



Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

MS-4787: Abba Hillel Silver Papers, 1902-1989.

Series IV: Sermons, 1914-1963, undated.

Reel
164

Box
59

Folder
879

Some reflections on the present political campaign, 1952.

801

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE PRESENT POLITICAL CAMPAIGN

Part I

October 26, 1952

My dear friends, there are two things which I will not tell you this morning - whom to vote for, and who will be elected. Recently someone called me a poor Rabbi and a worse politician. Well, I am not that poor of a Rabbi to imagine that my congregation will take my advice on the election, and I am not that poor of a politician to go out on a limb where the wisest of pollsters in the past found themselves ignominiously suspended.

There are two things I will tell you this morning - be sure to vote, and be assured that whoever is elected, the world is not coming to an end.

I have been going through my lecture files during the last few days. I keep a stenographic report of all my Sunday morning lectures, and have for the last 35 years. I have always devoted a Sunday morning lecture before a national election to giving observations on the campaign and on the issues. In reading over my lecture of October 26, 1940, on the eve of the Roosevelt-Willkie election, I find the following, and I submit that with the substitution of the names of Stevenson and Eisenhower for Roosevelt and Willkie, this thing could have been said this morning. I declared twelve years ago on October 26, 1940:

There has been considerable bitterness and heat engendered in the political campaign this year. Some of it, of course, is the customary synthetic emotionalism incidental to every national campaign. If one were to listen to all the high-pitched and frenzied voices on the air, in the press and on the platform, one could come to think of the American people today as being confronted with the dread choice of one or two alternatives of disaster. If you vote for Mr. Roosevelt, you vote for disaster. That is the Republican opinion. If you vote for Willkie, you vote for disaster. That is the Democratic opinion. If you vote for Mr. Roosevelt, you vote for a man who has already ruined the United States; if you vote for Mr. Willkie, you vote for a man who will ruin the United States.

Roosevelt and his backers, according to the super-heated political campaign - those who believe in him are Redd and war-mongers. On the other hand, Willkie and his backers are Fascists and appeasers. Partisanship has run riot in this campaign, more than is customary in political campaign. Many people have become exceedingly intolerant, have lost their own sense of proportion and perspective.

People have somehow persuaded themselves in this campaign that there exist vast, colossal and irreconcilable differences between the parties, platforms and candidates, that no campaign in the last 50 or 75 or 100 years has been so critical and so momentous. They have somehow talked themselves into, or permitted others to talk them into believing that American destiny is at stake, that the American way of life is in the balance.

Permit me to say, friends, in all modesty and in all reverence, all this is "shtuss" and nonsense. It is either pure political auto-intoxication or the resultant frenzy of clever and calculated propaganda. I don't know of any campaign in recent years in which there was less involved of decisive significance between the two major parties than this one. I don't recall a campaign where there has been more agreement on major issues, and great similarity as to program and platform as in this campaign. I would like to get excited about this campaign, but I don't know how and I don't know what about.

And I concluded that part of the address by saying,

I am inclined to believe, good friends, that an outsider who is not acquainted with American political tradition, on listening to the statements and speeches of the candidates and the spokesmen of the parties, would come to the conclusion that both President Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie would make excellent running-mates on the same ticket.

I suspect that it is due largely to the fact that there is so little essential difference between the platforms or the programs of the two parties in the present campaign that so much emphasis is being put on what, in my judgment, are the unessential and the matters which are immaterial and only distantly related to basic issues. It is well known that people who are far apart seldom hate one another and fight one another as viciously as close neighbors. Proximity breeds contempt and badmanners, also in political parties.

I suspect, too, that a good bit of the acrimony and bitterness of this campaign and of other campaigns are due to the length and the duration of the campaign. The tone lowers perceptibly as the campaign drags on. The candidates simply run out of arguments. How many issues are there, after all, in a campaign, and once you have

stated them to the American people over the radio and television, in a week or in ten days, you have said it all. And then you have to resort, if the campaign lasts very long, either to repetition, which is not news-worthy or interesting,^{or}/you have to resort to sensational charges which will attract attention, which, of course, are met by counter-charges on the part of the opposition. And you have to resort to high-voltage invectives on which no party has any monopoly. You begin to pour it on, as the saying goes, and by the time the mud-slinging is over, I am sure that the candidates would not be recognized by their own mothers. It's a sorry spectacle. Just compare the early utterances, the early speeches of Governor Stevenson and General Eisenhower. Their dignity, their calmness, their high quality, their impersonal, objective discussion of basic issues - compare the speeches of these same two people with those in recent days, and you will know exactly what I mean. They have become hot and unrestrained.

And then, too, these candidates are being subjected by these long campaigns to terrific physical punishment - 10, 15, 20 speeches a day - for weeks on end, day and night. The English system is far better. Three weeks and then it's "fartig" - it's over. After three weeks the candidates and the nation - everybody needs a nerve rest.

I personally had occasion last week innocently to become involved in one of these sensational charges directed against one of the candidates, charged in the heat of electioneering - a charge by no less a person than the President of the United States - and I came within the direct line of fire. I had been helpful in getting a favorable plank on Israel introduced in Chicago last July in the Republican platform. Having had a hand in the establishment of the State of Israel, I had been, of course, very eager, as far as I can, to insure its future - at least as far as the attitude of the American government is concerned. And I wrote a letter

about two weeks ago to the Republican candidate, calling his attention to this plank and suggesting that he has not had an opportunity as yet, in a public utterance, to define his own position on the subject and would he do so. Many of his friends would like to hear him on the subject. The reply came to me from his headquarters that General Eisenhower would like to see me; he would like to discuss this matter with me more fully; and that he would issue, at the time that we meet, a formal statement on the subject, his attitude towards Israel. And the date was set for a week ago last Saturday and we met and we had a very interesting conversation on the subject, a rather lengthy one, in which we explored the many problems which face the State of Israel, and the position of the State of Israel in the Middle East, and the interest of the United States Government and the American people in the future of the State of Israel. It was, I believe, a very helpful as it was a very pleasant conversation.

In the course of the conversation, General Eisenhower complained bitterly about the charges which were made just the day before by Mr. Truman, which charges by implication, implied that he was favorable to the master race, Nazi-Hitler doctrine, charges which I read in the paper the very morning that I arrived in the city of New York. We parted, and as I left his home in Morningside Heights, there awaited me on the steps quite naturally a group of newspaper men who began to ask me questions about our interview. Was I going to vote for General Eisenhower, was one of the questions. I told them that even the General did not ask me that question. Well, didn't I attend the Republican Convention and pray there? I said yes, and if the Democrats had invited me to pray for them, I would have prayed for them, too, because they need prayer quite as much as the Republicans. And one other question was, did I read what the President had to say about General Eisenhower with reference to the master race charges, and were these discussed with the General. I said yes, I had read them and they were discussed. What did I think about them? I said I was

shocked. I said there were many things permitted in a campaign, but there are certain things which are not permissible. And, of course, it was this statement that broke into the public press with such a crash that the letters, the exchange of letters which was the purpose of my mission to General Eisenhower were, to a large extent, overlooked. Fortunately, these letters have since been given rather extensive coverage. They have appeared in the Anglo-Jewish press in full here in Cleveland. I have also had these letters reprinted in The Temple Bulletin. I should like you to read General Eisenhower's letter.

Within the last few days a statement on Israel has also been issued by Governor Stevenson, a good statement, and at the request of the press, I have issued a statement praising both General Eisenhower and Governor Stevenson for their favorable attitude on Israel.

Some people got the impression that I rushed to New York or was rushed there for the sole purpose of criticizing President Truman. Strange things do happen to a man. I remember the story that was told of a Rabbi who was walking innocently down the street and he was accosted by a vulgar Tsarist officer who demanded of him where he was going. The Rabbi said, "I don't know," and the officer took that to be insolence, an insolent remark, and he pummeled the poor Rabbi and had him thrown into jail, and as the turnkey was closing the door on the Rabbi in jail, the Rabbi said, "I don't know what this is all about. I told the truth. I told the officer I didn't know where I was going. I thought I was going to the synagogue. I actually ended up in jail."

But, of course, I would have said what I did say if I were not in New York, but in Cleveland, because that attack was unwarranted and dangerous. It was not at all politically motivated. I have frequently praised President Truman from this very pulpit. Some of you may recall that last May I delivered an address on the book, "Mr. President" which had just then appeared, in the course of which I said,

In stepping out of office (for this book, I suspect, is in the nature of a valedictory), Mr. Truman would like to carry away with him the affection of his fellow citizens, of his fellowmen. And I believe that to a large extent he succeeds; whether one agrees with his politics or not, whether one believes that he has carried out successfully any or all of the things which he has attempted to do, one leaves the book with the feeling that here is a man who cannot be hated, here is a man who has many fine, laudable qualities. Mr. Truman is not a man of great personal charm, like his distinguished predecessor in office, but the very simplicity of the man, his uncomplicated nature, his modesty, his lack of pretense - the homespun quality of his shrewd and sentimental Americanism - these make their own appeal and they make a very strong appeal.

Mr. Truman emerges from this book a man that you might call, in the American tradition, religious, devoted to his family, loyal to his friends, self-educated, self-reliant and very humane.

I recall, too, that last year, when President Truman recalled General McArthur and the whole country seemed to be down on him for that action, I spoke from this very pulpit in praise of President Truman, for his courageous action, what I thought of General McArthur in seeming to dictate policy, had stepped out of his role as a General and was endangering the free institutions of American life. And I got in touch with a dear friend of mine in Washington, the majority leader of the House, and asked him that if he had an opportunity within the next day or so to speak to the President, to tell the President that I heartily approved of his action. The next morning I received a telegram from Congressman McCormick in which he stated: "I gave the President your message this morning which pleased him very much. The President asked me to extend to you his deep thanks. He was profoundly touched."

And I have praised him on his stand on civil rights, and of course, on his stand on Israel. But I always felt free, as every free American citizen should, to criticize him or anyone else in office, on acts or policies of which I do not approve, and I have from time to time criticized his foreign policy.

President Truman is unfortunately unrestrained in his speeches in the last few weeks, and when in his message to the Jewish Welfare Board meeting in Washington, he accused General Eisenhower, whose humanity and tolerance were known throughout the world, of accepting the very practices that identify the so-called master race, I

felt the same shock which every fair-minded American must have felt, and I said so, and I said that such utterances are not permissible, that the grounds upon which President Truman based his charges, to use his own words, are the following:

Among those who voted for the McCarran Bill and to override my veto, was the Republican candidate for Vice-President. Among the other Republicans were Senators Jenner and McCarthy, together with ex-Senator Chapman Revercomb, the champion of the anti-Catholic, anti-Jewish provisions of the original D.P. Bill, these men have been embraced by the Republican candidate for President.

The Republican candidate for the Presidency cannot escape responsibility for his endorsement. He has had an attack of moral blindness, for today, he is willing to accept the very practices that identified the so-called master race, although he took a leading part in liberating Europe from their domination.

Now, if endorsement of men who voted for the McCarran Bill and to override the President's veto of the Bill is sufficient to denounce and to repudiate candidates for any office or to brand them as anti-Jewish and anti-Catholic, then the President of the United States and the Democratic candidate for President, Governor Stevenson, should repudiate most of the leadership of the Democratic Party in the House and in the Senate. Because the McCarran was sponsored, was fathered by two Democrats, Senator McCarran of Nevada and Congressman Walter of Pennsylvania, party lines were broken in passing that measure and to override the President's veto, 25 Democrats in the Senate of the United States voted in favor of overriding the President's veto, and only 18 Democratic Senators voted to sustain the President.

The New York Times, which vigorously fought the McCarran Bill, had this to say a few days ago in an editorial which is very important to bear in mind:

We ourselves, on this newspaper, vigorously opposed the McCarran bill, described it as a vicious measure and fought it step by step at every juncture of its way through Congress. We cannot fail to note, however, that among those voting to override Mr. Truman's veto of the McCarran bill were not only some of the Republican candidates now endorsed by General Eisenhower, but also some of the leading lights of the Democratic party.

Voting to override the veto was Senator Connally Texas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee; Senator George of Georgia, Chairman of the Finance Committee; Senator Johnson of Colorado, Chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce;

Senator McKellar of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations; Senator Hayden of Arizona, Chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration; Senator Johnston of South Carolina, Chairman of the Committee on Civil Service; Senator McClellan of Arkansas, Chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; Senator Maybank of South Carolina, Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency; Senator Ellender of Louisiana, Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; Senator McCarran himself, Chairman of the powerful Committee on the Judiciary. Here is practically the whole Democratic hierarchy in control of the Senate's business. Is Mr. Truman now ready to charge these gentlemen with "accepting the very practices that identified the so-called 'master race'?"

Let us come down to cases still more concretely. Speaking at Havre, Montana, on September 30th, Mr. Truman specifically gave his endorsement to Representative Mansfield of that state for election to the Senate, saying of him that "Mike Mansfield is a credit to Montana and to the United States. He has a record to be proud of. . . . He has represented the United States before the whole world." Would anyone guess from this ringing endorsement that Mr. Mansfield, too, had voted to override Mr. Truman's veto of the McCarran bill?

I want to say a word about this issue. Not repudiating a candidate who is on your ticket does not mean that you subscribe to all his views. If we bear in mind that ours is a two-party system of government, then many of our strictures lose their point. Unless we favor fragmentizing our political life into numerous splinter parties which practices brought into disrepute democratic ^{governments} ~~practices~~ in many countries of frequently defeated democracy - unless we are ready to have in these United States a large number of little parties so that we could find among these numerous parties just the party, lily-white, and just the candidates of whom we can completely - and of all of them - approve, then we must accept as inevitable that in neither of the two major political parties, there will be candidates of whom we cannot approve and office-holders of whom we cannot approve. These two major parties represent so many sections of our country, of necessity - so many interests, and in a sense, so many points of view. And the standard-bearer of each party, whether it be the Republican or the Democratic - it makes no difference - cannot be summoned

in a pre-election campaign to screen all the candidates, to purge them, to pass judgment on them. He has been called to be the standard-bearer of his party, to lead his party to victory, and not to disrupt it.

Now, it is unfortunate - or fortunate, as you wish to look upon it - that the situation in our country is as it is - a two-party system of government. But once you assume that a two-party system of government is desirable, then you have to reconcile yourself to certain absences and certain undesirable things. The independent citizen is, of course, free to split his party ticket if he wishes to, and to refuse to vote for candidates of whom he does not approve.

There are reactionaries, for example, in both political parties - Democratic and Republican. The Southern Democrats have filibustered effectively and blocked every major civil rights measure in Congress; compulsory FEPC was defeated in the House by 240 to 177, and among these 240 were 115 Democrats. And in the Senate, when the same issue was voted upon indirectly on a motion to impose cloture, 26 Democratic Senators joined with 6 Republican Senators to make sure that there was no two-thirds vote to impose cloture.

I am certain that there are anti-Negro, anti-Catholic, anti-Jewish, anti-labor men in both parties. There is very little to choose, was very little to choose between Congressman Rankin, Democrat, and Congressman Hoffman, Republican, between Senator Bilbo or Senator Jenner - and if I may be as bold as to say, there is very little to choose between the Vice-Presidential candidate Sparkman, and the Vice-Presidential candidate Nixon. Senator Sparkman voted against the law to outlaw ~~lynching~~ lynching; he voted against the law to abolish the poll tax; he voted against the law to prevent segregation in the armed forces; and he stated, "I am against the civil rights proposals, always have been and always will be." And as far as the Republican candidate for Vice-President is concerned, Senator Nixon, he voted for the McCarran law; he voted for other reactionary measures in the Senate; and I am afraid that his defense of his privately-subscribed expense fund left much to be desired.

No, it is not and never can be the case of all white or all black among the two parties. And no candidate on the eve of an election can be expected to separate the sheep from the goats in his full party. The important question before the voter to decide is whether these individuals or elements in this party or that party are so numerous and so powerful as to dominate the policies of that party, if elected, and whether the candidate for the President is sufficiently independent and sufficiently strong and dependable to resist such individuals and elements and not to permit them to have sway and domination in government. And on this score I think the American people have reason to congratulate themselves on both candidates for the Presidency for they are men of character and independence and leadership. If elected, each will lead his party - no doubt about it. They did not seek the office; both of them were sought out. And it is silly to speak of Governor Stevenson or General Eisenhower as being the captive candidate of his party, and it is equally silly when the candidates themselves hurl the same charges at one another because they know better. Both men are men of resolution and men of great patriotism.

Just look back a few months. Our country was very glad and hailed with satisfaction the nomination of both of these candidates. It is only the furious partisanship which developed during the campaign which has obscured this very sound, first and glad reaction of the American people. And it is high time that we recapture that confidence and that pride in both of these candidates. Both men have high qualifications for the office.

→ ^{Gallen} ~~Governor Stevenson has made an~~ ^{was the} eminently successful Governor of a great state. X
^{Rob} He has practical experience in government. He comes from a distinguished background, a line of ancestors who have served their country ^{in important positions} with distinction. He served competently in Federal government as Special Assistant to ^{the President} Navy Secretary ~~Knox~~, as Special Assistant to two Secretaries of State, and ~~he~~ was a member of the United States delegation to San Francisco where the charter of the United Nations was drafted.

Adlai
Governor Stevenson is a man of culture, possessed of a fine intellect, with a rare gift of public utterance, with ~~an~~ fine endowment of courage and a lilt of good humor.

Pres
~~General~~ Eisenhower will be numbered among the greatest military leaders not alone of our generation. He organized the victory of the free world against the dark forces of Nazism and Fascism. He gave evidence of rare qualities of statesmanship in organizing the free nations for collective security, bringing them together and reconciling their differences in NATO and in SHAPE and at a time when our country had assumed military and political leadership in the world, General Eisenhower, if elected, would bring to the office of President, a rare equipment for diplomatic and military leadership. He is a man of tact and of wisdom and of courage in face of making the gravest decisions that any human being has ever been called upon to make.

So that, my good friends, which ever man is finally chosen, the rudder of the ship of state will be in strong and competent hands. X

I indicated earlier that the position of the candidates and the platforms on most of the issues confronting our people today are not far apart. That is why so many Americans find it difficult to make up their minds for whom to vote. On domestic issues, for example, take the much, in my judgment, overworked Taft-Hartly law issue. President Truman still talks about that measure as a slave labor law. Governor Stevenson, however, in his Detroit speech of September 1st, declared: "I don't say that everything in the Taft-Hartley Act is wrong. It isn't. And moreover, I'll say frankly that I don't think it's a slave-labor law either." Governor Stevenson believes that we can best remedy the defects in the old law by scrapping it and starting out afresh.

General Eisenhower is also for removing certain defects in the law, as is the framer of the law himself, Senator Taft. Now, whether the law should be amended or modified or be completely rewritten - the difference is not so vast or irreconcilable that we need to whip ourselves into a lather over it. I believe that Governor Stevenson

himself realizes that the chances for revising and modifying the law in place of re-writing it completely are greater even if the Democrats win in November.

Take the matter of corruption in government, a grave and menacing phenomenon, not unique in our history, but one of ominous proportions, of increasing unfortunate frequency in recent years. Governor Stevenson is not unaware of the problem. He has referred to the need of cleaning up the mess in Washington. Knowing, of course, of the vulnerability of his party on this issue in the election, he has had to dwell softly and lightly on this in the campaign. But I am sure that once he is elected, if he is elected, he will proceed most zealously to try to set the American house in order.

Now, the question which the American voter will have to decide next Tuesday, a week from Tuesday, is whether in his judgment the Democratic party during whose term of office these great corruptions have developed in a period of years, will be able with a new Chief Executive to do the job called for or whether a new party with a new Chief Executive, coming fresh into office, eager to make a record for itself and unencumbered by entrenched party interests and loyalties and indebtedness and personalities, will be able to do a more thorough job. Both candidates agree that a change in the moral climate of Washington is called for. The American voter will decide how much of a change he wants, and who he believes will do the job more thoroughly.

And on most other domestic issues there is substantial agreement. The Democrats are in favor of tax cutting as rapidly as defense requirements permit. The Republicans favor tax cuts and claim that elimination of waste and extravagance in government and larger sharing of costs for their own defense on the part of our allies will make such a cut possible and at an early date.

The Democrats favor more generous social security, measures for the aged, the indigent, the veterans, the unemployed, and so do the Republicans

The Democrats favor price support for the farmer at not less than 90% of parity; the Republicans say that parity prices for all forms of products and full parity prices.

Both parties favor support of farm cooperatives and support for small business.

There are certain differences, of course. The Democrats are in favor of workable price and rent controls, as a means of combating inflation. The Republicans call for an end of injurious price and wage controls. They are in favor only of federal rent control in areas where the expansion of defense production has created critical housing shortages.

The Republicans favor state ownership of tidelands oil. The Democrats are opposed to it.

The Democrats favor more federal projects like the TVA. The Republicans favor greater local participation in the operation and control and the eventual local ownership of such projects.

Now, I believe that it is fair to state that the differences which exist reflect the traditional and quite legitimate tug of war, not so much between reaction on the one hand and radicalism on the other, but between what you might call economic conservatism on the one hand, and economic liberalism on the other hand, and all truths or injustices are not exclusively the right of one side or another. But 22,000,000 Americans who voted the Republican ticket in 1948 are not all millionaires or Wall Street brokers or economic royalists or reactionaries. And the 24,000,000 American citizens who voted the Democratic ticket in 1948 are not all radicals and Socialists. They all want a better life for themselves and their families and their children; they all want greater security; they all favor progress. It is largely a question of

tempo. One half of the American people approximately favor a slower tempo, a lesser adventuresome tempo. They want to make progress without haste, a haste which in their mind might mean danger to our hardwon liberties, a haste which might be paid for dearly by the sacrifice of ultimate freedoms in terms of too great domination of government, in terms of too great over-centralization of authority in a bureaucracy. The other half of the American people feel that this is unjustified. They would like to move forward rapidly, more confidently. Business, industry, capital - the upper levels of the middle classes, the white collar classes, the professional classes, large sections of the farming population would naturally fall in the Republican fold. Labor, the lower levels of the middle classes, minority groups, considerable sections of the farming population and the white collar class, of course, the South - not so much for economic reasons/^{but}for historic reasons - are largely to be found in the Democratic party. These same differences still exist in 1952 and each voter, on the basis of his legitimate self-interest, will decide where he belongs, and where he belongs is a legitimate American section of the population.

I am afraid that my time is running out. There is so much more that I want to speak of. It is 12 o'clock. We still have a Sunday before election and while I announced as my subject for next Sunday, "The Spiritual Destiny of America", I shall reserve what I have to say on the issues of Communism and Korea, which in my judgment, are fundamental issues in this campaign, for my address next Sunday morning.

1/ 2 things - whom - poor Rabbi -

2 things - Be sure to vote - Be assured -

2/ Lecture files - stenographic - 35 yrs - Always devoted

On Oct. 26-1940 - eve of election in Roosevelt-Wheelie. - I find the
following - I submit - substitutions - could be deleted

Read

3/ I suspect - due largely - so little essential diff. - so much emphasis - unessential - unimportant matters

- People who are far apart never hate - fight - neighbors.

- Proximity breeds contempt & bad manners - also in pol. parties.

4/ I suspect, too, length acronym - Tone lowers as campaign

drops in - Run out of arguments - Scratch How many
issues, after all - Once you have stated them - Radio - Week

or 10 days - you are through;

Resort either to repetition - not news-worthy or interesting

or - sensational charges - met by counter-charges -

- invections - monopoly - "pour it on" - their own mothers;

Sorry spectacle - Compare the early hot, unvarnished

⑤ Physical punishment - 10-15-20 strokes - across continent

day after day - The English system is better - after 3;

5/ I had reason last week - innocently involved - in one-sensational

charges forced in heat - no less a person - came with us -
direct him & fire;

Had been helpful - Plan C; Having had hands - safe to interfere

its future at least as far as W.S.

Write letter - 2 wks ago - Reply to Jones - like to see me - discuss

Letter - Date set - we met - met me at door - took pictures
45 m. (Borah) - helpful. In course of conversation: (unhappy)
Charges - read in paper that morning. (Parked) (as I left)
~~At the~~ For 5:15.2 (Pray) (shocked) - "much is permitted..."
(a) It was this (bowl shell) (Letter - read it) (Stevens on)
(b) Some people got the impression - (wished) - just to
criticize Truman
(c) Strange things sometimes happen to a man - (Rebbi)

6. But, of course, I would have - Cleveland - unwarranted dangers
and pol. motivated.

(1) "Mr. President" (Just) (2) Much then - whole country down -
(this fulfil) - got in touch - dear friend, (appears most)
(Telegrams) "I gave the President your message this morning
which pleased him very much. The President asked me to extend
to you his deep thanks. He was profoundly touched"
(3) His stand on Civil Rights (4) Israel.

(a) Always felt free - to criticize - foreign policy
(b) Has unfortunately been (unrestrained) - (and when) (message)
(J. W. B.) he accused Gen. E. G. "accepting the very practices
that identify the so-called 'master race' (i.e. Nazi - Hitler
doctrines & practices) - I felt the same shock - and I said so!
- (not) (permissible)

(c) (The grounds) upon - based (Just)
If the endorsement of men who voted for McCarran Bill
sufficient to determine & rehydrate - brand them (anti-f)
& anti-father - Mostly the leadership of Sen. Paul is there
and Senate.

(a) The Caneen Bill (which, by way Ers. denounced) - when he declared. (3)

"We must strike from our statute books any legislation concerning
immigration that implies the blasphemy against democracy that
only certain groups of Europeans are welcome as Am. share"

- was fathered by democrats - The Caneen - Canada; Walter, 69
Party-line broken to pass it. To over-ride veto 25-18

(Just "N.Y. Times")

7/. Not repudiating a candidate - subscribes to all his views
If we have in mind. 2 party-system - structures lose point.

Unless we form fragments - splinters disrupts me
must accept as inevitable that both parties representing

So many - will have some candidates - officials, workers
whose views ~~and~~ conduct are not acceptable to us

The standard-bearer of either party - summed - cannot really
be called upon to screen - purge pass judgement
- disrupt.

The ind. citizen is free to split his ticket - + vote against

(a) There are reactions in both parties!

Southern democrats filibustered effectively + blocked every
major Civil Rights measure in Congress

Compulsory FEPC - defeated in House 240 to 177. The 240 incl. 115 dem

Senate - impose closure - 26 dem. joined 6 Repub

(b) I am certain - anti-hegemony - Little to choose - Jenner
- V.P. Sparkman - Law to outlaw lynching - full-tax - Segregation
in armed forces : "I am against the civil rights proposals"

always have been - and always will be" — and
V.P. candidate Nixon - the American law - other necessary
measures - and other defense of his privately submitted expense
found left much to be desired.

(c) No, it is not + never can be the case of white White - Black -
- no candidate on issue - can be expected to separate themselves
- Important Justice which every voter - there incl. members
sufficiently strong - and Candidate - not to find them

8) On this score - Am. people - congratulate - (Both) - character
independence & leadership; If elected, each will lead his party/
(Did not seek) - (Sought out) - (Silly) - (captain) -

Both are men of resolution will - & patriotism.

(9) The country was glad - former partizanship (banned)
first, sound & good nature - High time that we recognize
it.

(10) Both men have high regard for the free -

(a) Gen. St - eminently successful serv. of a great state
Has practical exp. in Govt. - Comes from a line -
Served competently & bravely in Fed. Govt - as Special Asst
to Harry Lee Knox; Spec. Asst. to 2 King of State -
As member, U.S. delegation to San. Francisco
He is blessed with a fine intellect, with a new gift of address
An endorsement of courage and a bit of good humor

(b) Gen. E.S. - will be remembered - greatest military leader - Organized
Victory - Rare Statesmanship in org. free nations - NATO
At a time when our country - leadership new equipment - SHAPE
for diplomatic & military tasks - Tact - wisdom - Caution - no hesitation
- to take decision

16

At the matter of corruption in govt a crime &
one racing ~~phenomenon~~ ~~in our federal govt~~ - but
✓ tragic in our history - but ^{one} of our major problems
and increasing frequently in recent years.

Gov. St. is not unaware of the problem. He has referred to the need of 'cleaning up the mess in Washington'.

Knowing the vulnerability of his party in this race in the election - he has had to dwell lightly on the subject. I am sure, however, that, once elected, he would proceed most zealously to try to set his house in order.

order. The question which the Amer. voter will have to decide ~~rests~~ on Nov. 4th - whether, in his judgment, the ~~democ. party~~ ^{democ. party} ~~is~~ ^{deserves} whose turn of office, this same corruptly developed, but he able, even with a new chief Executive, to do the job as thoroughly ^{and as mechanically} ~~as~~ a new party coming in fresh with ^{new} ~~fresh~~ vigor, and eager to make a record for itself, not encumbered by ~~any~~ ^{entrenched} party loyalties and indebtedness and precedents. A change is ~~clearly~~ ^{clearly} ~~indicated~~ ^{indicated} Both ~~parties~~ ^{candidates} agree that a change in the moral climate / Wash. is called for. The Amer. voter will decide how much of a change - he wants - and who, he believes, will do ~~so~~ ^{the} new though hard-drawing job.

16/ On ~~all~~ ^{most} other domestic issues - ~~however~~ there is substantial agreement.

The Dem. are in favor of Tax cuts - as rapidly as other governments permit. The Repub. favor Tax cuts and claim that elimination, waste in ~~govt.~~ ^{govt.} would make this possible and larger sharing of costs on the part of their own defense on the part of an allies would make this possible.

The Dem. favor more generous social security measures for the aged, the independent, the Veterans, the unemployed. So do the Republicans.

The Dem. - Farmers - favor price support at not less than 90% of parity.

Republicans - free fairly prices for all farm products

Both ~~both~~ ^{and} favor price supports for balance production support for small business.

There are certain differences of course.

① The Dem. are in favor of available prices as a means of controlling supply and demand in the market. Call for an end of "in justice prices and way control"

but are in favor of federal rent control in areas where the expansion of defense production has created critical housing shortage.

② The Republican favor state-ownership of side lands oil.

The Dem. are opposed.

③ The Dem. favor more federal projects like the Tenn. Valley Authority.

The Repub. favor greater local participation in the regulation and control of essential local resources of and other projects.

Excerpt from address of Dr. Abba Hillel Silver - Sunday, May 18, 1952 - MR. PRESIDENT

. . . In stepping out of office (for this book, I suspect, is in the nature of a valedictory) ~~in stepping out of office~~, he would like to carry away with him the affection of his fellow citizens, of his fellowmen.

And I believe that to a large extent he succeeds, whether one agrees with his politics or not, whether one believes that he has carried out successfully any or all of the things which he has attempted to do, one leaves the book with a feeling that here is a man who cannot be hated, here is a man that has many fine, laudable qualities. Mr. Truman is not a man of great personal charm, like his distinguished predecessor in office, but the very simplicity of the man, his uncomplicated nature, his modesty, lack of ^{trappings} ~~presentations~~ - the homespun quality of his shrewd and sentimental Americanism, ^{These} make their own appeal and they make a very strong appeal.

Mr. Truman emerges from this book a man what you might call, in the American tradition - religious, devoted to his family, loyal to his friends, self-educated, self-reliant and very humane.

✓ There has been considerable bitterness and heat engendered in the political campaign this year. Some of it, of course, is the customary synthetic emotionalism incidental to every national campaign. ^{5/10/40} Some of it, however, is unusual. (I suppose that is due to the tension and stress of war abroad, the war preparation at home, and the sudden speeding up of our defense work. Conscription has much to do with putting the nerves, so to speak, of the American people somewhat on edge. I believe too that the various nationality groups in the country who were vigorously approving of the president's foreign policy affecting their original homeland, or vigorously disapproving of it - that has something to do with the passions which are aroused. Then, too, there have been certain permanent disgruntled individuals who have personal axes to grind, former friends of the administration, and now its bitterest enemies, who have contributed to what might be called the verbal blitzkrieg - of the type of Hugh Johnson, Al Smith, Raymond Moley and John L. Lewis.)

✓ If one were to listen to all the high pitched and frenzied voices on the air, in the press and on the platform, one could come to think of the American people today as being confronted with the dread choice of one or two alternatives of disaster. If you vote for Mr. Roosevelt, you vote for disaster. That is the Republican opinion. If you vote for Willkie, you vote for disaster. That is Democratic opinion. If you vote for Mr. Roosevelt, you vote for a man who has already ruined the United States - that is the Republican version. If you vote for Mr. Willkie, you vote for a man who will ruin the United States - that is the Democratic version. Roosevelt and his backers, according to the super-heated political campaign - those who believe in him are Reds and war-mongers. On the other hand, Willkie and his backers are Fascists and appeasers. Partizanship has run riot in this campaign, more than is customary in political campaigns. Many people have become exceedingly intolerant, have lost their own sense of proportion and perspective. (That, my good friends, is not wholesome in times such as these. Clear thinking and deliberate sound judgment are more necessary than at

any time before. And it is not a pleasant spectacle for friends of democracy to witness. I am afraid that the American press has not contributed much to moderation, temperateness, in the discussion of the political issues of the day. That holds true of course of our Cleveland newspapers as well.)

✓ People have somehow persuaded themselves ~~that the issues~~ in this campaign ~~are of important moment~~, that there exist vast, colossal and irreconcilable differences between [&] parties, platforms and candidates, that no campaign in the last fifty or seventy-five years or a hundred years has been so critical and so momentous. They have somehow talked themselves into, or permitted others to talk them into believing that American destiny is at stake, that the American way of life is in the balance.

✓ Permit me to say, friends, in all modesty and in all reverence, that all this is "shtuss" and nonsense. It is either pure political auto-intoxication or the resultant frenzy of clever and calculated propaganda. I don't know of any campaign in recent years in which there was less involved of decisive significance between the two major parties than this one. I can't recall a campaign where there has been more agreement on major issues, and greater similarity as to program and platform as in this campaign. I would like to get excited about this campaign, but I don't know how, and I don't know what about.

Both parties and platforms and candidates are in substantial agreement with reference to American foreign policy. (Both believe in maximum aid to the Allies. Both have approved of the exchange of destroyers for the leasing of naval bases. Both are opposed to appeasement. Both believe in keeping America out of war if possible. Both are opposed to the sending of American soldiers across the sea to fight in foreign wars. Both parties, both platforms, both candidates are for maximum national defense. Both want America to be armed fully on land, on sea, and in the air. Both favored conscription.)

As far as domestic issues are concerned, I don't recall a campaign where there was less difference on domestic issues than in this campaign. (The Republican candidate has accepted and has approved many of the measures of the so called "New Deal" of the last administration, though he condemned, for some unaccountable reason, the New Deal program in toto, while approving of many of the measures. He has pledged his party to continue all the social and labor advances which have been made in recent years. He feels, of course, that he can do it better, more economically. But there has been no oppositional program announced to excite the people, no threat to dismantle the New Deal, or the gains which have been made, or have been proved valuable and serviceable by other American people. No contradictory political philosophy has been announced.)

What, then, is all the excitement about? I am inclined to believe, good friends, that an outsider who is not acquainted with American political tradition, on listening to ~~statements~~^{the} statements and speeches of ~~the~~^{the} candidates and spokesmen of parties, would come to the conclusion that both President Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie would make excellent running-mates on the same ticket.

Of course, there are varying nuances. Of course there are unequal emphases, accents, stresses. Naturally! But in most cases, I must confess that the distinctions which have been made are distinctions without differences. ^{STW} Thus, for example, while both candidates and parties are opposed to war and in favor of maximum aid to the allies, Republican spokesmen, including Mr. Willkie, have criticized the President of the United States for having been too provocative in his attitude toward the dictators, or too eager to oppose them, and they maintain that this is courting war. At the same time, and in the same breath, they charge him with being a collaborator, as it were, in the Munich appeasement arrangement. That is being too anxious for peace. The fact of the matter is, my dear friends, that the President's denunciations of the dictators will have nothing to do with the ultimate fact of whether we will have peace or war.

here.

'Exact Word' Cited

The president cited the "exact words" he used in the message, which said:

"Among those who voted for the McCarran bill and to override my veto, was the Republican candidate for Vice President.

"Among the other Republicans were Senators Jenner and McCarthy, together with ex-Senator [Chapman] Revercomb [Republican of West Virginia], the champion of the anti-Catholic, anti-Jewish provisions of the original D. P. Bill, these men have been embraced by the Republican candidate for President.

"The Republican candidate for the Presidency cannot escape responsibility for his endorsement. He has had an attack of moral blindness, for today, he is willing to accept the very practices that identified the so-called 'master race' although he took a leading part in liberating Europe from their domination."

The President's statement today continued:

"If the Republican candidate sees fit to endorse such well-known supporters of discriminatory legislation, 'if he is willing to campaign on a platform that is utterly silent on the subject of amending that legislation; and if he wants people to take seriously his belated acknowledgment, just the other day, that the McCarran Act needs radical amendments; he must then explain to the public whether he accepts the practices of the men he supports or whether, by some political disclaimers, he disassociates himself from such practices.

"The practices of those Senators—the practices of the big lie and of character assassination—are identified with the so-called 'master race' theory and no amount of distortion can change that fact. I know that the Republican candidate for President is neither anti-Jewish nor anti-Catholic, but why does he give his endorsement to such men?"

The President stepped in as such prominent figures as Bernard M. Baruch and Dr. Abba Hillel Silver

Continued on Page 22, Column 5

GOODY'S World's largest record dealer. All long playing records, always 30% off. Sam Goody, 235 West 49th St.—Adv.

We ourselves, on this newspaper, vigorously opposed the McCarran bill, described it as a vicious measure and fought it step by step at every juncture of its way through Congress. We cannot fail to note, however, that among those voting to override Mr. Truman's veto of the McCarran bill were not only some of the Republican candidates now endorsed by General Eisenhower but also some of the leading lights of the Democratic party.

Voting to override the veto was Senator Connally of Texas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Voting to override was Senator George of Georgia, chairman of the Finance Committee. Voting to override was Senator Johnson of Colorado, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Voting to override was Senator McKellar of Tennessee, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Voting to override was Senator Hayden of Arizona, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. Voting to override was Senator Johnston of South Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Civil Service. Voting to override was Senator McClellan of Arkansas, chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Voting to override was Senator Maybank of South Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Voting to override was Senator Ellender of Louisiana, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Voting to override was Senator McCarran himself, chairman of the powerful Committee on the Judiciary. Here is practically the whole Democratic hierarchy in control of the Senate's business. Is Mr. Truman now ready to charge these gentlemen with "accepting the very practices that identified the so-called 'master race' "?

Let us come down to cases still more concretely. Speaking at Havre, Mont., on Sept. 30, Mr. Truman specifically gave his endorsement to Representative Mansfield of that state for election to the Senate, saying of him that "Mike Mansfield is a credit to Montana and to the United States. He has a record to be proud of. * * * He has represented the United States before the whole world." Would anyone guess from this ringing endorsement that Mr. Mansfield, too, had voted to override Mr. Truman's veto of the McCarran bill?

into food
There
Vietnam
ing lost.
we redo

A

New Je
opportunit
themselves
sition Nun
empower
credit the
struction
way. This
northern c
incorporate
seem likely
respect, a
A short st
Woodbridge
credit of t
for the con
will mean a
in interest c

The histo
well locate
Parkway, i
easily outst
ments for d
of experien
road, the
highly in
funds w
meet t
Garden
lieve
vote
Propos

NE

The
proach
this ti
tion t
ese G
effect
dersta
Premi
proble
justly
right
tians
friend
and th
fulfille
people

The
center
achiev
unilat