopened, that crop prices rose, that industry revived, and that the dangerous forces subversion of our form of government were turned aside.

A few people -- a few only -- unwilling to remember, seem to have forgotten those days.

In the summer of 1933, a nice old gentlemen wearing a silk hat, fell off the end of a pier. He was unable to swim. A friend ran down the pier, dived overboard and pulled him out, but the silk hat floated off with the tide. After the old gentleman had been resuscitated, he was effusive in his thanks. He praised his friend for saving his life. Today, three years later, the old gentleman is berating his friend because the silk hat was lost.

Why did the crisis of 1929 to 1933 pass without disaster?

The answer is found in the record of what we did. Early in the campaign of 1932 I said: "To meet by reaction that danger of radicalism is to invite disaster. Reaction is no barrier to the radical's challenge -- revolution. The way to meet that danger is to offer a workable program of reconstruction, and the party to offer it is the party with clean hands." We met the emergency with emergency action. But far more important than that, we went to the roots of the problem, and attacked the cause of the crisis. We were against revolution. Therefore, we waged war against those conditions which make revolutions -- against the inequalities bred by radical resentment. In America in 1933 the people did not attempt to remedy wrongs by overthrowing those institutions. Americans were made to realize that wrongs could and would be set right within their institutions. We proved that Democracy CAN work.
I have said that there is a very great difference between the two parties in what they do about communism. Conditions congenial to communism were being bred and fostered throughout this Nation up to the very day of March 4, 1933. Hunger was breeding it, loss of homes and farms was breeding it, closing banks were breeding it, a ruinous price level was breeding it. Discontent and fear were spreading through the land. The previous national administration, bewildered, did nothing.

In their speeches they deplored it but by their actions they encouraged it. The injustices, the inequalities, the downright suffering out of which revolutions come — what did they do about these things? Lacking courage, they evaded. Being selfish, they neglected. Being short-sighted, they ignored. When the crisis came — as these wrongs made it sure to come — America was unprepared.

Our lack of preparation for it was best proved by the cringing and the four of the very people whose indifference helped to make the crisis. They came to us pleading that we should do, overnight, what they should have been doing through the years.

And the simple causes of our unpreparedness were two: First, a weak leadership, and, secondly, an inability to understand the reasons for social unrest — the tragic plight of ninety per cent of the men, women and children who made up the population of the United States.

It has been well said: "The most dreadful failure of which any form of government can be guilty is simply to lose touch with reality, because out of this failure all imaginable forms of evil grow. Every episode that has crashed has come down primarily because its rulers didn't know what was going on in the world and were incapable of learning."

It is for that reason that our American form of government will continue to be safest in Democratic hands. The real, actual, undercover Republican leadership is the same as it was four years ago. That leadership will never comprehend the need for a program of social justice and of regard for the well-being of the masses of our people.

I have been comparing leadership in Washington. This contrast between Democratic and Republican leadership holds true throughout the length and breadth of the State of New York, as far back as the year 1910, the old Black Horse Cavalry. In Albany was falling to meet changing social conditions by appropriate social legislation. Here was a State noted for its industry and noted for its agriculture — a State with the greatest mixture of population — where the poorest and the richest lived, literally, within a stone's throw of each other — in short a situation made to order for unrest. And yet in this situation the best the Republican leaders of those days could say was: "Let them eat cake." What would have happened if that reactionary domination had continued through all these hard years?

Starting in 1911, a Democratic leadership came into power, and with it a new philosophy of government. I had the good fortune to come into public office at that time. I found other young men in the Legislature — men who held the same philosophy — one of them was Bob Wagner, another was Al Smith. We were all joined in a common cause. We did not look on government as something apart from the people. We thought of it as something to be used by the people for their own good.

New factory legislation setting up decent standards of safety and sanitation; limitation of the working hours of women in industry; a workmen's compensation law; a one day rest in seven law; a full train crew law; a direct primary law — these laws and many more were passed which were then called radical and alien to our form of government. Would you or any other Americans call them radical today?
In later years, first under Governor Smith, then during my Governorship, this program of practical intelligence was carried forward over the typical and unwavering opposition of Republican leaders throughout the State.

'Today the great tradition of a liberal, progressive Democratic Party has been carried still further by your present Governor, Herbert H. Lehman. He has begun a program of insurance to remove the spectre of unemployment from the working people of the State. He has broadened our labor legislation. He has extended the supervision of public utility companies. He has proved himself an untiring seeker for the public good; a doer of social justice, a wise, conscientious, clear-headed and businesslike administrator of the executive branch of our government. And be it noted that his opponents are led and backed by the same forces and the same individuals who, for a quarter of a century, have tried to hamstring progress within the State. The overwhelming majority of our citizens, regardless of party, propose to return him and his administration to Albany for another two years.

His task in Albany, like my task in Washington, has been to maintain contact between statecraft and reality. In New York and in the nation which has given him and us a new type of service to our constitutional democracy has done a work for the protection and preservation of our institutions that could not have been accomplished by repression and force.

Let me warn you and let me warn the Nation against the smooth evasion which says, 'Of course we believe in these things and believe in work for the unemployed; we believe in saving homes. Cross our hearts and hope to die; we believe in all these things, but we do not like the way the present administration is doing them. Just turn them over to us.' We will do all of them -- we will do more of them if we do them better; and, most important of all, the doing of them will not cost anybody anything.

But, my friends, these evaders are banking too heavily on the shortness of our memories. No one will forget that they had their golden opportunity -- twelve long years of it.

Remember that the first essential of doing a job well is to want to see the job done. And make no mistake about this: The Republican leadership today is not against the way we have done the job. The Republican leadership is against the job being done.

Look to the source of the promises of the past. Governor Lehman knows and I know how little legislation in the interests of the average citizen would be on the statute books of the State of New York, and of the Federal Government, if we had waited for Republican leaders to pass it.

The same lack of purpose of fulfillment lies behind the promises of today. You cannot be an Old Guard Republican in the East, and a New Deal Republican in the West. You cannot promise to repeal taxes before one audience and promise to spend more of the taxpayers' money before another audience. You cannot promise tax relief for those who can afford to pay, and, at the same time, promise more of the taxpayers' money for those who are in need. You simply cannot make good on both promises at the same time.

Who is there in America who believes that we can run the risk of turning back our Government to the old leadership which brought it to the brink of 1933? Out of the strains and stresses of these years we now come to see that the true conservative is the man who has a real concern for injustices and
takes thought against the day of reckoning. The true conservative seeks to protect the system of private property and free enterprise by correcting such injustices and inequalities as arise from it. The most serious threat to our institutions comes from those who refuse to face the need for change. Liberalism becomes the protection for the far-sighted conservative.

Never has a Nation made greater strides in the safeguarding of Democracy than we have made during the past three years. Wise and prudent men – intelligent conservatives – have long known that in a changing world worthy institutions can be preserved only by adjusting them to the changing time. In the words of the great 33rd Alist – "The voice of great events is proclaiming to us – Reform if you would preserve."

I am that kind of a conservative because I am that kind of a liberal.

-End-
Tonight you and I join forces for the 1936 campaign. We enter it with confidence. Never was there greater need for fidelity to the underlying conception of Americanism than there is today; and once again it is given to our Party to carry the message of that Americanism to the people.

The task on our part is twofold: First, to separate, as simple patriotism requires, the false issues from real issues; and, secondly, by sticking to facts and without use of rancor, to clarify the real issues for the American public.

There will be — there are — plenty of false issues. In that respect, this will be no different from other campaigns. Partisans, unwilling to face realities, will drag out red herrings — as they have always done — to divert attention from the trail of their own weaknesses.

This method is as old as our democracy. Avoiding the facts and fearful of the truth, a malicious opposition charged that George Washington planned to make himself king under a British form of government; that Thomas Jefferson planned to set up a guillotine under a French Revolutionary form of government; that Andrew Jackson soaked the rich of the Eastern seaboard and planned to surrender American democracy to the dictatorship of a frontier mob. They called Abraham Lincoln a Roman Emperor; Theodore Roosevelt a Destroyer; Woodrow Wilson a self-constituted Messiah. And all of us — Protestants, Catholics and Jews — remember the red herring of 1932 — that if Alfred E. Smith were elected President the Pope would rule America.

In this campaign the herring turns up again. It has been British and French and Roman — and a variety of other things. This year it is Russian. Desperate in mood, angry at failure, selfish in purpose, individuals and groups are seeking to make Communism an issue in an election where Communism is not a question between the two major parties. It is insinuated that I am a Communist. It is openly charged that I am allowing
Communism to creep into our government. This is the time to bury that red herring and destroy this false issue once and for all.

1. We Americans have created our own American form of government, and we Americans propose to keep it.

2. Communism cannot accord with that American form of government. It, therefore, must and will be kept out.

3. I repudiate the support of any advocate of Communism or any other alienism which seeks by fair means or foul to change our American democracy.

4. No member of my Administration is either an advocate of Communism or seeks to change our form of government.

5. I have said "I hate war." I say, with equal strength, "I hate Communism."

That is my position. It always has been my position. It always will be my position. I am certain — as are all commonsense men and women in the United States, that no candidate of either major party for the Presidency or the Vice-Presidency or the Governorship would tolerate for a minute any change in our democratic form of government.

There is no difference between us as to what we think about Communism. But make no mistake about this. There is a very great difference between the two parties in what they do about Communism.

Communism is a manifestation of the social unrest which always follows in the wake of widespread economic maladjustment. We in the Democratic party have not been content merely to denounce this menace. We have been realistic enough to face it. We have been intelligent enough to do something about it. And the world has been the results of what we have done.

In 1933 we faced a crisis which was the ugly fruit of twelve years of neglect of the causes and spread of economic and social unrest. It was a crisis made to order for the Communist; for those who would overthrow our form of government. Do I need to recall to you the fear of those days — the stories of those who piled supplies in their basements, who laid plans to get their fortunes across the border, who got themselves hideaways in the
country against the impending upheaval? Do I need to recall the
law-abiding heads of peaceful families, who, seeing their children
starve, began to wonder how soon before they would have a brick
through the bakery window to get bread? Do I need to recall the
homeless boys who were traveling in bands through the country
seeking work and food — desperate because they could find neither.
Do I need to recall the farmers who banded together with pitchforks
to keep the Sheriff from selling the farm home under foreclosure?
Do I need to recall the powerful leaders of industry and banking
who came to me in Washington in those early days of 1933 pleading
to be saved.

Some people — most people in the United States —
are grateful today for the fact that starvation was averted,
that homes and farms were saved, that banks were reopened, that
crop prices rose, and industry revived, and that thereby the
dangerous forces subversive of our form of government were turned
aside.

Some people — a few only — seem to have forgotten
those days.

In the summer of 1933, a nice old gentleman, XXXX
wearing a silk hat, fell off the end of a pier. He was unable to
swim. A young man ran down the pier, dived overboard, and pulled
him out but the silk hat floated off with the tide. After the old
gentleman had been resuscitated he was effusive in his thanks. He
praised the young man for saving his life. Today, three years
later, the old gentleman is cursing the young man because the silk
hat was lost.

Why did the crisis of 1930 to 1933 pass without
disaster? How were forces of subversion turned aside?
The answer is found in the record of what we did.

We met the emergency with emergency action. But far more important
than that, we went to the roots of the problem and attacked the
cause of the crisis. We were against revolution. Therefore, we
waged war against those conditions which make revolutions; against
the inequalities and resentments which breed them. In America in
1933 there was no attempt to remedy wrongs by overthrowing our
institutions. America was made to realize that wrongs could and
would be set right within our institutions. We proved that Democracy can work.

I have said that there is a very great difference between the two parties in what they do about Communism. Communism was being bred and fostered throughout this Nation up to the very day of March 4, 1933. Hunger was breeding it, loss of homes and farms was breeding it, closing banks were breeding it, a ruinous price level was breeding it. Discontent and fear were breeding spreading through the land. The previous national administration ran from pillar to post wringing their hands — doing nothing.

And the simple causes were two: First, a weak leadership, and, secondly, an inability to understand the causes of social unrest and the seriousness of the tragic plight of ninety per cent of the men, woman and children who made up the population of the United States.

Today in the campaign we are about to enter there exist the same reasons why the Democratic form of government will continue to be safest in Democratic hands; the Republican leadership is still at bottom in the hands of the same people as four years ago, and there exists among them the same inability to comprehend the need for continuing a program of social justice and of regard for the well-being of the masses of our people.
Once and for all, let us here and now bury that red herring and destroy that false issue. You are familiar with my background, you know my heritage, and you are familiar, especially in the State of New York, with my record in the public service extending back over a quarter of a century. For nearly four years I have been President of the United States. A long record has been written. In the long record, both in this State and in the National Capitol, you will, I am confident, find a very simple, very clear and very consistent adherence not only to the letter but to the spirit of the American form of government.

My future and the future of my Administration will conform to the record of the past. I repudiate the support of any advocate of Communism or the support of any other alienism which seeks by fair means or foul to change our American Democracy.
Tonight you and I join forces for the 1936 campaign. We enter it with confidence. Never was there greater need for fidelity to the underlying conception of Americanism than there is today; and once again it is given to our Party to carry the message of that Americanism to the people.

The task on our part is twofold: First, to separate as simple patriotism requires, the false issues from real issues; and, secondly, by sticking to facts and without use of rancor, to clarify the real issues for the American public.

There will be — there are — plenty of false issues. In that respect, this will be no different from other campaigns. Partisans, unwilling to face realities, will drag out red herrings — as they have always done — to divert attention from the trail of their own weaknesses.

This method is as old as our democracy. Avoiding the facts and fearful of the truth, a malicious opposition charged that George Washington planned to make himself king under a British form of government; that Thomas Jefferson planned to set up a guillotine under a French Revolutionary form of government; that Andrew Jackson soaked the rich of the Eastern seaboard and planned to surrender American democracy to the dictatorship of a frontier mob. They called Abraham Lincoln a Roman Emperor; Theodore Roosevelt a Destroyer; Woodrow Wilson a self-constituted Messiah.

And all of us — Protestants, Catholics and Jews — remember the red herring of 1932 — that if Alfred E. Smith were elected President the Pope would rule America.

In this campaign the herring turns up again. It has been British and French and Roman — and a variety of other things. This year it is Russian. Desperate in mood, angry at failure, selfish in purpose, individuals and groups are seeking to make Communism an issue in an election where Communism is not a question between the two major parties. It is insinuated that I am a Communist. It is openly charged that I am allowing...
Once and for all, let us here-and-now bury that red herring and destroy that false issue. You are familiar with my background, you know my heritage, and you are familiar, especially in the State of New York, with my record in the public service extending back over a quarter of a century. For nearly four years I have been President of the United States. A long record has been written. In the long record, both in this State and in the National Capitol, you will, I am confident, find a very simple, very clear and very consistent adherence not only to the letter but to the spirit of the American form of government. To that record, my future and the future of my Administration will conform to the record of the past. I repudiate the support of any advocate of Communism or the support of any other alienism which seeks by fair means or foul to change our American Democracy.
Communism to creep into our government. This is the time to bury that red herring and destroy this false issue once and for all.

1. We Americans have created our own American form of government, and we Americans propose to keep it.

2. Communism cannot accord with that American form of government. It, therefore, must and will be kept out.

3. I repudiate the support of any advocate of Communism or any other alien ism which seeks by fair means or foul to change our American democracy.

4. No member of my Administration is either an advocate of Communism or seeks to change our form of government.

5. I have said "I hate war." I say, with equal strength, "I hate Communism."

That is my position. It always has been my position. It always will be my position. I am certain — as are all common-sense men and women in the United States — that no candidate of either major party for the Presidency or the Vice-Presidency or the Governorship would tolerate for a minute any change in our democratic form of government.

There is no difference between as to what we think about Communism. But make no mistake about this: There is a very great difference between the two parties in what they do about Communism.

Communism is a manifestation of the social unrest which always follows in the wake of widespread economic mal-adjustment. We in the Democratic party have not been content merely to denounce this menace. We have been realistic enough to face it. We have been intelligent enough to do something about it. And the world has seen the results of what we have done.

In 1933 we faced a crisis which was the ugly fruit of twelve years of neglect of the causes of economic and social unrest. It was a crisis made to order for the Communists, for those who would overthrow our form of government. Do I need to remind you of the fear of those days — the presence of those who piled supplies in their basements, who laid plans to get their fortunes across the border, who got themselves hideaways in the
country against the impending upheaval? Do I need to recall the
law-abiding heads of peaceful families, who, seeing their children
stare, began to wonder how soon before they would have a brick
through the bakery window? Do I need to recall the
homeless boys who were traveling in bands through the country
seeking work and food -- desperate because they could find neither?
Do I need to recall the farmers who banded together with pitchforks
to keep the Sheriff from selling the farm home under foreclosure?
Do I need to recall the powerful leaders of industry and banking
who came to me in Washington in those early days of 1933 pleading
to be saved.

Remember -- Most people in the United States --
and grateful today for the fact that starvation was averted,
that homes and farms were saved, that banks were reopened, that
crop prices rose, and industry revived, and that the
dangerous forces subversive of our form of government were turned
aside.

A few
people -- a few only -- seem to have forgotten
those days.

In the summer of 1933, a nice old gentleman, wearing a silk hat, fell off the end of a pier. He was unable to
swim. A young man ran down the pier, dived overboard, and pulled
him out but the silk hat floated off with the tide. After the old
gentleman had been resuscitated he was effusive in his thanks. He
praised the young man for saving his life. Today, three years
later, the old gentleman is cursing the young man because the silk
hat was lost.

Why did the crisis of 1930 to 1932 pass without
disaster? How were forces of subversion turned aside?

The answer is found in the record of what we did.

We met the emergency with emergency action. But far more important
than that, we went to the roots of the problem and attacked the
cause of the crisis. We were against revolution. Therefore, we
waged war against those conditions which make revolutions; against
the inequalities and resentments which breed them. In America in
1933 we attempted to remedy wrongs by overthrowing their
institutions. America was meant to realize that wrongs could and
In my Acceptance Speech in Chicago I said: "The way to meet that danger -- radicalism -- is to offer a workable program of reconstruction."
That is what we did to avert this threat.

What is the record of the Republican leadership while this threat developed? In their speeches they deplored it but by their actions they encouraged it. The injustices, the inequalities, the downright suffering out of which revolutions come -- what did they do about these things? Lacking courage, they evaded. Being selfish, they neglected. Being short-sighted, they ignored. When the crisis came -- as these wrongs made it sure to come -- America was unprepared.

Our lack of preparation for it was best proved by the cringing and the fear of the very people whose indifference helped to make the crisis. They came to us pleading that we should do, overnight, what they should have been doing through the years.
would be set right within our institutions. We proved that Democracy can work.

I have said that there is a very great difference between the two parties in that they do about Communism.

Communism was being bred and fostered throughout this Nation up to the very day of March 4, 1933. Hunger was breeding it, loss of homes and farms was breeding it, closing banks were breeding it, a ruinous price level was breeding it. Discontent and fear were spreading through the land. The previous national administration ran from pillar to post—wringing their hands—doing nothing.

And the simple causes were two: First, a weak leadership, and, secondly, an inability to understand the causes of social unrest and the seriousness of the tragic plight of ninety per cent of the men, woman, and children who made up the population of the United States.

Today in the campaign we are about to enter there exist the same reasons why the Democratic form of government will continue to be safest in Democratic hands; the Republican leadership is still at fault in the hands of the same people as four years ago, and there exists among them the same inability to comprehend the need for continuing a program of social justice and of regard for the well-being of the masses of our people.
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It has been well said - "The most dreadful failure of which any form of government can be guilty is simply to lose touch with reality, because out of this failure all imaginable forms of evil grow. Every empire that has crashed has come down primarily because its rulers didn't know what was going on in the world and were incapable of learning."

Today, in the campaign we are about to enter, there exist the same reasons why our American form of government will continue to be safest in Democratic hands; the Republican leadership is still in the hands of the same people as four years ago, and there exists among them the same inability to comprehend the need for contending a program of social justice and of regard for the well-being of the masses of our people.

I have been comparing leadership in Washington. This same-comparison holds true throughout the length and breadth of the State of New York. As far back as the year 1910, the old Black Horse Cavalry in Albany had failed to meet changing social conditions by appropriate social legislation. Here was a State noted for its industry and noted for its agriculture -- a State with the greatest mixture of population -- where the poorest and the richest lived, literally, within a stone's throw of each other. The political philosophy of the Republican leaders of those days was: "Let them eat cake." What would have happened if that reactionary domination had continued through all these hard years?

Starting in 1911, a Democratic leadership came into power, and with it a new philosophy of government. I had the good fortune to come into public office when that happened. I found other young men in the Legislature -- men who held the same philosophy -- one of them was Bob Wagner; another was Al Smith. We were all joined in a common cause. We did not look on government as something apart from the people. We thought of it as something to be used for the good of the people.
New factory legislation setting up decent standards of safety and sanitation; limitation of the working hours of women in industry; a Workmen's Compensation Law; a one day rest in seven law; a full train crew law; a direct Primary Law — these laws and many more were called radical and alien to our form of government. Would you or any other Americans call them radical and alien today?

In later years, first under Governor Smith, then under this program of practical intelligence was carried forward over the typical and unswerving opposition of Republican leaders throughout the State. The obstructionists of those days called our program masterful and radical and alien to the American form of government.

Today the great tradition of a liberal, progressive Democratic Party has been carried still further by your present Governor, Herbert H. Lehman. He has begun a program of insurance to remove the spectre of unemployment from the working people of the State. He has broadened our labor legislation; he has extended the supervision of public utility companies. He has proved himself an unswerving seeker for the public good; a doer of social justice; a wise, clear-headed and businesslike Administrator of the Executive branch of our government. And be it noted that his opponents are led and backed by the same forces and the same individuals, who, for a quarter of a century, have tried to hamstring progress within our State. The overwhelming majority of our citizens, regardless of party, propose to return him and his Administration to Albany for another two years.
His task in Albany like my task in Washington, has been to maintain contact between statecraft and reality. Government which has rendered more than lip service to our constitutional democracy has done a work for the protection and preservation of our institutions that could not have been accomplished by repression and force.

Let me warn you and let me warn the nation against the smooth evasion which says "Of course we believe all these things; we believe in social security; we believe in saving homes; and promise, cross our hearts and hope to die, we believe in all these things; but we do not like the way the present administration is doing them. Just turn them over to us. We will do all of them - we will do more of them - we will do them better; and, most important of all, the doing of them will not cost anybody anything."

But, my friends, these evaders are using too heavily on the shortness of our memories. No one will forget that they had their golden opportunity - 13 long years of it. No one will forget that during those long years, a crisis was growing right under their noses, and that they were doing nothing about it.

Remember that the first essential of doing a job well is to want to see the job done! But make no mistake about this: The Republican leadership today is not against the way we have done the job. The Republican leadership is against the job being done.

Look to the source of the promises of the past. Governor Lehman knows and I know how little legislation in the interests of the average citizen would be on the statute books of the State of New York, and of the Federal Government if we had waited for Republican leaders to pass it.

The same lack of purpose of fulfillment lies behind the promises of today. You cannot be an old guard Republican in the East, and a New Deal Republican in the West. You cannot promise
to repeal taxes before one audience and promise to spend more of the
tax-payers money before another audience. You cannot promise
tax relief for those who can afford to pay, and at the same
time promise more of the tax-payers money for those who are in
need. You simply cannot make good on both promises. You cannot
sit on both sides of the fence at the same time.

Somebody is going to be fooled. If the Republican record means a thing it proves that it is not the forces behind
the Republican leadership that are going to be fooled. They are
paying the bills for the Republican leadership this year because
they know that if their game succeeds they will not be fooled.
These people who need a fairer share in the benefits that America
can give them - the farmer and the worker and the average citizen -
they as usual are the ones who will be left to hold the bag.

Who is there in America who believes that we can run
the risk of turning back our Government to the leadership of the
which brought it to the brink of 1933? Out of the
strains and stresses of these years we now come to see that the
true conservative is the man who has a real concern for injustices
and takes thought against the day of reckoning. The true conservative
seeks to protect the system of private property and free enterprise
by correcting such injustices and inequalities as arise from it.
The most serious threat to our institutions are those who refuse to
face the need for change. Liberalism becomes the protection for
conservative.

Never has a nation made greater strides in the safe-
guarding of democracy than we have during the past three years.
Wise and prudent men - intelligent conservatives - have long known
that in a changing world worthy institutions can be conserved only
by adjusting them to the changing time. In the words of the great
Essayist "The voice of great events is proclaiming to us - Reform
if you would preserve".

I am that kind of a conservative because I am that kind
of a Liberal.
The Old Guard had brought things to such a pass that if we had allowed nature to take its course no one knows what kind of economic doctrines would have taken root in the ruins of our traditional business and banking system. The laissez-faire of unrestrained individualism was the surest road away from the system of free enterprise. Because we desired to preserve the system we refused to continue on that road.

What we did was no different in essence from what the Democratic Party in this state has been doing for the last twenty-five years.

We have tried to use the same social intelligence to meet problems which government alone can solve. We have sought to re-establish "contact between statecraft and reality". The record speaks for itself. Soundly progressive, genuinely democratic legislation, legislation that does more than lip service to our constitutional democracy, has done a work for the protection and preservation of our institutions that could not be accomplished by repression and force.

What have we done to protect our system of individual enterprise and free competition in its service to the common man? done to buttress that system against attack so that it may operate for the children's children of today's free men and women? I do not ask you now to rejoice with me over the figures of recovery; I ask you now only to consider our fundamental repairs to the machinery of individual enterprise.
given individual enterprise a sound financial system in which to operate. By revaluing the currency we have brought money values into line with real values and prevented the disruption of both domestic and foreign trade. By refinancing private obligations at reduced interest rates the danger to the social order of vast aggregates of debt have been reduced. Through the N.R.A. we stopped the psychology of deflation. By agricultural legislation we have begun the restoration of parity between the farmer and owner of industry. By tax legislation we have encouraged the growth and prosperity of small and moderate-sized independent industry. By labor legislation we have undertaken to provide a realistic bargaining status for millions of workers upon whose purchasing power the national stability of production and employment depend. By social security legislation we have begun the insurance of employment stability of the workers and the establishment of a self-respecting security system. By a continuing program of public works we have sought to put our natural resources at the service of our human needs. By the greatest conservation program in our history we have preserved our natural plant for the benefit of ourselves and our children.

By housing, resettlement, and rural electrification projects we have provided government underwriting for the right of the average citizen to a healthier and happier life. By utility legislation we have removed obstacles to the cheapest possible distribution to all private enterprise and individuals of the all-essential source of power for the home, the farm and industry.
Never has any government given its people such a bulwark for capitalism, conservatism and democracy. Wise and prudent men, real conservatives, have long known that in a changing world worthy institutions can be conserved only by adjusting them to the changing times. Lord Macauley once gave the formula which has served to English democracy through so many centuries. "Reform, if you would preserve, is the watchword of great events".

I am that kind of a conservative because I am that kind of a liberal.
supplies in their basements, who laid plans to get their fortunes across the border, who got themselves hideaways in the country against the impending upheaval. Why did this crisis pass without disaster? How were the forces of subversion turned aside?

The answer is found in the record of what we did. We met the emergency with emergency action. But far more important than that, we went to the roots of the problem and attacked the cause of the crisis. We were against revolution. Therefore, we waged war against those conditions which make revolutions; against the inequalities and resentments which breed them. In America in 1933 there was no attempt to remedy these wrongs by overthrowing our institutions. America was made to realize that these wrongs could and would be set right within our institutions.

A Democratic Convention in New York State is a good place to dispose of red herrings. It is a good place to appraise the process and the value of legislation as social insurance against unrest. It has been under the Democratic party in New York that every great advance in progressive labor and social legislation has been made. Each advance, in its day, was labelled by the opposition as dangerously radical. And yet these advances — proposed as plain measures of social justice and human decency and branded as radicalism now stand as a bulwark against radicalism.

Prior to 1910, under the domination of the Black Horse Cavalry of the Republican leaders in New York State, no attempt was made to meet changing social conditions by appropriate social legislation. Here was the most highly industrial of all our states. Here was the greatest mixture of population. Here the poorest and the richest lived, literally, within a stone's throw of each other. Here in short the problems of our new industrialism were most acute. Here was most apparent the danger of their neglect. And yet the neglect continued. The political philosophy of the Republican leaders of those days was: "Let them eat cake." You and I can only surmise — from
what has happened in other lands - what would have happened in New York State if that reactionary domination had continued. It did not continue. It did not continue. In 1908 a Democratic leadership came into power, and with it, a new philosophy of government.

I had the good fortune to come into public office when that happened. Several other young men were starting public life in the New York Legislature at the same time; one of them was Al Smith and Bob Wagner. We were all joined in a common cause. We did not look on Government as something apart from the problems. We thought of it as something that we were in the front line of the people.

New factory legislation was enacted setting up decent standards of safety and sanitation. That was called radical and alien to our form of government. What American would call that radical and alien today?

Statutes were enacted regulating the hours of labor for women - limiting them to the unheard of minimum of a mere 54 hours per week. That was called radical and alien to our form of government. What American would call that radical and alien today?

By these laws and by others we sought to meet the human need of those days by practical intelligence. The cry then went up against us that we were dangerous and subversive and sought to destroy the American system of free private enterprise. And those who cried out in those days were the same who now call Communism a threat. Soon, later when we apply the same social intelligence to the problems on a national scale.

Later, when Al Smith became Governor Smith, he carried forward this same program of social intelligence. He sought - fifteen years ago - to meet the growing need for cheap electricity in the homes and on the farms by the development
And those who cried out then were the same who now call us Communist when we advance our program nationally.

Following the administration of Governor Smith when I became Governor of the state, the Democratic party continued its leadership for the same type of social legislation. What we did for the relief of the farmers of the state, what we did for the creation of an Old Age Security against want, what we did for the underprivileged, what we did to secure cheap electricity for the people, what we did for public works improvements—all of these and other measures were attacked by the same reactionaries as radical and subversive of the American system.

Now the great tradition of the Democratic Party has been carried further by your present Governor Herbert H. Lehman. He has begun a program of insurance to remove the spectre of unemployment from the working people of the state. He has broadened our labor legislation. He brought about the enactment of a minimum wage law for women and children in industry. He has secured the extension of the Workmen's Compensation Law to include all occupational diseases. He has brought about the legislative limitation of labor injunctions. He has broadened the supervision of public utility companies. To quote the words of the New York State Federation of Labor about Governor Lehman: "These laws establish an achievement in social and industrial well-being for men, women and children that has no parallel in the legislative history of this or any other state on the American continent."

This vast program for social security has also been attacked by the same reactionaries as wasteful and radical and subversive of the American system.

Clear-headed people who realize and history which proves that the socially intelligent legislation under three Democratic Administrations
Tonight you and I join forces for the 1936 campaign. It will be an historic campaign. Its result will affect the direction of our government, both state and national, for years to come. Whatever I shall have to say in this campaign will be confined to the campaign issues. It is on those issues that the American people, in their good sense, will determine the election.

Because the real issues at stake are so vital to the future of America, you can count upon it that there will be plenty of false issues. In that respect, this will be no different from other campaigns where important questions were involved. Partisans, unwilling to face the real issues, will drag out red herrings - as they have always done - to divert attention from the trail of their own weaknesses.

In fact, the old red herring - larger and more melodramatic than ever - has already been dragged across our path.

This is nothing new. The opposition avoided the real issues and fearful of the truth, charged that George Washington planned to make himself a king under a British form of government; that Thomas Jefferson set up a guillotine under a French Revolution form of government; that Andrew Jackson planned to surrender American democracy to the dictatorship of a frontier mob. They called Abraham Lincoln a Roman Emperor; Theodore Roosevelt a Destroyer; Woodrow Wilson a self-constituted Messiah.

In this campaign the herring turns up again. It has been British and French and Roman - and a variety of other things. This year it is Russian. Desperate in mood, angry at failure, selfish in purpose, individuals and groups are seeking to make Communism an issue in an election where it has no place. It is incessantly charged that I am a Communist. It is openly charged that I am allowing Communism to creep into our government. Let us bury this red herring and destroy this false issue once and for all.

1. We Americans have created our own form of government.
2. Communist cannot accord with that American form of
government. It, therefore, must and will be kept out.

3. I repudiate the support of any devotee of Communism or any other alien isim seeking by fair means or foul to change the American system.

4. I have said "I hate war". I say, with equal strength, "I hate Communism".

That is my position. It is always been my position. It will always be my position. I am certain — as are all common-sense men and women in the United States, that no candidate of either major party for state offices or for the presidency or vice-presidency would tolerate for a minute any change in our democratic form of government toward any European form of government.

But there is an error in the make no mistake about this. There is no difference between the two parties in what they think about Communism. There is a very significant difference between the two parties in what they propose to do about Communism. We in the Democratic party have not been content merely to denounce the menace of Communism and in the stupid faith that hard words would stem these tides of discontent. Communism is only the latest manifestation of the social unrest which always follows in the wake of widespread economic maladjustment. We in the Democratic party have not been content merely to denounce this menace in the naive faith of the reactionary that hard words would alone stem the tide. We have realistic enough to face it. We have been intelligent enough to do something about it. The world has seen the result of what we did about it.

In 1933 we faced a crisis which was the ugly fruit of 15 years of neglect of the causes and spread of this unrest. It was a crisis the Communist; for made to order for the Communists, those who would overthrow our form of government. Why did the Communist party seek to overthrow our government stories of those who piled supplies in their basements, who laid plans to get their fortunes across the border, who got themselves hideaways in the country against the impending upheaval? Why did this crisis pass
without disaster? How were the forces of subversion turned aside?

The answer is found in the record of what we did. We met the far
emergency with emergency action. But more important than that, we met
that to the roots of the problem and attacked the cause of the crisis.
We were against revolution. Therefore, we waged war against those
conditions which make revolutions—inequalities—which breed them. In America there was no attempt to
remedy these wrongs by overthrowing our institutions. America was
made to realize that these wrongs must be set right within our insti-
tutions. For that we are now charged with Communism.

We set out to right the disparity between the income of the
former and the owner of industry.

A Democratic Convention in New York state is a good place to
dispose of such red herrings. It is a good place to appraise the process
and the value of legislative insurance against unrest. It was under the
Democratic party in New York state that every great advance in progres-
sive labor and social legislation has been made. Each advance, in its
day, was labelled as dangerously radical. And yet these advances —
proposed and branded as plain measures of social justice and human decency
radicalism
now stand as bulwark against radicalism.

You and I can only surmise what would have happened
in New York state in the reaction which dominated New York state
before 1919 and continued up to 1933. Prior to 1910, under the domination
of the Black Horse Cavalry of the Republican leaders,
no attempt was made to meet changing social conditions by appropriate
social legislation. The political philosophy was: "Let them eat cake."
You and I can only surmise—what would have happened in New York state if that reactionary domination
had continued up to 1933. But it did not continue. In 1910 a
Democratic leadership came into power and with it a new philosophy of government.
I had the good fortune to come into public office when that happened. Several other young men were starting public life at the same time; Al Smith and Bob Wagner. We were all joined in a common cause. The neglected problem of the new industrialism was tackled for the first time.

New factory legislation was enacted setting up decent standards of safety and sanitation. That was called radical and alien to our form of government. What would call that radical and alien today?

Statutes were enacted regulating the hours of labor for women - limiting them to the unheard of minimum of 44 hours per week. That was called radical and alien to our form of government. What would call that radical and alien today?

The first workman's compensation law was passed. That was called radical and alien to our form of government. What would call that radical and alien today?

By these laws and by others we sought to meet the social and economic problems of those days by a new social intelligence. The cry then went up against us that we were dangerous and subversive and sought to destroy the American system of private enterprise. And those who cried out in these days were the same who now call us 25 years later Communist when we apply the same social intelligence to the new problems on a national scale.

Later, when Al Smith became Governor Smith he carried forward this same program of social intelligence. He sought to meet the growing need for cheap electricity in the homes and on the farms by development of water power resources of the state by a state agency. It was he who led the fight for shorter working hours for women and children in industry and for wages consistent with decent living. He began a vast public works program for the rehabilitation of the state's schools, prisons and hospitals. These and other forward-looking measures were called wasteful and radical and alien to our form of government.
These measures had their immediate origin in humanitarian concern for the principles of social justice. But clear-headed people realize and history proves that they are the soundest protection for our system of private property and free enterprise. In a society with such protection the forces of Communism are robbed of their weapons of propaganda and of their chance for success. This is evident from the record of New York state during the last seven years. The sufferers from the depression were most numerous. Here the preachers of Communism were most active. But the fact is that here in New York we withstood the depression with no more evidence of strain than in states which had few of our problems. Those dykes held in 1933.

When the Democratic Party came to power in Washington it faced the same situation that confronted the New York state Democratic Party when it came to power in 1910. Old Guard Republican leadership had declared a moratorium on social legislation. Their philosophy was: "Let them eat cake." Again, you and I can only surmise what would have happened in the nation if that reactionary domination had continued in Washington through 1933.

But it did not continue. In 1932, a Democratic leadership came into power in Washington and, with it, a new philosophy of government. They had no conception of how government could be used to protect the social and economic system, or to protect themselves. They had no conception of the American method of moulding government to protect the social-economic system. Again you and I can only surmise what would have happened here, if that reactionary domination had continued.
two types of leadership in this State and it can properly be said in the Nation as well. Back in 1911, etc.

1928 -- to make some little reference to the fact that in that campaign, we all remember that another red herring was dragged across the trail. We remember Protestants, Catholics and Jews, the stories that were dragged out about how the Pope was going to run the United States.
It was applied to Abraham Lincoln in the election of 1864 -- Lincoln, the Roman *imperator* Imperialist; Lincoln, the butcher of tens *mii* of thousands of Federal troops; Lincoln, the destroyer of the Supreme Court.

It was applied to Theodore Roosevelt -- Roosevelt, the Radical, the destroyer of business.

It was applied to Woodrow Wilson -- Wilson, the man whom they said thought himself a Messiah, was trying to reform the world in six months; Wilson, the man who was willing to police Europe with American Doughboys.

And today, the old red herring crosses the American path once more. Desperate in mood, angry at failure, selfish in purpose, individuals and groups are seeking to make Communism an issue in an election where it has no place. Again I say let us destroy this false issue once and for all.

1. I have said -- "I hate War." I say with equal strength -- I hate Communism.

2. I believe in, and for many long years have taken part in government in accordance with the American democratic form. Communism does not accord with the American form of government. It must, therefore, be kept out.
Who is there in America who believes that we can run the risk of turning back our Government to the leadership of the Old Guard which brought it to the brink of 1932? Out of the strains and stresses of these years we now come to see that the true conservative is the man who has concern for injustices and takes thought against the day of reckoning. The true conservative seeks to protect the system of private property and free enterprise by correcting such injustices and inequalities which arise from it. The most serious threat to our institutions are those who refuse to face the need for change. Liberalism becomes the protection for the true conservative.

End I am that kind of a conservative because I am that kind of a liberal.
Here was the most highly industrial of all our states. Here was the greatest mixture of the population. Here the poorest and the richest lived, literally, within a stone's throw of each other.

Here in short the problems of our new industrialism were most acute. Here the danger of their neglect was most apparent. And yet the neglect continued.