

With the election drawing rapidly nearer, the air is being filled with all sorts of charges and counter-charges to the point where it sometimes seems as if the aim of political oratory is to confuse the voter, rather than to shed light on the really important issue which is to be resolved by your vote - and those of all American citizens, on Tuesday next.

To justify myself - before my conscience - I want to depart from the usual procedure, at least this once - and tell you my conception of the role of our Federal Government

In the United States we function under what we call a Democratic system.

Now, to my way of thinking, there are three essential elements of Democracy. These essentials are either lost sight of - or are kicked around to serve a speaker's purpose - during the course of a campaign for public office.

However, under my conception of government, these essential elements must always be foremost in our minds, and our actions as members of a Democratic Government, must always be in conformity with those elements.

Briefly - they are - First, there is a moral law which is inherent in human nature and is unchangeable by whim or desire. This moral law derives from the Divine Creator.

Second - by virtue of this moral law man possesses certain inalienable rights. And Third - The purpose of government is to secure those inherent and inalienable rights.

The founding fathers recognized these principles and inscribed them permanently in the Declaration of Independence. They are fundamental in American Democracy - and a denial of them is but the forerunner of a system of Government based on Totalitarianism..

~~Now~~ A great deal has already been said about Communism. Reminiscent of an earlier ~~day~~ generation, some campaigners seem able to find communists under every bed and behind every bush. They decry every utterance with which

27  
they do not - or will not agree - as emanating from Communists or being fostered by the Party Line. They cry that the only thing important at this hour in our country's history is to save the United States from being over-run by Communism.

But while they do this, they preach a philosophy of Government which furnishes the best means for the development of totalitarianism.

Thomas Jefferson said Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Abraham Lincoln pointed out that ours is a Government of the people, ~~for them~~ by the people and for the people. This was recognition, not formulation, of the fundamental principles upon which true democracy is based. Yet some modern speakers seem determined to sell the idea that citizens exist as servants of the state  $\theta$  rather than as masters of their government.

Some men today seem bent on setting the government off as a separate institution, completely divorced from the people for whom and by whose sufferance it exists.

We hear the idea propounded that government is something set apart. That the citizens of this Democracy owe certain duties to the State - but the ~~State~~ government owes no duties to its citizens.

We are told that ~~the~~ government, which exists only because the people of the Nation decree it shall exist, must not have an intimate interest and concern with the problems of the individual citizens. That it has no duty to ACT to make secure the inalienable rights of its citizens.

We are told - and boldly it is declared - that the duty of Government <sup>e</sup> ~~cases~~ once it has outlined certain broad - mark well that word "Broad" - policies. Thereafter it is the sole responsibility of the citizen whether he survives or perishes.

And what are the broad policies which would be outlined, as advocated by the GOP concept of democracy.

First, of course, there is economic stability. Like sin, everyone is

opposed to violent fluctuations in our National Economy. But after propounding that "Broad Policy" what do they propose the government should do to assure economic stability.

3  
~~should do to provide economic stability?~~

In all seriousness, I implore you to read the record of their campaign speeches and campaign promises and you will find there nothing by way of a concrete proposal which will point the way to the government's duty in this connection.

They do denounce regulations. They denounce every regulation. They recite the number of regulations adopted ~~for~~ over <sup>the last</sup> ten years and cry - "wipe them out!"

Is this your conception of Government. Should Government be a disinterested spectator, or does it have some duties to the citizen?

Consider the regulations ~~now~~ which have existed - and the reason for their promulgation.

Why were the first <sup>of these</sup> adopted by the Democratic Administration which is now painted as the epitome of everything evil in Government. They were adopted because men starved. Because business failed. Because banks closed. because families were destroyed. Because honest men were driven to thievery in order to find bread for hungry children. because the soldiers of the country were discredited. because government itself had failed to function. because men had lost hope in the future of their country, of their fellow men and of themselves.

Your government, beginning in 1932, was ~~now~~ motivated by the belief that Government owes some obligations to its citizens. <sup>recognizing its obligations & ACTE</sup> It produced a feeling of hope <sup>of faith</sup> and banished fear. It produced a Nation of people proud of their country and confident of its future.

Your government, because it did not believe its duties were confined to those of a disinterested spectator - <sup>merely</sup> promulgating ~~merely~~ "broad policies" - took a hand in the struggles of its people - and whipped the worst, the most bitter and most harrowing depression in the history of the world.

Your government, under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, issued

the regulations which were required to accomplish this feat, and in doing so your government acknowledged the fact that every individual citizen has certain inalienable rights and that your government should ACT to protect those rights.

4  
What other "Broad Policies" would they advocate for the type of Government they propose?

In the field of Foreign Affairs - one segment of the Republican Party decries our insistence on truth and justice. This segment of the political wisdom of the GOP demands an ~~attitude~~ end to the firm and patient attitude toward Soviet Russia, the British Empire, toward China and all the Nations of the world. They condemn this policy and talk about a broad middle ground where we ~~xxx~~ could travel safely toward a lasting peace. While another segment of the leadership of the Republican Party condemns the action of an International Tribunal of Justice in demanding the extreme penalty from those international felons who filled Europe's cemeteries with the bodies of America's youth. They say our conception of simple justice is to our everlasting shame and thus they give encouragement to the totalitarian philosophy of Nazism.

Examine, I implore you, all their campaign speeches, all their campaign promises and you will find not one single iota of evidence of an affirmative solution to the intricate problems which now attend the conduct of international relations.

The Secretary of State, on the other hand, does pursue a consistent and positive policy. He is a man of action and his concept of government is one that requires constant forward movement. And his program of patience with firmness - of insistence on truth and justice - has the overwhelming support of the plain people of America.

Have they any other "Broad Policies" their type of government would set forth?

Yes, it is apparently their last - and most important if we can take their campaign speeches as a guide. It is in the field of Labor legislation where once again we have offered to us a broad middle ground.

What has been accomplished in the past fifty years of development in the

5  
~~The~~ trade union movement is ~~not~~ evil, they tell us.

They believe labor should be <sup>allowed</sup> ~~able~~ to strike - but under what circumstances?

They believe labor should be entitled to ask for increased wages to meet increased living costs - but under what circumstances - and in what manner <sup>is</sup> their request to be handled? All this is in the broad middle ground of mystery and, frankly, deception.

It is the picture of ineffective, uninterested Government. It is the attitude of an untouchable super-being which rules from afar, <sup>on</sup> ~~from~~ a lofty plateau, and who wants no interference from the rabble that travel the dirty plains below.

It is the attitude of a do-nothing Government, of a care-nothing government- such as brought on the debacle which brought this proud and mighty land to the verge of out-right rebellion against the high and mighty attitude of the last Republican Administration.

~~For myself, I think it is a man's effort~~

In my book Democracy depends on counting heads - not knocking them together.

In the Republican Party's book, apparently, the only way to preserve the tranquility of the Government is to use the whip on those who dare speak out against the existing order. Flattitudes and promises may sometimes be substituted for the whip - but they are only substitutes <sup>until</sup> ~~and when~~ the time is ripe, ~~then the whip comes into play.~~

The attitude of every speaker representing the Republican Party on the subject of Labor is one of recrimination.

They do not consider that the working man has certain God-given rights which are entitled to protection. They insist that his only rights are those conferred upon him by a benevolent State authority. He has used those rights to better his own economic, ~~and~~ social and political position, therefore, they

6  
must be curtailed or stripped from him entirely.

If they recognize that the average ~~man~~ citizen has inalienable rights under our form of Government - then where is the attempt, or the suggestion, that those rights should be understood. Where is the plea for a new moral conception of the relative positions of Industry and Labor. Where is the sincere attempt, by press or party spokesman, to bring labor and management together. There isn't any. But instead, every suggestion by a Labor Union that the two should get together is immediately branded, from the press and from the party platform, as a scurrilous threat of a strike - and a treasonable act against the welfare of the country.

This attitude I argue is wrong. This conception of Government's relations to its citizens is wrong. The only manner in which the inalienable rights of the individual can be secured to him - is through a Government based on action in the promotion of the Common Good. They cannot be secured through indifference, inaction or disinterest.

For myself, I'll work for a more dynamic government; for a government truly responsive to the needs of its citizens - as the best possible way to prevent the growth of any form of totalitarianism - communist or fascist.