Most of us remember the difficult and dark days of the depression that came after the collapse in 1929. We are conscious of the years of struggle that followed in the wake of the disaster, and of the significance of the election in 1932.

We would perhaps like to pin the full responsibility for those dread days upon a single personality or lay all of the fault at the door of the political party then in power.

If, however, we are completely honest, we must accept the fact that America overextended its private credit, that its banking system was at fault, and that its distributive system was not geared to world conditions.

The real significance of the 1932 election lay in the fact that Mr. Hoover and his Republican Party were fearful of taking the unusual and striking action that was necessary to restore confidence, of rebuilding the psychological climate necessary for a healthy economy, and of doing those things which had never been done before.

Into those darkened hours there came a great crusader of unusual courage. He came with the support of the political party that had not placed a candidate in the White House in more than a decade. He did unusual things. He rebuilt the confidence of the American people in its banks. He instituted a policy of deposit guarantees. He initiated the machinery that began the long tortuous road toward economic recovery.

During the years from 1932 to Pearl Harbor Day, there was no golden blossoming of great economic stability and recovery, but we always had a consciousness of trying. We were working as American people toward the achievement of prosperity.

Not all Americans, not all of the members of his own party, agreed with the policies and formulas adopted by President Roosevelt. This would have been

true regardless of who might have been the president of the United States. It will always be true because we, here in America, have the blessed privilege of freedom of opinion, and the judgment of no man becomes an untouchable conclusion.

Then came the war days. Again we had a president who would do the unusual and who tried, regardless of whether we may pass favorable judgment in retrospect upon his actions, to do those things which would lead to a successful conclusion of our military problems.

One of the unusual things he did was to select a man by the name of Dwight David Eisenhower to become the Supreme Commander of all of the Allied Forces of the Western Theatre of War. He was selected without regard to military rank, for there were others who exceeded his military status. He was selected because a war-time president became convinced that he was the man best qualified to exercise judgment in the making of some of the most momentous decisions made during the twentieth century.

Franklin Roosevelt knew the exacting requirements of the job of Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces. He realized better than anyone else that the task was not alone a military one, but one that called for leadership in the field of world politics as well as military leadership in the field of battle. President Roosevelt knew that the Supreme Commander would have to be a man of tact and diplomacy, yet a man of character and firm convictions. The Supreme Commander would necessarily be dealing with the political and military leaders of Great Britain, Russia, France, and many, many other countries of the world. Even above a military expert, the job called for a man of statue, of character and integrity, who could supply the leadership and world statesmanship to weld into a common bond all of the Allied Forces. For this monumental task, he picked Dwight D. Eisenhower. Surely, the implicit faith which President Roosevelt had in Dwight D. Eisenhower as a man, a soldier, as a great leader, could not have been expressed

in a more eloquent and everlasting way.

Even during those days when the great patriot of England, Winston Churchill, was urging the conquest of the western theatre to proceed through the "soft underbelly of Europe", Franklin Roosevelt declared that the decision should be left to the Supreme Commander. It was Eisenhower, the choice of Franklin Roosevelt, who made perhaps the most important single decision of this generation when he concluded to attack Europe across the English Channel. Riding upon this decision were millions of lives and multiplied millions of dollars. Riding upon this decision was not alone the fate of a nation, but the fate of a world.

The history of that crossing, the history of European conquest is a part of the revered history of the American people. You know it well, There is no occasion for repetition here.

You may well say that if President Roosevelt is to be credited with the selection of Eisenhower to make the great decisions of the Second World War, then he is also to be credited with the selection of Truman as Vice-President of the United States.

The choice of General Eisenhower was a free choice among all of the competent people of the country. The choice of Mr. Truman was a political one, when the other alternative was the retention of Henry Wallace. I have no doubt but that in making the choice between Truman or Wallace, most Americans would agree that the lesser evil was selected.

The selection was also made in the confidence that Mr. Roosevelt would be the president of the United States and that Mr. Truman would be required only to exercise his legislative abilities as the presiding officer of the Senate.

Then came the day of the death of Mr. Roosevelt and into the presidency came a man from Missouri.

He was the creature of the political machine of the Pendergast's. If ever there was a professional politician, he was rightly endowed to wear the label. He came with humbleness, asking the help of his former colleagues, the tolerance of the people, and invoking the blessings of his God. The nation rallied around him believing that here was a man, though unfitted by experience for the task and wearing the mantle of a political gangster, who would nevertheless give courageous leadership to a courageous nation.

Gradually, what had been humbleness was galvanized into egotism. What had once been the spirit of a contrite heart became a spirit of defiance and challenge.

He laid down for his administration one deliberate policy - loyalty to the party of Truman. During the election of 1948, against a Republican candidate, who lacked the courage of clear and sound commitments, and who believed rather that the American people would select him in antagonism to an administration of political corruption and that positive commitments were unnecessary, the man who was then president of the United States made his famous "whistlestop" campaign through America. It was a campaign of ugly words and vilifications, but it was laced through and through with promises and commitments. Here was a commitment to the farmers. Here was a promise to the labor union leaders. Here was talk of economies. Here were the boastings of what prior administrations had done, but for whose achievements he could not in good conscience claim credit, and always there was the deliberate effort to lead the American people to the conclusion that his was a continuation of the administration of Roosevelt. The American people returned him to office, and during the last four years there has been a constant repetition of that sad political philosophy engineered by political racketeers for the conscious achievement of their own political fortune.

Scarcely a week has passed but that there are new discoveries of corruption and distrust in high places. There has been moved into the White House

the Harry Vaughns and others like him. The entangling responsibilities of departments and officials have become so confusing and complex that no one dares to fix responsibility for the making of even great decisions. It has been characterized by actual personal misconduct of a president who makes statements and utters caustic words of cursing criticisms that lowers the dignity of the great office he occupies.

We were told in the enunciation of the four freedoms that we must keep ourselves free from fear, and that there was nothing to be afraid of except fear itself. What has been the Truman Administration except a constant period of fear?

We have fear of the Russians and fear that our own State Department is incompetent to know their planning or to deal with them on an international level. We have fear of an economic system fed by burning fires of war and inflation generated from international fear. We have fear that tomorrow there will be new evidences of fraud and corruption and of trust misplaced. We are afraid that there may be other traitors than Alger Hiss carrying portfolio of America's confidential papers and defended by the President of the United States.

In this atmosphere of fear this man, who became by unfortunate chance the President of the United States, has spent more money than his predecessor, Franklin Roosevelt, in winning a war, and of all of the other presidents of America combined.

We, who were told to avoid the disaster of fear, have permitted a nation to be led perilously close to the brink of economic disaster fighting against a fear that largely stems from lack of confidence in the people who give leadership to America.

Every night we pray for peace. That, we wish more devoutly than anything else. Yet how have we planned to live in a world at peace? How will we

distribute our goods? How can we have international trade? How can we use all of the surplusses of America's great productive machine? How, if no one were afraid of another in the world, could we prevent unemployment of those who are making the materials of war?

These fundamental problems go unanswered. We hear the constant voice of warning and of doom. Listen to what they are saying. If the Republicans come again, you will have a repetition of depression. If the Republicans come again, there is danger of war. If the Republicans come again, America's pressure groups and privileged groups will not have the same privileges. If the Republicans come again, some Americans will lose their political offices. These, and questions like them run constantly in the ears of an American people in an effort to keep them so afraid that they would live with corruption, unwilling to make a change.

Political parties are associations of people. The things that political parties believe in and work for are propositions that are laid down by party leaders. No party, however old and honorable and however great it may have been, can rise above the leadership that is given to it.

Democrats, during the administration of Roosevelt, whether they agreed with him or not, could have the feeling that their party was led by a man of a great heart and of genuine ability. The democrats of today have the privilege of being led by the product of machine politics wearing the disgraceful mantle of the Pendergast.

I sincerely believe that if Franklin Roosevelt could lend a guiding voice to the destiny of his country, he would urge the adoption of the motto "loyalty to America rather than loyalty to the party of Harry Truman". He would be among the first to recognize that the ideals for which he labored as national objectives have been perverted by an administration beyond recognition as national aims.

If Franklin Roosevelt had lived, it might never have been necessary to make the choice we are making now. With a clean and honorable government, with dignity and intelligence directing our national actions, General Eisenhower might well have been the choice of the Democratic Party and he might well have carried their standard with pride. It is common knowledge in America that the leaders of the Democratic Party were exceedingly anxious that General Eisenhower align himself with the Democratic Party in seeking the nomination for the presidency of the United States. He simply took the position that he could not assume the tremendous responsibilities of that office and carry with him to the White House any sense of obligation to the corrupt hierarchy who has assumed the leadership of the Democratic Party.

And so it is today that we are faced with the choice of elevating to the presidency General Eisenhower, selected and made great by Franklin Roosevelt, or by elevating one who has chosen to follow the leadership of a party whose test of greatness is loyalty to Truman and the things for which he stands. Surely, men and women of America, our loyalty to this country, to our posterity, to the obligations we owe the free peoples of the world must lead us to the compelling conclusion that there is no alternative except the choice of General Eisenhower as president. Let no man hold up the standard of a war-time president in an effort to rally support to a Democratic Party that has perverted and disgraced his efforts at national greatness. We are a free people. We are an independent people. We have the inherent right of making decisions which, in our hearts, we know are morally good. To preserve those rights, to exercise them, and to meet our responsibilities, demands another great leader in perilous times.

Roosevelt came to the nation, not to the Democratic Party in 1932. Let us tomorrow bring Dwight David Eisenhower to America, not the Republican Party, for the welfare of a whole nation.