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Tomorrow we have an election. Mark In a few days the United States, the oldest of the modern democracies will hold an election. A free people will have a free choice to pick free leaders of free men. In the past we have taken liberty to do this so much as a matter of course that max have been willing to assume that the whole process should be contaminated.

But what has been going on across the water? Light familiar this old picture. By the reign of militarism and terrorism and intolerance in Europe, the suppression of the right to say what men please, to live where men please, to earn a living as men please; we see perhaps for the first time in our generation for the first time how precious a thing it is to be allowed a free choice to pick free leaders for free men. When you and I go to the polls next week we shall see more than the police, or the volunteer watchers assaysing a guard these polls so that no one can tell you what you must vote.

"Yes," which is the only right to vote in other countries. But for the first time ever you may will feel that the real watchers at your polling booth are hundreds of thousands, even millions of Yankee farmers who fought.
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Irish rebels against the Crown, the French traitors
who followed Garibaldi. They were tough, fellows who fought
these battles -- they wanted to be free in a world where those
were always those whose lust for power or for riches seeks to make
subjects of them; and because they yearned for a right to freedom and a peace of submission. They chose those
fellow soldiers they knew what they wanted in life more than
being shielded from trouble or avoiding trouble -- to be free --
to have the right of free speech, the right of free assembly,
the right to worship God as they chose. For these things they
- for themselves and for me -- they had not only to fight. They had to put up with each other, to
organize their
get along with each other, to make democracy work as a unified
so that it would win and endure.

They did their work so well that we have become almost
soft and flabby in what we think we can put up with as the
price of maintaining for ourselves what they gave to us.

Politics is so much trouble, choosing between candidates in
these days or confused issues is so much trouble, contributions
to candidates who are being swamped by the money of those few
who do know what they want, is so much trouble. Do you ever
think of the trouble it was to the men who made this democracy,
who risked their lives and the forfeiture of all they had, to
give you the luxury of being able to have our present political
trouble.
This is the time for this generation to take all the trouble
needed to be taken to preserve that heritage which millions of
can have handed down to us.
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among all men and women of goodwill, militant enough to
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The first victims of war have been the electric of free
peoples aroused in time to their own peril. We still cherish our democracy and are prepared not only militantly to defend it but to make it work.

Our times call for a vindication of democracy not as a romantic dream but as a tradition and body of principles that must be made to work here and now, under completely different circumstances from those which confronted the founders of American democracy, Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln. That means that democracy must become a positive conception and not merely a negative.

In other words, democracy must be both energetic and competent enough to dispel any doubt left as to the possibility of democracy can no longer be negative and survive. To survive it must have a purpose more vigorous than the merely negative purpose to preserve itself.

No one ever won a war by wanting not to be killed. It must to prove to its people that it cares for them. It must work as a cooperative instrument for bringing the living of the mass of people up to the level of security which they know and nature's bounty can bring them. Too many of those who talk about saving democracy merely mean saving the status quo. The New Deal program for the betterment of the everyday life of the average American is an aggressive attempt to save democracy in spite of those so-called democrats who want to have democracy confused with the status quo.
This has been shown not merely idealism—although pressing it is all of that—but as a realistic necessity.

We have already seen in certain sections of this country, let alone Europe, if democratic government merely becomes a mask for those who have, it will be torn to pieces by those who have not and who insist on getting what they think is social justice by any means they have to take to get it. If democracy is to become affirmative and purposeful and capable of winning in any struggle that may come with competing ideas of government, it must untangle the notion of democracy from the notion of the status quo. It must have a sharp, sure objective of its own—the objective of the highest standard of living and of security compatible with the highest liberty of the mass of its people. It cannot have the merely negative objective proposed by the Communists and the Republicans alike—the mere objective of continuing to survive against any other Fascist threat than their own. What the New Deal has tried to do, what the New Deal program has been, is to give play to this reviving strength of democracy as a way of life. It is an attempt to redefine the democratic objective in modern terms and those opposed to all forms of social justice now seek to cut the hair of Samson before he has even met the Philistines.

The continuing vitality of national democracy at the top
depends upon the continuing vitality of local democracy at the bottom. Local issues may be and frequently are different from national issues. But no strong, responsible democratic leadership can long maintain itself in national affairs unless democracy is fundamentally sound at its grass-roots. No national administration, however much it may represent the genuine popular will of the people, can in the long run prove enduringly effective if that administration can be insulated from the people by state and local political machinery controlled by men indifferent or hostile.

Many good people regard the local and state political machinery as something unimportant and even beneath them. They even think that responsible leaders of national government demean themselves when they show a sufficient interest in that machinery to object to its being used to scuttle great social and economic reforms. These good people prefer to leave that local machinery to unscrupulous professionals who are ready and willing at times to place it at the disposition of those who have the most cash to put on the barrel head.

In the past we have taken our democracy too much for granted.

In the spiritually barren days of the 1920s, the people had little effective voice in the determination of the policies
of the national government. The Administration at Washington
cooperated wholeheartedly with the state and local political
bosses. Liberalism was pretty well frustrated out at the top.

But liberalism was not wholly stamped out at the bottom.
Here and there a liberal Democratic government or an insurgent
Republican government would come into power.

During my governorship of the State of New York, for example,
I was initiated into most of the problems which have since
occupied my attention at Washington. At Albany I struggled
with problems of farm relief and land use, of reforestation
and conservation, of public health and housing, of water-power
development and utility regulation, of old age pensions and
unemployment relief, of minimum wages and maximum hours. Although
I found that there was work that could be done within the confines
of a single state, I discovered that the economic life of the
whole nation was so interdependent that it was difficult for any
one state to advance very far without the active and eager
cooperation of the federal or government. I found that no one
state could wholly eliminate competition in terms of human misery
from without its boundaries.

But there was not much that we could do to obtain federal
cooperation and help in those spiritually barren days of the
1920s. Even the federal courts frequently obstructed the
efforts of the states within their own borders to undertake useful and necessary social and economic reforms.

The great depression brought a rude awakening. It awakened the whole nation to the fact that government really matters. It awakened the whole nation to the fact that the general welfare of the ordinary man and woman depends not upon a government indifferent enough to leave them alone, but upon a government which cares enough about the people's needs to do something about them; which cares enough about the needs of the several states to cooperate with the state and local authorities in meeting those needs.

Today we live in a new human society, a society so highly integrated that it must function as a whole or it will not function at all, and we live in a society from which there is no escape.

Fifty or seventy-five years ago, our people could stand the chaotic disorder of an industrial and financial system manipulated by powerful men whose servants were in control of the government. For the millions who suffered injustice, the underpaid or unemployed workmen, for the dispossessed farmers, there was always an escape. They could take up homesteads in the West.

That avenue of escape has vanished. The frontier is closed. The cheap and fertile land is occupied. And at the very time
this avenue of escape disappeared, our economic system took on
a new form. Through the wizardry of science and the wizardry
of finance, business and industry and agriculture have been
knit together into a vast, delicate, complicated machine -- a
machine so vast and intricate that it runs from end to end of
human activities, and brings every man, woman and child in the
nation within its compass.

It is no longer possible to let this machine be run ex-
clusively for the profit of those who own and manage it. It
is no longer possible to deny the paramount right of the
millions who toil, and the millions who wish to toil, to have
this economic machine function smoothly and efficiently as a
means of distributing our national resources, to make it serve
the welfare and happiness of all the people of America.

To lead in this direction has become the duty of government,
end so vast is the responsibility, so tragic the consequences of
a failure in duty, that we cannot depart from this duty without
disaster.

The modern interdependent industrial society is like a
large factory. Each member has his own job to perform on the
assembly line, but if the conveyor belt breaks or gets tangled
up, no one no matter how hard he tries can do his own particular
job. Each of us -- farmer, businessman or worker -- suffers
when anything goes wrong with the conveyor belts.

In an interdependent industrial society, the economic conveyor belts must be kept moving. The individual alone is helpless to keep the conveyor belts moving. To do so, he must have the aid of his government. As Abraham Lincoln so wisely said, "the legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities."

If the great Depression through which we have passed has taught us anything it is that there can be little liberty, opportunity or security for the average individual in an interdependent industrial society without the exercise of a continuing responsibility by government to keep the economic conveyor belts moving. Without the exercise of such a continuing responsibility by government, the average individual has little chance of obtaining the blessings of liberty which our fathers taught us was the primary object of democratic government.

If our democracy is to survive it must give the average man and woman reasonable assurance that the economic conveyor belts will be kept moving. In the fits and starts of economic activity there is no security for either capital or labor. The extreme variability of our economic life is probably the gravest threat
to orderly, democratic progress. Neither our nerves nor our
cocketbooks can stand the strain of continually alternating
booms and depressions. In other lands when democratic govern-
ments have failed to keep the economic conveyor belts moving,
men in despair have even yielded their liberty to dictators who
were at least willing to try to keep the conveyor belts moving.
You and I have reason to feel uncomfortable when foreign dic-
tators jeer and scoff at the inability of democratic countries
to solve the problems of unemployed labor and unemployed capital.

I freely concede that there may be much, very much, honest
difference of opinion as to how the continuing responsibility of
government, state, as well as nation, should be exercised so as
to ensure the maximum amount of liberty; security and opportunity.
I should certainly hope that time and experience would suggest
not only changes and improvements in the methods and devices
which we are now employing to meet this continuing responsibility
of government, but might suggest wholly new and better methods
and devices.

Sometimes I wonder whether the people are fully aware of
the subtle maneuverings, which have all the earmarks of a planned
and deliberate effort, to make the political machinery of govern-
ment subservient not to the people's needs but to the greed of
scheming politicians and their economic overlords.
There are powerful forces which mistake their own freedom to exert their economic power over other men's capital and other men's labor for the freedom of the average individual. They may perform pay lip service to the continuing responsibility of government to the ordinary individual, but in their mind that continuing responsibility of government is always subject to a reservation -- subject to a "yes, but" -- that their powers and their privileges must not be touched. They do not tell you, and they do not know, how they want government to fulfill its continuing responsibility to the people. But they do know that they don't want that responsibility discharged as the New Deal has discharged it. When democracy struggles for its very life, they obstruct our efforts to maintain it without offering proof of their own will to preserve it. They try to stop the only fire engines we have from proceeding to the fire because they're sales agents for a different make of engine.

Let me warn you now, as I warned you two years ago in my address at Syracuse against the smooth eversion 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."

I wish I could convince myself that the principal contests in the forthcoming election were struggles not between liberalism and reaction but struggles between competing methods of making a liberal and tolerant democracy work.

Although I am the head of the Democratic Party and believe party responsibility essential to the effective functioning of representative government, I am no blind partisan. Just because I am devoted to the liberal principles set forth in the Democratic Platform of 1896, I must recognize that few men have fought more gallantly for those principles than Senator Norris of Nebraska, Senator La Follette of Wisconsin and Governor Benson of Minnesota, although none of them has ever run under the Democratic Party label.

But it is the duty of every citizen who believes in liberal democracy to scrutinize with care the candidates, the issues, and the political situation in his State and in his District in order to determine how his vote in behalf of liberal and tolerant democracy may most effectively be registered.

There is no doubt, in this election or any election, of the basic desires of the people. And because these
basic desires are known to all, you find all parties, all candidates, making the same general promises to satisfy those desires.

During the weeks before a general election, all parties are the friends of labor, all parties are against monopoly, all parties say that the unemployed must have work or be given government relief.

Therefore, as you and I approach the ballot box, we must not only know in what direction we want the country to go, but we must be able to judge the sincerity and the fitness of parties and candidates, all of whom promise, in a general way, to bring about the conditions we hope for.

So we are obliged to judge parties and candidates, not merely by what they promise, but by what they have done, by their records in office, by their kind of people they travel with, by the kind of people who finance and promote their campaigns. By their promoters ye shall know them -- for before those who throw their money and their power into a political campaign risk that money and that power, you may be sure they have calculated the value of the candidate to them if he gets in.

My own State of New York is to choose a Governor. Its population is 13 million, greater than that of the entire nation
...as it was during its first fifty years of national existence. Measured by the complexities of its problems by varieties of population, needs, standards of living and all the factors which have the danger of making for social unrest. The government of the State of New York is and requires skill and experience as the conduct of the nation itself. Here is no job for one who has the qualifications and training of a District Attorney alone. Governing the State of New York is more than merely prosecuting crime. Its government and its legislation effect has an intimate upon the lives of every one of its 15 million people. The Governor of New York State is called upon to administer eighteen great departments of government, and state institutions housing over 100,000 unfortunate wards of the state. He must be able to understand and handle the problems of agriculture and state finance and the maintenance of state credit. He is responsible for the widespread system of roads, canals, bridges, schools, to meet the present and growing needs of its people. He has to maintain, and preserve the great body of social legislation already on its books -- unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, social security, help for the needy and underprivileged; he must also see to it that these reforms are made to keep pace with the broadening concepts of social justice. Human rights
as well as property rights; equal protection of the laws; civil
and religious liberty -- these precious essentials of American
government -- are entrusted unto his hands. New York State
has been always in the vanguard in cooperation with the Federal
movements to better the lot of the men and women of America.
On the statute books of New York you will find corresponding
State laws to match every progressive Federal measure of the
last five years. They were all placed there under the guiding
hand and driving energy of Governor Herbert H. Lehman. Herbert
Lehman is a seasoned soldier in the battle for economic democracy.
It is true that we need and welcome recruits who are sincere in
the battle for economic democracy, but we are not prepared and
cannot take the risk of supplanting seasoned warriors like
Governor Lehman with raw recruits who, even if they were sincere,
have yet to win their spurs in the fight for social justice.

In our struggle for social justice I would not minimize
the need of efficient organization of law enforcement, particularly
in our great cities where brutal racketeers and their political
protectors prey upon the poor. But a few dramatic or even
melodramatic prosecutions are no substitute for a thoroughly
organization of law enforcement, not only against the lords of
the underworld but against the lords of the overworld. The
fight for social justice and economic democracy is not a
sensational criminal trial; it is a long, weary up-hill struggle and those who give themselves unspiringly to it seldom are acclaimed at my lady's tea or at my gentleman's club.

Those who would join the struggle for social justice and economic democracy do not throw stones at their examina comrades in arms. Social and economic reform is something more than a matter of bookkeeping.

Governor Lehman was a pioneer in the fight for unemployment insurance in the State of New York. He was in the fight even before our federal law was passed. He was unceasingly on the job cajoling recalcitrant Republican and even backsliding Democratic legislators, beating back litigation in the State courts and in the federal courts. His opponent who comes into the fray after the most perilous battle was won complains that we are a little behind in our work of administration. There were his present political sponsors and backers when we fought at Crecy? Of course we are behind in our work. We should have had our federal law at least ten years ago when the Republican Party was in power, and we ought now to have had ten years of administrative experience.

I think I have the right as a resident and voter in New York State to urge my fellow citizens and voters who are interested in preserving good government and American democracy to vote for
Herbert H. Lehman.

Just as a Governor requires much more than a good prosecutor, the office of United States Senator requires much more than a good lawyer. A Senator should be able to do more than merely vote. His is the job of keeping the wheels of a militant democracy working to meet new conditions and to stop them from being forced into reverse by those ever clemoring to shift the gears. If you list some of the major newly-recognized responsibilities of the Government to meet the complexities of modern life — protection of the rights of labor, security in old age, unemployment insurance, low-cost housing and slum clearance — you will have a virtual resume of the acts of the Congress which bear the name of Robert F. Wagner. So often since 1933 has new legislation been described as "The Wagner Act" that the phrase has become confusing because there have been so many Wagner Acts. There is the Wagner Labor Relations Act, the Wagner Social Security Act, the Wagner Housing Act. But although you might feel uncertain as to what act is meant by the phrase, you can feel no uncertainty of this — that any one of the Wagner Acts was an act intended for the benefit of those who need the help and support of government against oppression and intolerable conditions of living. His name stands for courageous and intelligent leadership, constructive statecraft and steadfast devotion to the common man. Does his opponent
and do his political backers and sponsors claim that the some of the legislation he sponsored needs improvement? Where were they when Senator Wagner fought at Crecy?
The price support program is proving reasonably successful on both fronts: increasing production and maintaining fair food prices for the consumer. I am convinced that a change in policy will increase the cost of living, bring about further demands for increased wages, and might well start a serious and dangerous cycle of inflation—without any net benefit to anyone. Those who are advocating such a course will have to be ready to accept the responsibility for the results. We have so far been following a tried path, and are getting along fairly well. This is no time to start wandering into an untried field of uncontrolled and uncontrollable prices and wages.

Some people say, "a little inflation will not hurt anyone." Well in life the man who takes an opera will for the operation he thinks it will help. He takes it, causing he will not make it a habit. Soon he is taking two— and then more and more. Inflammation is that. Once tastes it more. I am irresistibly opposed to taking the first shot by Congressmen, or any other action. The action cannot afford to acquire the habit. We have children to think of.
On the eve of another election, I have come home to Hyde Park and am sitting at my own fireside in my own election district, my own County and my own State.

I have often made it clear that the mere fact of being President should not prevent me as a citizen from expressing my views on candidates and issues in my own State. Nor should it prevent me from forcibly expressing my opinion of those in other parts of the country who have unwittingly, or with malice of forethought, misused my name or twisted actual facts.

But to-night, before I take up any specific instances, I want to speak simply and seriously about certain philosophies and objectives of representative government -- and I do so without reference to the party labels of any candidates, and without reference to purely local issues.

Several times in the past I have compared the operations of government to the building of a substantial house from the ground up.
As you may have read, I started to build a little stone cottage last spring up on a wooded hill, three miles back from the Hudson River -- a simple cottage with wonderful views of distant hills -- but above all a place of silence, of relaxation and of thought.

The cottage stands nearly completed and next spring I can begin to use it for brief moments when I can escape from work.

Government, however, is never completed and, therefore, it has been brought home to me that it should not be compared with the erection of any mere building.

Six years ago I was finishing my second term as Governor of New York. My four years in Albany had witnessed the culmination of the unthinking excesses of the twenties, and had witnessed also the greater part of that depression which brought the United States literally to the brink of ruin.

In Albany I had faced the task of caring for starving people without any financial assistance from the Federal Government. My State, like most of the States, created deficits to take care of relief. The municipalities and counties of my State, like those in most other States, went
into the red to take care of starving people. Washington offered no help. Washington floundered.

During those four years in Albany also we laid the foundation within one State for many things that became later the national policy -- the beginnings of soil erosion control and the better use of the land; things like the battle to get lower electricity rates for the householder, the farmer, and the small industrialist and storekeeper; things like better roads and schools. Then came 1933 and with it the beginning of a philosophy of government that has come to be called "The New Deal". When you think of that term I hope you will not think of it in anything but the larger point of view. Because it is a philosophy and applies to literally hundreds of individual problems of life, it is the broad objective that counts rather than the immediate detail of some one smaller problem out of the many hundreds of them.

I myself do not agree with many of the details of the working out of the individual problem, for I know that the detail can and must be changed or improved as we gain experience.
We have made our banks immensely safer than they were before, but the banking structure is not a completed house because we must continue to improve it in all the years to come. The checks we have provided against the issuing of securities and for the ending of stock exchange abuses are good in themselves but eternal vigilance is necessary to improve the methods and prevent a sliding-back to the old discredited processes.

After years of court actions and recriminations, we, in many cases, are working successfully with private utilities for the maintenance and securing of lower rates and the ending of privately owned utility empires which, dominated by half a dozen men, control monopolies in hundreds of counties and municipalities. And eternal vigilance is still necessary lest we revert to the olden days.

In the twin fields of industry and agriculture we have followed the consistent policy that has made the picture today very different from the picture I faced on March 4, 1933. There was a definite objective: In the case of industry, to put a floor under wages and a ceiling over hours -- in other words, to give more purchasing power to industrial workers;
in the case of farming, to bring the income of farmers up to a parity with the income of industry.

Why is it that the business slump beginning last Fall and running to last Summer did not become a major economic disaster like the one that began in 1929? Why is it that instead of being on the road to ruin we are now on the road to prosperity once more? I will tell you why. You had an Administration in Washington that was willing and ready to act in defense of the incomes of city people and farm people. We moved quickly to sustain farm income and farm buying power. We had to repair the damage done by the Supreme Court decision of 1936. We had to build a new farm program. Farm cash income this year is seven and a half billion dollars. It was less than four and a half billion dollars in 1932.

Look at the farm value of some of the big crops in comparison with 1932. In the case of wheat it is nearly three hundred million dollars more; in the case of cotton it is nearly five hundred million dollars more; in the case of dairy production it is five hundred million dollars more; in the case of meat animals, the form in which corn and hay
are marketed, it is nine hundred million dollars.

Do not be deceived by silly stories about two price systems. Actual existing laws are working out in such a way that we have in wheat, for example, a price of eighteen cents above its usual relationship with the world market, and the policy of conservation payments and parity payments are beginning to protect the farmers of the nation against uncontrolled surplus.

Ramparts have been thrown up. In protecting farm income the program is helping to get the whole nation back on the road to recovery. I ask any farmer in the nation what would have happened if only the laws of 1932 were on the statute books?

In 1934 I said that we were "on our way". Four years later I still say that we are "on our way". And that is all to the good because as long as you and I live we will never be able to say "we have arrived".

The danger to us Americans is that we may stop continuing "on our way" -- whether that means sitting down beside the road or actually walking backwards. So far these five and a half years of progress have been definite. Each
Congress has added constructive measures to improve that progress in some new or old line.

Not all of their laws have been perfect any more than all of the acts of the Administrative branch of the Government have been perfect. But in both cases the objective has been sound and, as we learn from experience, the detail and the practice is being improved.

There are two types of people in this country who are dangerous to continued social and economic progress.

I do not quarrel much with the first type for they are the frank, outspoken people who have the honesty to say that they believe in practically no Government controls or assistance. They would let watered stock be sold to the gullible. They would have no Government supervision of banking; they would let utilities charge all the traffic would bear; they would let the farmers take their own chances in the markets of the world; they would ask the rich men to pay no higher taxes than the poor man. They would tell you that if finance and industry were given a completely free hand, finance and industry would put everybody to work and that no unemployment relief would thereafter be necessary.
I have no indignation against people like these because they are entitled to their outspoken views.

But the second type is far more of a menace to the United States. These are the people who give lip-service to fine social and economic objectives and when you ask them what they think of this remedy, they solemnly oppose it; and when you ask them what they think of that remedy, they laugh it to scorn; and when you ask them what their own remedy is they tell you that that is none of their business.

These are the people who condemn everything constructive and decline to suggest what they would do were they in a position of responsibility.

These are the people who say "throw so-and-so out, I will do better than he is doing"; and when you ask them how, all they will tell you is "I will do better than he".

We are coming to an election. People all over the country will be asked to choose between candidates, and I think that there are certain simple rules that most of us can apply. The personality of the candidate is, on the whole, not a very important factor. What the candidate can and will do, after elected, is an important factor.
We can tell something by his own record. Has he in that record accomplished on the whole constructive things for the people he has represented? Has he the experience in the new office he seeks to accomplish constructive things for the people he seeks to represent?
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On the eve of another election, I have come home to Hyde Park and am sitting at my own fireside in my own election district, my own County and my own State.

I have often made it clear that the mere fact of being President should not prevent me as a citizen from expressing my views on candidates and issues in my own State. Nor should it prevent me from forcibly expressing my opinion of those in other parts of the country who have unwittingly, or with malice of forethought, misused my name or twisted actual facts.

But tonight, before I take up State matters, I want to speak simply and seriously about certain philosophies and objectives of representative government -- and I do so without reference to the party labels of any candidates.

I have been doing a good deal of thinking in the past few years about the continuity of democratic processes. I used to talk about the problems of government as if they were the problems of building and completing a house.

Today, as I was watching the finishing touches being put on a simple cottage I have recently built -- not by the
way a "dream house" in any sense of the term -- I realized that
my comparison has been a rather poor one.

For a house can be and generally is completed -- made a
finished product in the course of a few months. Whereas, building
operations in the field of government are never finished -- never
brought to perfection.

Lots of us have seen our ideas about government change,
not only in our lifetime, but especially in the past few years.
This election time gives us another chance to think about a con-
tinuing processes and to make up our minds whether we want the
process to continue, to remain where they are, or to slip back-
words into the old grooves.

We all remember well-known examples of what a change in
direction can mean to liberal government. Theodore Roosevelt,
introduced[without doubt] a march of progress during his seven
years in the Presidency, but [progress stopped and slipped backward

during the four years of President Taft, little was left of the progres
which had been made. Think of the great liberal achievements of
Woodrow Wilson when he assumed another period of liberal govern-
ment, and then quickly it was dependent as the country lost ground under President Harding.

In the State of New York it is generally conceded
that the State government has been
liberal and extremely effective during the past sixteen years.
The gains made by Theodore Roosevelt were largely lost under Taft. The social and economic gains made under Wilson were largely lost under Harding. If the continuity of liberal government had not existed during the past sixteen years in this State, during the time we would no longer have the point we have reached today.

A social or economic gain is not like a room in a newly built house. A room stays put but a social and economic gain may, and often does, evaporate into thin air.

Because of their past experience, when they have turned down liberal government in the nation and in the State, the voters throughout the country should bear that clearly in mind when they vote next Tuesday.

On that day the oldest of modern democracies will hold an election. A free people will have a free choice to pick free leaders of free men. In the past we have often taken this liberty as a matter of course. We have laughed when a campaigner has thought it shrewd to campaign like a circus; some Americans have cynically thought of an election as a corrupt process with which self-respecting persons should not be contaminated.

But what has been going on in other lands across the

water has cast a new light on this particular liberty of ours.
The flares of militarism, terrorism, intolerance, and conquest
have lit our generation of Americans for the first time since
the Revolution, how precious it is to be allowed this free choice
of free leaders for free men.

No one can tell us how we must vote, and the only watchers
we have at the polls are the watchers who guarantee that our
ballot is secret. Until three years ago, the electorate was
the populace.

Some nations, ruled under a different form of government,
have never known what the free ballot box means. Others, new to
democracy, have seen democracy disappear because they
could not make democracy work.

Therefore, we cannot carelessly assume that a nation is
strong and great merely because it has a democratic form of
government. We have learned that democracy weakened by internal
dissension, by mutual suspicion born of social injustice, is no
match for autocracies which are ruthless enough to repress
internal dissension and clever enough at the same time to give
work [and wages] to their population.

We know that democracy in order to live must become a
positive force in the daily lives of its people. It must make
[for men and women whose devotion is given to democracy feel
that it really cares for the security of every individual, that
it is tolerant, to inspire an essential unity; and that it is
militant enough to maintain liberty against aggression at home
and against aggression abroad.

In these tense and dangerous world situations democracy will
fare itself by proving itself worth saving.

No part of the world is anything like as far from us as
it was in the days of democracy's founders. - Jefferson, Jackson
and Lincoln. Therefore democracy must be a positive, up-to-date
conception, competent enough to disprove the pretenses of rival
systems. It can no longer be negative, it can no longer stand
still and survive.

Too many of those who prate about saving democracy really
mean saving things as they are. Kipling wrote about "God-of
things-as-they-are." I prefer to think about "God-of-things
as-they-ought-to-be." For if America has a house that is com-
pleted, etc.

The New Deal program for the betterment of the every-day
life of the average American is an aggressive attempt to save
democracy in spite of those campaigners who try to keep a
living, forward-moving democracy confused with things as they
are.
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I am not talking mere idealism; I am pressing realistic necessity.

I object to the greatly-inactive purposes proposed by Communists and old-line Republicans alike — seeking to set up their own Fascist type of control, in order to stave off some other Fascist threat.

What the New Deal has tried to do and what its program is is to revive the real strength of democracy as a way of life.

Most of those, who, regardless of party, oppose it today, consciously or unconsciously, are undermining our national strength by choosing to represent them men who are Fascist at heart or else want to turn back the clock.

Fascism and Communism are not threats to the continuation of our form of government today. But I venture the challenging statement that if American democracy ceases to move forward as a living force, seeking day and night by peaceful means to better the lot of our citizens, Fascism and Communism will grow in strength. Fascism and Communism thrive on the calling out of the troops. During my four years as Governor I am proud of the fact that I never called out the National Guard except on an errand of mercy. During my nearly six years as President, I have never called-out the Army or Navy of the United States.
except on occasions of necessity. Passions in many local instances have run high and bloodshed has been threatened. The democratic problem was illustrated by the action of Governor Murphy in Michigan last year when in effect he locked the negotiators of the employers and employees into a room, got an agreement, avoided bloodshed and earned the praise of both sides of that controversy.

As a result of actions like this, we are slowly but surely, ironing through the processes of evolution, working out difficulties between labor and capital, difficulties between utility companies and the public, difficulties between farmers and householders, who are about to be dispossessed, and the people they owe money to. In a hundred other ways the New Deal, keeping its feet on the ground, is working out current problems. That is the salvation of democracy.

Fifty or seventy-five years ago our people could stand the disorder and chaos of an industrial and financial system that was manipulated by powerful men who put their servants into control of the government. Those who suffered injustice, the underpaid or unemployed workmen, the dispossessed farmers, had an escape — they could take up homesteads in the West.
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That escape has vanished. Our cheap and fertile land is occupied; science and finance have knit business and industry and agriculture into a vast, delicate, complicated machine, that brings every man, woman and child in the nation within its compass.

That machine can no longer be run exclusively for the profit of those who own and manage it. That machine cannot deny the paramount right of the millions who toil and the millions who wish to toil, to have it function smoothly and efficiently, means of distributing our national resources and of making it serve the welfare and happiness of all the people of America.

The New Deal does not wish to run or manage that machine. That should be left to individuals, to corporations, to private management. There should be profit for those who manage it well.

But we have seen the abuse which has come from wholly uncontrolled private management. The New Deal has undertaken, therefore, the type of supervision which seeks only to eliminate from the running of the machine those inequities, those unsocial and those un-economic results which so often in the past have hurt the lives of the public as a whole.

We do not assume for a minute that all we have done is right or all that we have done has been successful, but it is worth pointing out that our economic and social program of the
past five years and a half has given to this country a more stable and less artificial prosperity than any other nation in the world has enjoyed.

But the fact remains that most Americans think we are on the right track.

Why is it that the business slump beginning last Fall and running to last Summer did not become a major economic disaster like the one that began in 1929? Why is it that instead of being on the road to ruin we are now on the road to prosperity once more? You and I know that the automobile factories and many other industries are opening up again. And during the month of October alone employment has risen nearly 3½ -- not a bad sign.

I have been trying consistently to do a little here and a little there, not only to improve the conditions of the moment, but also to build on fundamentally sound lines. Only last week a prominent editor and a prominent business man have written me separately to the same effect: "With abundant signs of an upward trend everywhere evident I have not, in ten years, been so certain as I am today that we are on the threshold of an excellent recovery. During these years the great majority of objectives of business men have been coming to accept the ...
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[reform, of a more stable economy and of certain necessary supervision of private activities, in order to prevent a return of the serious abuses and conditions of the past.]

The chief foes of returning prosperity are those who, for political purposes, hurl unsupported charges, making untruthful allegations and offer nothing constructive as a substitute for the social and economic program under which we are definitely going forward.

I quarrel with them a great deal more than with those who are honest enough to say publicly that they want no government controls and no government assistance.
My own State of New York is to choose a Governor. Its population is thirteen million — greater than that of the entire Nation during the first fifty years of its national existence.

Ours is a complex State — Great farming areas, hundreds of small communities, one huge city of seven million people, many towns, and many other cities, great and small. Many elements enter for social unrest.

Therefore, the government of the State of New York requires a very large amount of skill which comes from experience in its conduct.

I was invited to run for the Governor in 1915 when I was thirty-six years old. I was born for the sea, a Zone of the easternmost Atlantic; I am an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and I turned it down. I am sure I did not think that I had a sufficiently broad experience and knowledge of public affairs to make a good qualified governor.

Governing the State of New York is more than being an Assistant Secretary of the Navy or a district attorney. Its government and its legislation has an intimate effect on
the lives of everyone of its thirteen million people. The
Governor of this State is called on to administer eighteen
great departments of government and state institutions that
house over one hundred thousand wards of the State.
He must be able to understand and handle the problems of
agriculture, of State finance and the maintenance of State credit,
of his responsibility for its widespread system of roads, canals,
bridges, schools designed to meet the present and growing needs
of its people. He has to maintain, preserve and improve the
great body of social legislation already on its books—unem-
ployment insurance, workmen's compensation, social security,
help for the needy and underprivileged; and he must see to it
that these recent reforms are made to keep pace with the broad-
ening conception of social justice.

Human rights as well as property rights; prosecution of
financial
criminals in high places as well as low; equal protection of
the law—criminal and civil, civil and religious liberty.

New York State has ever been in the vanguard in cooperation
with the recent efforts of the Federal Government to better the lot of the men
and women of America. On the statute books of New York you have, therefore, fine corresponding State laws to match every progressive Federal measure of the last five years.

They were all there under the guiding hand and driving energy of Governor Herbert H. Lehman.

Recruits in the battle for economic democracy are always welcome, but at a critical moment in the world's history we cannot take the risk of supplanting seasoned leaders like Governor Lehman with men, no matter how sincere, who have yet to win their spurs or prove their stand in the fight for social justice.

No one can properly minimize the need of active law enforcement, whether it be in the great city or in the country.

A law new care of it in both places we need it not only against the lords of the underworld, but also against the lords of the overworld. The fight for social justice and economic democracy is not a criminal jury trial; it is a long, weary, uphill struggle — and those who give themselves unselfingly to it are seldom acclaimed at My Lady's High Tea or at My Gentleman's Club.
Those who would sincerely join the struggle for social justice and economic democracy do not throw stones at their comrades in arms.

I think I have the right as a resident and voter in the State of New York to urge my fellow citizens and voters, who are interested in preserving good government and American democracy, to vote for Herbert H. Lehman.

And just as a Governor is required by to be much more than a good prosecutor, so the office of United States Senator requires much more than a good lawyer. A Senator should be able to do more than merely vote. If you list some of the major newly recognized responsibilities of government to meet the complexities of modern life — protection of the rights of labor, security in old age, unemployment insurance, low-cost housing and slum clearance — you will have a virtual resume of the Acts of the Congress which bear the name of Robert F. Wagner.

So often since 1933 has new legislation been described as "The Wagner Act" that the phrase has become confusing because there have been so many Wagner Acts. You can feel no uncertainty of any this; however — that no one of the Wagner Acts was an Act intended for the benefit of those who need the help and support of government against oppression and intolerable conditions of
living. His name stands for courageous and intelligent leadership, constructive statecraft and steadfast devotion to the common man and the cause of civil liberties.

With him I hope the voters of this State will send to the Senate an experienced Member of the House of Representatives ---

James M. Head -- known through many years for his expert knowledge of railroad, aviation and other vital matters and for the most intelligent and support of the finest principles of Civil Service legislation, the housing of the elderly, aviation, and the problems of the railroads and the unflagging support of every Liberal Measure. He has been active before the Congress.

Look over the rest of the names on the ballot next Tuesday.

Pick those who are known for their experience and their liberalism. Pick them for what they have done and not just for what they say they would do. And now I say the one last but important word:

Pick them without regard to race, creed or color. Some of them may come of the earliest Colonial stock; some of them may have been brought here as children to escape the tyrannies of the Old World. They are all of them American citizens, and that is all that I care to know regarding their origin.
On the eve of another election, I have come home to
Hyde Park and am sitting at my own fireside in my own election
district, my own County and my own State.

I have often expressed my feeling that the mere fact
that I am President should not disqualify me from expressing
my views on candidates and issues as a citizen in my own State.

I have changed my mind a great deal about the nature
of the problems of democratic government over the past few years
as I have had more and more experience with them. I had never
realized how much my way of thinking had changed until the
other day when I was watching the finishing touches being put
on a simple cottage I have recently built — a cottage which
by the way is hardly the dream house it has been pictured.

Just watching the building made me realize that there was a
time not so long ago when I used to think about problems of
government as if they were the same kind of problems as building
and completing a house. A house can be, and generally is,
completed, made a finished product in a definite period of
time and, barring terrific catastrophies, stays put. Once you build it you always have it. A social or an economic gain, for instance, is not like a room in a newly built house. A new addition to a house stays put, but a social and economic gain made by one administration may, and often does, evaporate into thin air under the next one.

We all remember well-known examples of what a premature shift from liberal to conservative leadership can do to an incompletely liberal program. Theodore Roosevelt, for example, introduced a march of progress during his seven years in the Presidency, but after four years of President Taft, little was left of the progress which had been made. Think of the great liberal achievements of Woodrow Wilson’s new freedom and how quickly they were liquidated under President Harding. We have to have reasonable continuity in liberal government to get permanent results.

The whole United States concedes that we have carried out a magnificent liberal program through our State government during the past sixteen years. The sixteen years in a row were decisive. For if the continuity of liberal government had been broken in this State during that time, we would be no place near the point we have reached today.
The voters throughout the country should bear that necessity for continuity clearly in mind when they vote next Tuesday.

On that day the oldest of modern democracies will hold an election. A free people will have a free choice to pick free leaders of free men. In the past we have often taken this liberty as a matter of course.

But what has been going on in other lands across the water has cast a new light on this freedom. The flares of militarism and conquest, terrorism and intolerance have revealed for the first time since the Revolution to our generation of Americans how precious and extraordinary it is to be allowed this free choice of free leaders for free men.

No one can tell us how we must vote, and the only watchers we have at the polls are the watchers who guarantee that our ballot is secret. Think how few places are left where this can happen.

Some nations, ruled under a different form of government, have never known what the free ballot box means. Others, new to democracy, have seen democracy disappear because they could not make democracy work.
Therefore, we cannot carelessly assume that a nation is strong and great merely because it has a democratic form of government. We have learned that democracy weakened by internal dissension, by mutual suspicion born of social injustice, is no match for autocracies which are ruthless enough to repress internal dissension and clever enough at the same time to use a program of rearmament to give work to their population.

Democracy in order to live must become a positive force in the daily lives of its people. It must make men and women whose devotion it seeks, feel that it really cares for the security of every individual; that it is tolerant enough to inspire an essential unity; and that it is militant enough to maintain liberty against oppression at home and against aggression abroad.

No part of the world is so far from us as it was in the days of democracy's founders - Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln. Comparisons are unavoidable. To disprove the pretenses of rival systems, democracy must be a positive, up-to-date conception. It can no longer be negative with a defeatist concern solely to save itself. In these tense and dangerous
world situations democracy will save itself by proving itself worth saving.

Too many of those who prate about saving democracy really mean only saving things as they are. Kipling wrote about a "God-of-things-as-they-are". I prefer to think about a "God-of-things-as-they-ought-to-be".

The New Deal program for the betterment of the every-day life of the average American is an aggressive attempt to save democracy in spite of those campaignists who try to confuse the idea of a living, forward-moving democracy with freezing things as they are.

I am not talking mere idealism; I am pressing realistic necessity.

I object to the merely negative purposes proposed by Communists and old-line Republicans alike -- the objective of continuing to survive against any other Fascist threat than their own.

Fascism and Communism are not yet threats to the continuation of our form of government today. But I venture the challenging statement that if American democracy ceases to move forward as a living force, seeking day and night by
peaceful means to better the lot of our citizens and prevent
divisions among them, Fascism and Communism will grow in
strength. It will take cool judgment for our people to
appraise the repercussions of economic change in other lands.
And only a people completely convinced -- at the bottom as well
as at the top -- that their system of government best serves
their social and economic interests will have such a judgment.
And while we are developing that coolness of judgment we need
in public office, above all things, men who are wise enough
not to permit the rising of instances where passion and force
have a chance to be substituted for judgment and negotiation.
During my four years as Governor and during my nearly six years
as President, I am proud of the fact that I have never called
out the armed forces except on errands of mercy. That type
of democratic wisdom was illustrated by the action last year
of Governor Murphy in Michigan when he persuaded the negoti-
tiators of the employers and employees to sit around a table,
got an agreement, avoided bloodshed and earned the praise of
both sides of a controversy that had a whole nation justifi-
ably frightened.

In such a way the New Deal, keeping its feet on the ground,
is working out hundreds of current problems from day to day as necessities arise and as materials are at hand, without attempting to commit the Nation to any isms or permanent ideology except only the salvation of Democracy and of the civil liberties which form its foundation. That continuing responsibility of government is meeting current problems is something which no modern democracy can avoid.

Fifty or seventy-five years ago our people were able to survive the disorder and chaos of an industrial and financial system that was manipulated by powerful men who put their own servants in control of the government. Those who suffered injustice, the underpaid or unemployed workmen, the dispossessed farmers, had an escape -- they could take up homesteads in the West; they could find new jobs in a growing country.

Those avenues of escape have now vanished. Our cheap and fertile land is occupied; our population is ceasing to grow. Science and finance have knit business and industry and agriculture into a vast, delicate, complicated system that brings every man, woman and child in the nation within its compass. That system cannot deny the paramount right of the millions who toil and the millions who wish to toil, to have it function smoothly and efficiently. After all, any economic system must
in the large be an efficient means of distributing national
resources and of serving the welfare and happiness of all who
live under it.

The modern interdependent industrial society is like a
large factory. Each member has his own job to perform on the
assembly line, but if the conveyor belt breaks or gets tangled
up, no one, no matter how hard he tries, can do his own par-
ticular job. Each of us -- farmer, business man or worker --
suffers when anything goes wrong with the conveyor belts.

In an interdependent industrial society, the economic
conveyor belts must be kept moving. The individual alone is
helpless to keep the conveyor belts moving. But if our democracy
is to survive it must give the average man and woman reasonable
assurance that the economic conveyor belts will be kept moving.
In the fits and starts of economic activity there is no
security for either capital or labor. The extreme variability
of our economic life is probably the gravest threat to orderly,
democratic progress. Neither our nerves nor our pocketbooks
can stand the strain of continually alternating booms and
depressions. In other lands when democratic governments have
failed to keep the economic conveyor belts moving, men in
desperate have even yielded their liberty to dictators who were
at least willing to try to keep the conveyor belts moving. You
and I have reason to feel uncomfortable when foreign dictators
jeer and scoff at the inability of democratic countries to solve
the problems of unemployed labor and unemployed capital.

All the New Deal has been trying to do is to keep those
belts moving. It does not wish to run or manage any part of our
economic machine which private enterprise will run and keep
running. That should be left to individuals, to corporations
and any other form of private management with profit for those
who manage well. But Government has a continuing responsibility
to keep the belts moving and Government, it seems to me, has a
responsibility when it sees an abuse in private enterprise which
is destroying the ability of private enterprise to do its part
to keep the belts moving, to eliminate that abuse. Therefore,
the New Deal has undertaken the type of supervision which seeks
to eliminate from the running of the machine those inequities,
those unsocial and those uneconomic results which so often in
the past have hurt the lives of the public as a whole and the
very safety of private enterprise. That machine can no longer
be run exclusively for the profit of those who own and manage it.

We do not assume for a minute that all we have done is
right or all that we have done has been successful, but our
economic and social program of the past five years and a half
has given to this country a more stable and less artificial
prosperity than any other nation in the world has enjoyed.

Details can and must be changed or improve as we gain experience, but the very fact that the business
slump beginning last fall and running to last summer did not
become a major economic disaster like the slump beginning in
1929, is the best kind of proof that fundamentally we have
found the right track. We have changed enough underlying
theories and practices so that instead of sliding off further
according to the pattern of the 1929 slump, we are now clearly
on the road to prosperity once more. We have met the test of
being able to survive a business depression under the new condi-
tions we have created, and under the new techniques we have de-
veloped for following through the continued responsibility of
government to keep the conveyor belts moving. You have just
heard the news about the automobile factories and many other
industries opening up for full employment again. During the
month of October alone all employment has risen nearly 3\%.

Only last week a prominent business man has written me:
"with abundant signs of an upward trend everywhere evident I
have not, in ten years, been so certain as I am today that we
I have been very happy in the last six months to see how swiftly a large majority of business men have been coming around to accept the objectives of a more stable economy and of certain necessary supervision of private activities in order to prevent a return of the serious abuses and conditions of the past. But if there should be any weakening of the power of a liberal government next Tuesday, it would resurrect illusory hopes on the part of some business men, now beginning to change antiquated ideas that if they can hold out a little longer no adaptation to change will be necessary.

There is no doubt, in this election or any election, of the basic desires of the people. And because these basic desires are known to all, you find all parties, all candidates, making the same general promises to satisfy these desires.

During the weeks before a general election, all parties are the friends of labor, all parties are against monopoly, all parties say that the unemployed must have work or be given government relief.

Let me warn you now, as I warned you two years ago in my address at Syracuse, 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."

When democracy struggles for its very life, they obstruct our efforts to maintain it, even offering proof of their own will to preserve it. They try to stop the only fire engine we have from rushing to the fire because they are sales agents for a different make of engine.

New ideas cannot be administered successfully by men with old ideas, for the first essential of doing a job well is the wish to see the job done at all.

Judge parties and candidates, not merely by what they promise, but by what they have done, by their records in office, by the kind of people they travel with, by the kind of people who finance and promote their campaigns. By their promoters ye shall know them. For before those who throw their money and their power into a political campaign, risk
that money and that power, you may be sure they have calculated
the value of the candidate to them if he gets in.

The continuing vitality of national democracy depends
upon the continuing vitality of local democracy. No national
administration, however much it may represent the genuine
popular will of the people, can in the long run prove enduringly
effective if that administration can be insulated
from the people by state and local political machinery controlled by men indifferent or hostile.

My own State of New York is to choose a Governor. Its population is thirteen million -- greater than that of the entire Nation during the first fifty years of its national existence. Ours is a complex State -- great farming areas, hundreds of small communities, one huge city of seven million people of many races, and many other cities, great and small.

The government of the State of New York requires in its conduct the skill which comes from experience in public affairs.

In 1918 when I was thirty-six years old, I was invited to run for the Governorship. I was then Assistant Secretary of the Navy. I am glad I declined the offer; for, looking back on that time, I do not think that I had had a sufficiently broad experience and knowledge of public affairs to qualify me as governor. Besides, I did not think it quite right to abandon in mid-stream an important public job that I had undertaken.

Governing the State of New York is more than being an Assistant Secretary of the Navy or a district attorney. Its government and its legislation has an intimate effect on the lives of every one of its thirteen million people. The Governor
of this State is called upon to administer eighteen great departments of government and to supervise state institutions that house over one hundred thousand wards of the State. He must be able to understand and handle the vast and intricate problems of agriculture, of State finance and the maintenance of State credit, He is responsible for its widespread system of roads, parks, canals, bridges and schools, designed to meet the present and growing needs of its people. He has to maintain, preserve and improve the great body of social legislation already on the statute books of the State -- unemployment insurance, workman's compensation, social security, help for the needy and underprivileged; and he must see to it that these recent reforms are made to keep pace with the broadening conception of social justice.

Equal protection of the law -- criminal and civil -- for human rights as well as property rights; prosecution of criminals in high financial places as well as low places; the preservation of civil and religious liberties -- all these precious essentials of civilization are entrusted in him.

New York State has ever been in the vanguard in co-operating with the recent efforts of the Federal government to better the lot of the men and women of America. New York
has State laws matching every progressive Federal measure of
the last five years. They were all enacted under the guiding
hand and driving energy of Governor Herbert H. Lehman.

Recruits in the battle for economic democracy are always
welcome irrespective of party; but at a critical moment in
the world's history we cannot take the risk of supplanting
seasoned leaders like Governor Lehman with men, no matter
how sincere, who have yet to win their spurs or prove what
they really know or where they really stand in the fight for
social justice. Those who would sincerely join the struggle
for social justice and economic democracy do not throw stones
at their comrades in arms.

No one can properly minimize the need of active law en-
forcement, whether it be in the great city or in the rural
counties. Certainly Governor Lehman has never minimized it
and has never hesitated to call to his assistance in law en-
forcement, young and vigorous prosecutors, irrespective of
politics. We need more active law enforcement, not only
against the lords of the underworld, but also against the lords
of the underworld.
The fight for social justice and economic democracy has not the allure of a criminal jury trial; it is a long, weary, uphill struggle - and those who give themselves unspARINGLY to it are seldom acclaimed at my lady's tea or at my gentleman's club.

I think I have the right as a resident and voter in the State of New York to urge my fellow citizens and voters, who are interested in preserving good government and American democracy, to vote for Herbert H. Lehman.

And just as a Governor is required to be much more than a good prosecutor, so a United States Senator must be much more than a good lawyer. A Senator should be able to do more than merely vote on whatever bills drift by. He must be able to take the initiative to keep the legislative wheels turning in the right direction. If you were to list some of the newly recognized major responsibilities of government to meet the complexities of modern life -- security in old age, unemployment insurance, protection of the rights of labor, low-cost housing and slum clearance -- you would have a virtual resume of the Acts of the Congress which bear the name of Robert F. Wagner. So often since 1933 has new legislation been described
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as "The Wagner Act" that the phrase has become confusing because there have been so many Wagner Acts. There is not only the Wagner Labor Relations Act; there are the Wagner Social Security Act and the Wagner Housing Act, and although you might feel uncertain as to which particular Act is meant by the phrase, you can feel no uncertainty as to this -- that any one of the Wagner Acts was an Act intended for the benefit of those who need the help and support of government against oppression and intolerable conditions of living. His name stands for courageous and intelligent leadership, constructive statecraft and steadfast devotion to the common man and the cause of civil liberties.

With him I hope the voters of this State will send to the Senate an experienced Member of the House of Representatives -- James M. Mead -- known through many years for his expert knowledge of railroads, aviation and Civil Service, and for his unflagging support of every liberal measure that has come before the Congress.

Look over the rest of the names on the ballot next Tuesday. Pick those who are known for their experience and their liberalism. Pick them for what they have done and not just for what
they say they would do. And may I say one last but important word.

Pick them without regard to race, creed or color. Some of them may have come of the earliest Colonial stock; some of them may have been brought here as children to escape the tyrannies of the Old World. They are all of them American citizens.