
James A. Farley

Editorials and Articles

Printed in the Congressional Record on April 11, 1950;
January 17, 22, 23, June 20, September 13, October 9,
15, 16, 18, 1951; February 20, 27, March 4 and 10, 1952

*Not printed
at Government
expense*

United States Government Printing Office, Washington : 1952

205242—42987

Jim Farley's Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 11 (legislative day of
Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Jim Farley's Philosophy," which was carried in the Davenport (Iowa) Democrat of March 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JIM FARLEY'S PHILOSOPHY

It was a pleasure, indeed, to read extracts of the address James A. Farley delivered before the Atlanta, Ga., Rotary Club. He is chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp.

We have always considered Jim Farley to be one of the best informed, most reliable, and conservative of Americans, whether in the role of statesman or businessman, in both of which he fits to perfection.

We can hardly forget the recipe he gave some years back for taming Stalin and the Russians. "Give them not vodka, but Coca-Cola to drink," he declared. In view of past events we fear "Uncle Joe" and his fellow Commies failed to take this sage advice.

In his Atlanta talk Mr. Farley observed that the economic prospect for 1950 was very good, and he sees no reason for any change in his optimism. He held that free trade was the key to peace, declaring that goods made in the United States are found in all parts of the world.

And, he emphasized, "American goods abroad everywhere carry with them a feeling of integrity and good faith." Giving a strong endorsement to the Marshall plan, Mr. Farley declared, "It is doubtful whether without American aid, this world reconstruction could take place at all. When the announcement was made more than 2 years ago that this Nation was considering the Marshall plan, it was like turning on a light all over Europe."

Turning to Russian communism, Mr. Farley said the threat of the spread of this ideology may be fought with words, the atom bomb, or with trade.

The first is insufficient, the second is repulsive to us, but the third is the middle way and the one that should ultimately be successful, he declared. "Trade leads," he contended, "to an intermingling, interdependence, and understanding between peoples."

Looking toward this end, Mr. Farley concluded, this Nation should promote world trade continuously and as fully as possible, "for where American products go, understanding of what they stand for will not be very far behind."

Present Political Trends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17 (legislative day
of Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, several weeks ago Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, delivered an address at Tampa, Fla., on present political trends. This address elicited widespread editorial comment, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD various editorials dealing with Mr. Farley's address.

There being no objection, the editorial comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portsmouth (Ohio) Times of
November 27, 1950]

AN OLD HAND AT THE GAME

James A. Farley was master minding for the Democratic Party when some of its present strategists were still school children. He may be no smarter than his successors, but he has had more experience than they have had. Furthermore, being out of party politics now, he can speak freely.

Out of his experience, he has drawn the conclusion that the attempt by unions to take over the Democratic Party is contrary to the idea of the two-party system. The unions are not broadly representative. This defect in their nature, as far as politics is concerned, was sensed by many Democrats in the 1950 election.

In Ohio, Mr. Farley believes, many Democrats voted for Senator Taft because they wanted to salvage their party from the labor politicians who had taken charge of the anti-Taft campaign.

He believes, in other words, that the Ohio senatorial election was a show-down on the unions' bid for domination of one party in the two-party system and that the unions were licked.

Senator Taft thereby was made the beneficiary of a decision far more important than a decision in an ordinary political contest. His successful candidacy settled a momentous issue.

In view of the fact the union politicians lately have been blaming their failure to win in Ohio and other States on many other things, including the war in Korea, it is interesting to know that an old hand at the game thinks the unionists helped to lose votes for the Democratic Party's candidates.

[From the Danbury (Conn.) News-Times of
November 25, 1950]

MONEY WE HAVEN'T GOT

James A. Farley is, in the opinion of a good many Americans of both parties, one of the best political minds in the United States today.

Mr. Farley has been somewhat behind the political clouds the past few years, but appears to be emerging once more.

His comment on the recent elections is shrewd, sage, and to the point. Speaking some days ago he said: "The Brannan plan, socialized medicine, and other unsubstantial experiments won no honors in this election. We want to be a humane, progressive Nation, but we cannot be big-hearted with money we haven't got."

That seems to hit the nail smack on the head: "We cannot be big-hearted with money we haven't got."

Far too many of those who are superenthusiastic for the socialized schemes so widely and even wildly advocated these days appear never to think about where the money to make them work would come from.

The Government, of course, is expected to pick up the checks.

But the Government, as we have noted in these columns for some years now, hasn't a penny of its own. It has to get all its money from the people themselves.

"The recent elections," Mr. Farley declared, "clearly demonstrated that the voters want the Government to go slow with further experiments in domestic affairs."

Most students of current events agree, it seems to us, with Mr. Farley. Indeed, it seems difficult for any intelligent analyst of the voting in the recent elections to arrive at any other conclusion. The Fair Deal trend to the socialistic heaven was given a rude jolt that even its greatest protagonist must have understood.

We have on our hands a world problem of breath-taking proportions. We will need a united and a prosperous and a productive Nation to lead the world out of the present dilemma in which it finds itself. If this Nation is to dabble in socialism, to try to be big-hearted with money we haven't got, what is to become of us on the international front?

205242—42987

Even if the majority of the American people were minded to try socialism—we do not believe they are—this is worst of all times to take a whirl at it.

[From the Hartford Times of November 27,
1950]

MR. FARLEY IS RIGHT

The moderation and common sense that the country has come to expect from James A. Farley are well exemplified in an address he recently delivered in Tampa before the Florida Chamber of Commerce. The former national Democratic chairman, with characteristic frankness, chose to speak in part on the issue of civil rights. That is a subject that some national Democratic leaders might prefer to touch lightly, of at all, before an audience in the South. But as it was handled by Mr. Farley, there was enlightenment and guidance for both the North and South in his remarks.

As a basic proposition, he declared that to pass a law, especially a Federal law, is never the best way to correct an injustice. "Free men in whose hearts there lives a sense of justice and common sense," he said, "can generally be trusted to do what is right." Consequently, Mr. Farley would leave the correction of the denial of civil rights—and he did not blink the fact that they are frequently denied—to the sense of justice and common sense of the areas in which the problem arises. He pointed out that most of the problems are "gradually and peacefully being solved right here in the South."

Mr. Farley feels that "the gates of economic opportunity for all races" are opening wider and wider, that the right to vote is spreading, and that lynchings "have been brought under control by the States and communities."

All of that is true, to a degree. And Mr. Farley undoubtedly outlined the most effective—perhaps the only effective—approach to the problems. But there is still a question whether the opening of the gates and the spreading of the right of suffrage and the control of mass murder are proceeding at a rate consistent with the determination of the American people that they shall soon prevail without question wherever men live under the Stars and Stripes.

The answer lies either within the States of the South or in the hands of Federal authorities. Mr. Farley is right when he says corrective action should come from the local areas. The citizens there never tire in their insistence on State autonomy. But the thing that keeps up the steam in the movement for centralized attention to civil rights is the failure of local governmental units to meet their responsibilities.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union of
November 23, 1950]

FARLEY ON THE ELECTION

James A. Farley feels the election results generally showed a Republican trend, but were also "good for the Democratic Party," if it learns the lessons that will make for a better and more unified party and a better two-party system for the Nation.

We know of no Democrat better equipped to draw whatever lessons there may be in the election results, and to offer sound advice to his party, than James A. Farley. He puts first the lesson of Ohio and several other places where the CIO-PAC were particularly active, that neither of the two parties nor the workingman himself, nor the voters generally want an independent labor party.

He believes labor has sufficient leeway within the scope of the two-party system to protect and further its interests. Moreover, a political party loses its effectiveness when it lacks a universal viewpoint. "The interests of all the people must be considered in framing a philosophy or platform when an appeal is made to the voters."

Mr. Farley drew the further lesson that the voters want the Government to go slow with further experiments in domestic affairs, confronted as we are with a great peril in our foreign relations, with immense deficits and heavy taxation. He referred specifically to the Brannan plan and socialized medicine, adding "other unsubstantial experiments." We want to be "a humane, progressive nation, but we cannot be big-hearted with money we haven't got." Expenditures for nonmilitary purposes must be "cut to the bone."

He thinks the best way to help the farmer is not through a "two-pronged threat to the farmer and the taxpayer," as even the two big farm organizations regard the Brannan plan, but rather in helping him find the way to the market at less cost and with more efficiency. "Government aid in marketing, in lowering the cost of transportation, and in finding new uses for farm products is the way to prosperity with freedom."

The earliest hint that Mr. Farley was parting with the philosophy still current in Washington was his break with President Roosevelt, presumably on the third-term issue, but in reality over the sort of "experiments" to which he now objects. His is one more voice calling upon the party to get back to its earlier sound traditions by abandoning the road that leads eventually to socialism. There are many other Democrats who agree with him, but few who speak with greater effect. That he has spoken will be good for the Democratic Party, if it takes his advice, and for the country as a whole.

205242-42987

**Editorial Comment on Address by Hon.
James A. Farley**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, January 22 (legislative day of
Monday, January 8), 1951*

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two editorials and an article relative to the excellent address made by former Postmaster General James A. Farley to the State Chamber of Commerce of Florida in November of last year be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The first is entitled "Farley Looks at November 7," and appeared in the Bridgeport Post on November 24, 1950. The second is entitled "Mr. Farley Woos the South," and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on November 23, 1950. The third is in a column headed "Heffernan says Farley makes a diagnosis," and appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle, November 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bridgeport Post of November 24,
1950]

FARLEY LOOKS AT NOVEMBER 7

From all sections of the country political pundits have been having their say about the election on November 7, in varying degrees of importance.

Perhaps the most significant analysis has come from James A. Farley, former Democratic national chairman, who in two elections successfully presented Franklin D. Roosevelt to the voters of the country, and then broke with him on the third-term principle. Mr. Farley has always been scrupulous about principles, in and out of politics.

Although not active politically since then, the former Postmaster General still knows more about the Democratic Party, and the men and women who make up that party, than any other citizen. There is no question about his qualifications to speak on the effect of the November 7 results on the party which he led to power.

Defeats of union-endorsed candidates clearly indicate that the country does not want an independent labor party, he told

the Florida Chamber of Commerce. "The principle upon which this Nation rests is that individuals vote as individuals, not as members of blocs. They vote their convictions through the party of their choice, and that party represents all interests, business and agricultural, labor and capital," Mr. Farley said.

There are many lessons to be drawn, he said, which may not only make for a better Democratic Party, but a better two-party system for the Nation. He has always been a staunch believer in the two-party system and has often pointed out that it would be an error for labor unions to form a party of their own. The Ohio election proved beyond doubt how the people, and workingmen themselves, feel about a labor party. Yet, he noted, there has been great danger that labor would do this through union political organizations set up in districts and in States.

Such a development would be contrary to the theory of government under our American two-party system, since it would allow the elimination of policies by one issue and by one group in the community. It was this fear, he believes, that drove many Democrats into the Taft column in Ohio.

In his clear and frank appraisal of the results, he does not believe that people prefer to support third, or splinter parties, of which there were two in New York State. He scored the Democratic Party for allowing the Liberal Party, though less radical than the American Labor Party, to move in and dictate candidates. He pointed out the perils to European stability because of the multiplicity of parties.

He believes the election carried a warning to the Government to go slow with further experiments in domestic affairs for at least the duration. He mentioned specifically the Brannan plan, socialized medicine, and other unsubstantial experiments. They won no honors in the recent election, the former chairman said, declaring that we want to be a humane progressive Nation, but we cannot be big-hearted with money we haven't got.

Mr. Farley urged the abandonment of the proposed Federal civil rights legislation, because the problems cannot be solved on a Federal basis. They belong to the States or to the region, and he finds the Southern States solving their problems in this regard successfully without the heavy hand of law.

Mr. Farley's talk was filled with common sense, and if the Fair Dealers have any of that rare commodity, they will agree with him and change their partisan tactics. If they don't, Democrats will continue to vote with the more conservative Republicans, just as they did in Ohio.

[From the Brooklyn Eagle of November 30,
1950]

HEFFERNAN SAYS FARLEY MAKES A DIAGNOSIS

What was in an editorial this commentator wrote in May of 1931 is beyond recall.

205242-42987

But in his files he finds a letter in which James A. Farley wrote: "When I am again in Brooklyn I shall drop in and say hello to you, as I believe a personal chat would enable me to give you some information as to what I am trying to do around the State." In what he was trying to do then he was conspicuously successful.

Nineteen years, heavily freighted, have passed into hectic history since that letter reached my desk. Mr. Farley has been around the State, around the Nation, and around the world. He has learned much. His recent speech to the Florida Chamber of Commerce encompassed much of what he learned.

It was good medicine. The political doctor made an excellent diagnosis and prescribed medication.

"Somehow," said Mr. Farley, "I feel, as a Democrat, that the results generally, while they indicated a Republican trend, were good for the Democratic Party. That party still holds the Presidency and it still holds both Houses of Congress. There are some Democrats who are disappointed.

"And there are some who were never real Democrats who were deeply disappointed. But out of the lessons of this election we can draw some wisdom that may make for a better and more unified Democratic Party and a better two-party system for the Nation as a whole. I shall mention a few of these lessons."

It is not too difficult to identify those who were never real Democrats. Some of them transcended the bounds of democracy in the train of the leader in whose cause Jim Farley entered the political lists 19 years ago. Some of them went down to defeat in the recent election.

After touching briefly on the revolt of the workers against the labor bosses, notably in Ohio, Mr. Farley held up as a warning to honest liberals the danger of bloc or splinter parties which had reduced France to impotency when Hitler attacked and which now make difficult her decisions in the matter of rearming Germany.

We can pass his approval of the inclusion of Spain in the western alliance, and his plan for raising defense funds.

Mr. Farley's views on the outstanding issues of the late campaign might well receive consideration from Mr. Truman if he has in mind the conciliation of many interests, particularly those of the South. Thus:

"As we turn from parties to issues there is another real lesson in this election. Confronted as we are with a great peril in our foreign relations, with immense deficits and heavy taxation, the voters have made it clear that they want the Government to go slow with further experiments in domestic affairs for at least the duration. The Brannan plan, socialized medicine, and other unsubstantial experiments won no honors in this election. We cannot be big-hearted with money we don't have.

"This election and the primaries in the South that preceded it showed further that this country has no desire to follow Socialist Britain in adopting socialized medicine.

"Freemen in whose hearts there lives a sense of justice and common sense can generally be trusted to do what is right. I say to those anxious people who are too ready to lift the threat of authority to leave recovery to the spirit of liberty."

Editorial Comment on Address by Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 22 (legislative day of
Monday, January 8), 1951

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD three excellent editorials respecting a recent address by Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and former chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of
November 23, 1950]

FARLEY GIVES ADVICE TO FELLOW DEMOCRATS
(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, November 22.—Probably the sagest of the political observers of our times is James A. Farley, who, after twice piloting a presidential nominee to success at the polls, nevertheless parted from that same individual on a matter of principle—opposing a break in the third-term tradition.

What Farley says now in analyzing the recent election is particularly significant and revealing. For it is the opinion of a man who, more than any other outside of public office, knows what the Democratic Party really means to its followers and what it can mean in pursuing a course that might be termed sound instead of unsound liberalism.

The man who not only served in the late President Roosevelt's Cabinet as Postmaster General, but who led the Democratic National Committee is certainly entitled to speak about the Democratic Party as an institution.

"First," says Farley concerning the last election, "it showed in Ohio and in several other places that neither the Republican nor

205242—42987

the Democratic Parties, nor the workingman himself, nor the voters generally want an independent labor party. I have many times made myself clear on this subject.

"Since labor unions became an effective force in our economy, it has been suggested by some that labor might conceivably form a political party of its own, with the avowed objective of presenting its aims through the medium of a platform sponsored by an independent labor party.

"I want to say that I am definitely opposed to such an idea because I am a firm believer in the two-party system.

"The great danger since the two big labor federations have set up their own political organizations is that in many districts and in some States these organizations might well supplant one or both of the regular parties. The result of this would be the elimination of policies by one issue and by one group in the community. That is quite contrary to the whole theory of government in this Republic under a two-party system. The fear of that in Ohio I know in this year's election drove many Democrats to vote for TAFT. And it is also clear that thousands of union members refused to be told how to vote by the political arms of the unions and voted for TAFT in protest."

This is a frank exposition by one who knows the trends in party fortunes and the changing attitudes of voters. Farley, however, not only refers to what happened in Ohio, but in his latest speech—made in the deep South at Tampa, Fla.—he calls attention to the way the American Labor Party, which he says "came to be heavily influenced by Communists," ran a ticket in New York State that was thoroughly buried by the regular party vote. He adds that he is happy to note that the outlook is very dark for third or fourth parties in this country.

The former chief of the Democratic National Committee condemns also the Brannan plan, socialized medicine, and other unsubstantial experiments and calls on the President to summon the leaders of the South to a solve civil-rights problems on a regional and State basis.

"To pass a law," he remarks with reference to this issue that has aroused the South, "especially a Federal law, is never the best way to correct an injustice."

What Farley says to his fellow Democrats and to the Nation will be discussed widely. For it is the beginning of a very important dissent against New Dealism and Fair Dealism which has been smoldering for some time, but which is now coming to the surface as the independent Democrats, forced to choose between radicalism under the Democratic banner or antiradicalism in the opposite party, are voting in favor of Republican candidates. Thus they do not hesitate to leave their party for the time being—at least until the Democratic Party can get back on the track again.

Men in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. MCGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1951

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Men in Politics," that appeared in the Scranton, Pa., Catholic Light on November 9, 1950, together with an editorial that appeared in the Boston, Mass., Post under date of November 13, 1950, entitled "Impellitteri's Victory." The above-mentioned editorials follow:

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Catholic Light of
November 9, 1950]

MEN IN POLITICS

A politician is a politician even after the election. Unfortunately, this fact is not always appreciated. And while everyone realizes that a man seeking office is a politician, entirely too few remember that he is no different and no better after he gains office.

Consequently, the candidates who lose are remembered as politicians. Those who win become office holders and remain such until the next election. But they're still politicians.

These latter, mindful of their status, should study remarks made recently by one of their very own, the Honorable James A. Farley.

Mr. Farley traces the Christian attitude toward political power back to St. Paul's remark that "there is no power but from God and those that are ordained by God." This, he avers, means that those who hold political power are in a sense ministers of God in the temporal order. Since their powers come from God, and since they act in His name, obviously any politician who dares use his office in a manner that is contrary to the laws of God or in a way likely to arouse His wrath is rushing toward an inevitable day of reckoning with a speed and a blindness awful to behold. And this applies to every politician, however great or small the office he holds.

To Mr. Farley, politics is an ancient calling. More than that, it is an honorable profession and a sacred trust. So long as God remains in the picture; so long as politicians remember that they are the servants, not the masters, of the people, and so long as they do not lose sight of their only *raison d'être*

205242—42987

no one will quarrel with Mr. Farley's statements.

But what is the principal task, nay the only purpose, that even remotely justifies the existence of politicians? Again Mr. Farley supplies the answer:

"Always the common welfare is the goal. In a public order under God, neither the heads nor the members of the political parties should try to advance merely partisan or group interest. Self-enrichment is a betrayal of the sacred trust of the public officer in his office and of the political party in its power. It violates sound ethical principles and is an offense against good morals. We must never forget that it is the common good which is commanded by the natural law—that is, by the eternal law of God which we learn by examining human nature with our human reason."

Forthright as are these words, they are mild compared to those Mr. Farley uses in declaring that politicians have definite responsibilities. Oddly enough, no mention is made of responsibility or loyalty to the party. Mention is made, however, of responsibility to God and man. Politicians, he declares, "are responsible to God to keep a just account of their stewardship. They are responsible to man for the wise and temperate exercise of their God-given authority."

And yet who can deny that all too often no one is more completely forgotten than the people—unless it be Almighty God?

As Mr. Farley points out, the day will come when each politician must render an account of his works. He will be better prepared for that day of strict judgment by frequently recalling these final words of one who knows whereof he speaks:

"Let no one think that these are trifling matters. Let no one think that they are easy matters. Let no one think that they are matters which can be responsibly handled except reverently and prayerfully under God."

[From the Boston Post of November 13, 1950]

IMPELLITTERI'S VICTORY

The victory of Vincent R. Impellitteri, the new mayor of New York, is entirely his and the people's. The machines were defied; the parties were defied; the bosses were defied. He performed a political miracle and demonstrated the strength of American democracy—the tough fiber that lies beneath the political encrustations. But a word of thanks goes from all to James A. Farley, who lent his name and prestige to Mayor Impellitteri's campaign. In a political squabble such as that out of which the three-cornered New York mayoralty fight developed there are a good many voters who, hesitant about the issues, will gladly put their vote beside the name of the man that Mr. Farley says is "deserving."

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1951

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Syracuse Herald-Journal of May 14, 1951; the Florida Times-Union, of May 15, 1951; the Brooklyn Eagle, of May 17, 1951; and two from the Syracuse Herald-American of May 20, 1951; with reference to the Honorable James A. Farley:

[From the Syracuse Herald-Journal of May 14, 1951]

JIM FARLEY'S REMARKS IN SYRACUSE AND ITHACA

In his two most recent upstate addresses, former Postmaster General Farley put major emphasis on two sound principles.

First, in the Syracuse address Friday night, he said firmly that it was the patriotic duty of politicians of both parties to forget their differences in a period of national danger like the one through which we are passing today.

It is easy to understand why he believes that the principle of cooperation in time of peril should be stressed at this time. The passing of Vandenberg appears to have wrecked the bipartisan foreign policy. * * * At a time when national unity is needed the Nation is giving the world an unprecedented wartime spectacle of disunity.

Farley believes that perils that confront the Nation are so threatening that it is the duty of Democratic and Republican leaders to end the squabbling for party advantage. He doesn't think that either a Democratic or Republican leader would get very far under a Communist dictatorship.

Secondly, in his Ithaca College mid-century convocation dinner address Saturday night, Farley pleaded for sound moral leadership. Some of his words on this subject are worth using on an editorial page or anywhere else. For example, he said at one point:

"I deplore the cynical attitude that prevails in high political spots in this country and in others. We are told that if the act of a public official is not illegal that it is necessarily proper and always excusable. We are told that there is a fundamental difference between what is illegal and what is improper. I do not see this difference, because what is illegal is merely one of the improper things that happens to have been the subject of legislative action. We have got to pass

judgment against and, so far as we can, eliminate the improper as well as the illegal in our public life.

"Our public servants elected to high office have a duty far greater than that of merely enforcing the law and collecting taxes and spending our money. They have the duty of moral leadership in the country. For if they do or condone or permit things that are improper they are destroying the very fabric of public morals, and the poison moves down into all of the ranges of our population. When men in high places make hundreds of thousands of dollars through their improper acts it is a hard thing to maintain purity and integrity in the sports of boys in college and on the sandlots of the Nation."

Why is it that Jim Farley, who has been in politics all his life and has the reputation of being a smart politician if there ever was one, is earnestly advocating bipartisan agreements and high moral leadership?

The answer is perfectly clear.

For all his political maneuverings, Jim Farley is a thoughtful American patriot. And he is a little disturbed by the way things are going in the country he loves.

It seems to us that there is real justification for his fears. We do need unity in foreign relations and we do need high moral leadership in domestic affairs.

If Jim Farley's two upstate lectures to the political leaders of both parties bear fruit, he will have rendered his country a signal service. Certainly his remarks ought to be circulated extensively in Washington—and everywhere else.

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union of May 15, 1951]

WHAT DOES IT MEAN FOR A PERSON TO BE A CYNIC?

James A. Farley, one-time chairman of the Democratic National Committee during the Roosevelt regime, made a stirring address over the week end at Ithaca College's 2-day midcentury convocation.

The keynote of his talk is one that is likely to be used repeatedly during the coming commencement season as speakers mount platforms throughout the country to address 1951 graduating classes.

Deploring the "cynical attitude that prevails in high political spots in this country and others," Mr. Farley declared:

"When men in high places make hundreds of thousands of dollars through their improper acts it is a hard thing to maintain purity and integrity in the sports of boys in colleges and on the sandlots of the Nation."

Etymologically, the word "cynical," used by Mr. Farley in his talk, is one of the most interesting in the English language. It has been taken over almost bodily from the ancient Greek where it meant "dog."

The figure, therefore, is a vivid one. It depicts the image of a snarling canine creature—the kind undoubtedly that the Latins

used to warn their visitors about when they tacked a sign on their gates reading "caveat canis" (beware of the dog).

In modern life, a cynic is the type of man who says: "There are things in life better than money, but it takes money to get them." And then he pursues that philosophy just as far as the law allows, using every device, ruse, and stratagem to come by what he considers his share of worldly goods.

How many young people graduating from college this commencement season will cross the threshold of life, believing, from what they have seen about them, that they have no choice but to pursue this Machiavellian doctrine?

How many of this year's graduates, taking their cue from the sordid conditions that exist in public life, have concluded that there is no way to get along in the world save by making damaging compromises with their conscience?

These are the most challenging questions that face America's high schools and colleges as they prepare this commencement season to graduate another crop of young people.

Well might we in America flip the dog-eared pages of Horace and think twice, yea, thrice, upon the lesson of "Integer Vitae"—"the man of upright life," about whom all of us, both young and old, need to know more in these days when the Nation is being plagued by an era of decaying morals.

[From the Brooklyn Eagle of May 17, 1951]

HEFFERNAN SAYS—FARLEY TEACHES THE TEACHERS

This commentator has wondered, occasionally, whether university convocations are held for the purpose of weighing the "honorary degree" list with ponderous names, or in order that the faculties may learn something from distinguished guests.

Last week, at the Ithaca College mid-century convocation banquet, James A. Farley was the teacher; the mortar-board-and-gown fraternity the pupils of a master in the science of public relations. His topic was "Reaching the Hearts and Minds of Men."

Today we shall wander among Mr. Farley's apothegms, plucking what we may, and finding some pertinent observations of our own.

"His entire life," said Mr. Farley of the politician, "is devoted to the effort to please and persuade." But, if he is honest, "he must tell some unpleasant truths," the occasion requiring them.

Now here is a passage on the "pursuit of happiness":

"If we are managing a ball team we must deal not only with the players but with the public, for without a favorable public there would be nothing with which to pay the salaries of the players. In fact, if we want to have a happy life as well as a profitable

one we must have friends, and the way to have friends is to reach their minds and hearts. I sometimes think that Thomas Jefferson meant by 'the pursuit of happiness' the winning of friends. This winning of the hearts and minds of others has been a recognized art for a long, long time. There were books written about it more than 2,000 years ago by the Greeks. Aristotle's great book on rhetoric is a discussion of how to use words to win the confidence of others."

A current philosopher describes Aristotle as "the pagan philosopher who was baptized by St. Thomas Aquinas."

And finally, Farley on morals:

"I deplore the cynical attitude that prevails in high political spots in this country and in others. We are told that if the act of a public official is not illegal that it is necessarily proper and always excusable. We are told that there is a fundamental difference between what is illegal and what is improper. I do not see this difference, because what is illegal is merely one of the improper things that happens to have been the subject of legislative action. We have got to pass judgment against, and, so far as we can, eliminate the improper as well as the illegal in our public life.

"Our public servants elected to high office have a duty far greater than that of merely enforcing the law and collecting taxes and spending our money. They have the duty of moral leadership in the country. For if they do or condone or permit things that are improper they are destroying the very fabric of public morals, and the poison moves down into all of the ranges of our population. When men in high places make hundreds of thousands of dollars through their improper acts it is a hard thing to maintain purity and integrity in the sports of boys in college and on the sandlots of the Nation."

Which carries its own comment.

[From the Syracuse Herald-American of May 20, 1951]

GREATEST ISSUE BEFORE OUR PEOPLE

(By James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States)

Thanks for your invitation to write this Sunday's guest editorial. You ask what I believe to be the most important question before the country today.

Victory in the cold war—or hot war, if one chooses to call it that—obviously is the most important question. In fact, there has never been anything more important since the founding of the Republic.

We must win this struggle with bolshevism whether it takes 1 or 100 years. The Communists are out to destroy us and our free institutions. For us, the one alternative to victory is acceptance of tyranny, oppression, and slavery. That is the fate of men everywhere who fall into the Soviet-Communist trap.

Hence, I say again that the most important problem before the country is victory in this crazy, cold-hot war that has been forced on us by a ruthless gang of political and economic pirates in the Kremlin.

In order to win this cold-hot war the American people should demand certain things.

I mentioned two of these things in my Syracuse and Ithaca remarks recently. First, Americans should demand restoration of bipartisanship in foreign relations. Secondly, a high moral leadership is needed that will command the respect not only of our own people but of all people.

There is a third thing that also needs emphasis. That is the profound necessity of selecting men of outstanding ability for the vital tasks that confront the Government in these critical times.

To say that we haven't the men is sheer nonsense. America leads the world today in industry, business, science, education, and numerous other fields. The establishment of this leadership was not simply a matter of luck; it was the product of brains, thought, technical superiority, and farsightedness. We had the resources, yes. But without the brains the resources never could have been developed for the progress, prosperity, and contentment of the human race.

It was men—men of wisdom, determination, and courage—that put our country out in front.

I believe that the time has come when we must utilize all this wisdom and ability that has won for us an outstanding position in the modern world.

I'm not suggesting that politicians be outlawed. I've been in politics more or less all my life. I believe in our two-party system, and I've played the game, vigorously and fairly, I think. No; I'm not urging that we abolish the great political parties and substitute another kind of system. The present system, with all its imperfections, has served the country well through the years.

Nor do I advocate that Government shall reach into every successful industrial and business organization, every great laboratory, and every great university, and kidnap the leaders in these fields. These men and women already are rendering important service to the public right where they are.

What I do propose is that Government shall perfect a system of using the vast reservoir of brains and ability that is available in America today.

That would not mean the extinction of politicians or the two-party system. It would merely mean that our politicians and statesmen were drafting the best brains in the country, if only on a part-time basis, to save themselves and their country, and to achieve victory in the cold-hot war with the Communists.

It is my opinion that if we are to win we shall have to put everything we've got into the struggle. That's what the Communists are doing on their side. They are formidable

205242—42987

and fanatical enemies. For them, the sky is the limit.

We can win the struggle, yes. But to do so we must throw our best men as well as our abundant resources into the conflict. We must outthink and outguess our ruthless foes on every front and in every quarter of the world.

That's a large order, I will admit. But we have the brains to do this big job if we'll only use them. The politicians themselves ought to insist on it. For if the Reds win, the only opening for Democratic and Republican leaders would be a prison corridor leading to the yard where the firing squad was operating.

[From the Syracuse Herald-American of
May 20, 1951]

POLITICAL PERISCOPE—WHY JIM FARLEY
DOESN'T RUN

(By Laurence J. O'Toole)

James A. Farley will be 63 years old on May 30. The question is often asked by the average voter, both Republican and Democrat, why Farley does not run for public office.

It certainly is not because of his age. The sixties and seventies in many instances have become for politicians what the forties and fifties are for business and professional men—the era of achievement.

President Truman is 67. Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY and United States Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN are 73. Joe Hanley who might have been Governor of New York this year will observe his seventy-fifth birthday on Farley's sixty-third. Many voters regard Governor Dewey at 48 as too young to hold the responsibility of the Presidency.

Farley visited Syracuse 9 days ago and withheld comment on his availability for nominations for Governor, United States Senator, and President.

His intimate friends feel certain he would accept the Democratic nomination for President next year. They are not sure he would run for either Governor or for the United States Senate.

He is chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Exporting Co. and draws a salary of at least \$100,000 a year. He is the good-will man for the firm both here and abroad. He would not be likely to abandon this lucrative role without thinking twice.

But politics has been in Farley's blood since, at the age of 8, he carried a torchlight in a parade honoring William Jennings Bryan. His veins will course with political essence for the rest of his life. He must continue to have his political ambitions.

He is a distinguished American of the twentieth century and has an enviable and untarnished public record. He is one of the Nation's most substantial businessmen. He has long been sympathetic with the lot of the so-called common man and proved by his support of the early social reforms of the

Franklin Roosevelt regime that he was a friend of decent labor elements.

A giant of a man, he makes an impressive appearance. The nicknames of Gentleman Jim and Genial Jim apply to his natural charm and wit and to his winning smile. He makes personal friends of chance acquaintances, and it seems safe to say he knows more politicians and newspapermen than any other individual.

Farley's gift for remembering names is a familiar fact. He continually indicates that this remarkable alertness remains at full power. He maintains that he can name at least one person in every fair-sized city in the country, and, incidentally, he says he has more friends in Syracuse than in any other locality save his own New York City.

He probably has the most retentive memory since Abraham Lincoln. He would be likely to duplicate Lincoln's mental feat on meeting a farmer for the second time. On the first occasion the Great Emancipator was electioneering for Congress. He fingered the farmer's whetstone as he talked. Years later while a candidate for President, Lincoln stopped again at the farmer's barn.

The farmer complained that the whetstone had disappeared at Lincoln's first visit.

"Why," said Abe, peering at a beam, "I put it right up there."

And, sure enough, there it was.

Farley rose politically in the company of the late Alfred E. Smith. He latched onto Franklin Roosevelt as a man of destiny and piloted him into the White House. Farley became State and then National Democratic chairman. He organized the most powerful political machine in the Nation's history.

He believed in the tradition of limiting a President to two terms in office. In 1940 he sought to deprive Roosevelt of a third term and, indeed, permitted his own name to be presented on the convention floor at Chicago. Farley was defeated.

Big Jim's conviction has now been endorsed by Congress and the public in the twenty-second amendment which restricts all future Presidents, with the exception of Truman in the event he should run next year, to two terms.

In breaking with Roosevelt, Farley incurred the wrath of the New Deal organization. He resigned as national chairman and 4 years later after unsuccessfully opposing F. D. R. for a fourth term he relinquished the State chairmanship.

The New Dealers and their successors, the Truman Fair Dealers, still control the Democratic Party in New York State. Farley is a thoroughgoing organization man, and so long as he is willing to abide by decisions of the leaders, and their antipathy toward him continues, he apparently will remain a private citizen.

If the party's gubernatorial nomination had been left to the rank and file conventioners at Rochester last September, Farley might well have been the choice. But he refused permission to Frank Kelly, a young Wyoming County attorney, to submit his

205242—42987

name, and the decision made beforehand by New York City leaders was reluctantly executed.

Big Jim is now mentioned for nomination next year for the United States Senate and for designation for the Presidency. His popularity would give IRVING M. IVES, the incumbent Senator whose term expires in 1952, a run for his money. Members of the Massachusetts Democratic organization are reported planning to present Farley's name on the presidential convention floor. Who knows what would happen if the delegates were given the freedom to select their own standard bearer?

Illegal, or Just Improper?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1951

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Illegal, or Just Improper?" which appeared in the August 18 issue of the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post:

ILLEGAL, OR JUST IMPROPER?

Jim Farley, more formally the Honorable James A. Farley, has for many years played a large part in American affairs, as an adviser to Presidents, as a public official, and now as a head of an important business corporation. No man in American public life has a greater hold on the affections of the American people than Jim Farley.

One reason for this public admiration and respect is the high moral standard he has always maintained. On this point he said something singularly appropriate in an address given at Ithaca College on May 12 this year. He was deploring the cynical attitude which prevails in some high spots both in our own country and others, pretending that a line of conduct which is highly improper is all right provided only that it is not illegal. He said:

"We are told that if the act of a public official is not illegal that it is necessarily proper and always excusable. We are told that there is a fundamental difference between what is illegal and what is improper.

"I do not see this difference because what is illegal is merely one of the improper things that happens to have been the subject of legislative action. We have got to pass judgment against, and, so far as we can, eliminate the improper as well as the illegal in our public life.

"Our public servants elected to high office have a duty far greater than that of

merely enforcing the law and collecting taxes and spending our money. They have the duty of moral leadership in the country.

"For if they do or condone or permit things that are improper, they are destroying the very fabric of public morals and the poison moves down into all of the ranges of our population. When men in high places make hundreds of thousands of dollars through their improper acts, it is a hard thing to maintain purity and integrity in the sport of boys in college and on the sandlots of the Nation."

When Jim Farley uttered these words in Ithaca no whisper of the impending West Point scandal had reached the Nation. But how prophetic these words were. And how they did hit the West Point nail right on the head.

Adoption of James A. Farley Into the Iroquois Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 9, 1951

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], who is detained from the Senate by the illness of his wife, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix an editorial entitled "Jim Farley's Visit," which appeared in the Syracuse Herald-Journal of September 8, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JIM FARLEY'S VISIT

Former Postmaster General James A. (Big Jim) Farley is now "Chief Straightforward" of the Iroquois Nation. He was adopted into the tribe and given his Indian name at the State fairground yesterday.

The Iroquois, famous for their prowess, valor, and brains, now have a very able American to sit with them around the campfire.

But if they happen to have a stalwart brave with a resonant voice they ought to hang on to him very tightly, otherwise Chief Straightforward might pick him up and make him President.

Of course, it is always a pleasure to welcome Jim Farley to Syracuse, whether he comes for the purpose of joining an Indian tribe, running a political convention, or just delivering a speech.

Here is a patriotic American of great ability—a man whose sound integrity, broad ex-

perience, shrewd judgment, and vigorous ideas make him a very exceptional guest.

Whether there is anything to the reports that influential Democrats in certain States want to put his name before the Democratic National Convention next year, we do not know.

All we do know is that they could do much worse.

Maybe the delegates to that convention could learn from the Iroquois.

Reaching Hearts and Minds of Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. MCGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to amend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Reaching Hearts and Minds of Men" which appeared in the Lewiston (Maine) Journal shortly after an address by Jim Farley at Ithaca College:

REACHING HEARTS AND MINDS OF MEN

(By Daniel S. Dexter)

James A. Farley—he doesn't mind being called "Jim"—is a master of the art of politics. It's an art and close to being a science. Many miss that.

To be successful in politics—and the word is used here in its best meaning—one must have a good memory for faces and names.

The former Postmaster General Farley has this faculty.

While he needs no memory aids, he takes the precaution to make a note now and then to stiffen his memory and refresh his recollection.

The "Plumed Knight," of James G. Blaine whose heirs gave his house for Maine Governor's residence, saw a face or heard a name once—and he never forgot.

Maine's Senator OWEN BREWSTER has a top-flight memory.

Farley, who broke with Franklin D. Roosevelt on the third-term issue has a little talk on Reaching the Hearts and Minds of Men.

He's had many years' experience with reaching hearts and minds, which was his major objective.

To be successful in politics, he says, a man must gain the confidence of enough voters to persuade them to vote as he suggests.

It's the same with the businessman.

The man in business is forever at the polls. He wins if he succeeds in instilling confidence in himself and his goods. That is also the idea behind advertising. To build up

and keep before the public the name of a company or product.

It's the same with an executive whether he has a squad in uniform or employs men and women in civil life. He must reach the hearts and minds of his subordinates.

Success in command or civil administration doesn't depend so much in authority as on the ability to win confidence.

Farley puts good manners at the top of the list in the art of reaching other people.

This is something more than knowing how to hold your soup spoon or how to dress when you go to a church wedding.

Good manners are much more than a capacity to say the pleasant but insincere thing. It is much more than mere tact. It is to feel and, above all, to show that you have a genuine concern in others. It means caring for people, respecting them, treating them as equals and sharing their fears and earthly concerns and their ideals.

Closely associated with good manners is what we call "good humor," he continues.

And I am not now talking about ice cream, with which my own product is a close competitor. What I mean is the manifestation in all outward dealings with the public of a calm and friendly disposition. This is especially true in politics.

"We have learned in that very complex art that the most certain way that a man can defeat himself is to get angry. People are not interested in other people's angers. Anger does not attract; it repels.

"It causes the victim to say and do things that he would not otherwise say and do. He loses his balance of judgment. He makes mistakes. He reveals defects in his own personality and in his own ideas. He lays himself wide open to debate. Sometimes it is not easy to maintain a calm attitude, but success in life, in any profession, and success in attaining our own peace of mind is only gained by meeting situations with a smile, by turning aside criticism and the ill-natured attacks of others with calmness and courtesy."

And memory. "It is true that I have a pretty good memory for names and faces, and I have met a great many people in my life, all over this country and all over the world. I do not always trust to memory alone—that is too risky. I have, throughout my life, made it a habit, not only in politics but in business and socially, to help that memory by keeping a brief memorandum of anything which seems important, and at the same time incomplete and unfinished. I keep that memo until the matter is closed. * * *

"I would like to add something at this point. It is not a manifestation of good manners for a person to go up to another and challenge him by saying, "Do you remember me?" That puts you at a great disadvantage if you happen to have forgotten. I have found that the best way to meet that situation, when the challenge comes and when I am unable to remember, is to an-

swer frankly that I do not. Such an answer is not always pleasant for me but it is a good reminder to the other person that he should be tolerant and not expect too much of other people's memories. Of course, in my experience that has not happened too often and I am glad that it hasn't; but when I meet it, I meet it frankly."

Good Advice From Mr. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 16, 1951

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House know and admire Jim Farley. His comments always command respect. Recently he addressed the graduates of Ithaca College and gave the young people some fine advice. In commenting on his address the Salem (Mo.) News endorsed his reference to good manners, and under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix I include the News editorial as follows:

GOOD MANNERS, A VALUABLE ASSET

When James A. Farley addressed the graduates of Ithaca College he told them, among other things, that good manners are essential to the man or woman who expects to amount to something.

Mr. Farley said: "A person who is concerned in persuading other people to do something or buy something or just to be friendly and helpful, must have what I call good manners. Now good manners means something more than knowing how to hold your soup spoon or how to dress when you go to a church wedding. It is much more than a capacity to say the pleasant but insincere thing. It is much more than tact. It is to feel, and above all to show, that you have a genuine interest in others. It means caring for people, respecting them, sharing their fears and earthly concerns and their ideals. When these are felt and shown there need be no fear about winning confidence and winning friends, for this attitude will make itself known in a hundred ways."

Jim Farley's advice is good. There are characteristics that are invaluable in whatever business or profession one may engage.

But they must be genuine, and not assumed for the moment. Even a very dull person can see and know when someone is putting on an act to accomplish a purpose or attain an end. It is something that every young man and woman can acquire and use. Good manners are a valuable asset.

Farley Finds No Saints at Harvard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 18, 1951

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John Heffernan, from the Brooklyn Eagle of August 29, 1951:

HEFFERNAN SAYS FARLEY FINDS NO SAINTS AT HARVARD

Since the late Wendell Willkie circumnavigated the world and found that it was not only round but that it was one world, no modern emulator of Magellan has traveled the route more extensively and with greater attention to what he hears and sees than James A. Farley. And Mr. Farley, having seen and heard much that many of us neither see nor hear, considers it an obligation of good citizenship to let us in on the good news.

Some years ago, when Dr. Einstein devised equations to prove that everything that has been never was, President Hutchins, of Chicago University, called it the "good news of damnation." There followed the rise of the secularists in this country and much else, which is neither of good repute nor high hope. Our leading statesmen abandoned the things that had made American great, and placed all their alliance on the atomic bomb. As distinguished a statesman as Bernard Baruch returned from Europe not long since with the announcement that General Eisenhower was doing the best bit of crusading work in Europe since Peter the Hermit, a comparison that would no doubt puzzle the robed rallier of Christendom as much as the present organizer of Europe's scattered forces.

Mr. Farley, speaking at Loras College, Dubuque, finds hope in France, and even more in England and a revival of faith in many lands, and contrasts it with the universal panic that almost won the world.

Public Men and the Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 20, 1952

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

205242—42987

RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Atlantic City Press of February 8, 1952:

PUBLIC MEN AND THE FREE PRESS

James Aloysius Farley is really a big man, the several hundred members of civic clubs who heard him speak at a joint meeting of clubmen in Hackney's yesterday quickly realized.

Tall, handsome in an expertly tailored blue suit, confident and poised in the manner of the man who has made hundreds of speeches, the former United States Postmaster General and long-time political leader, radiated a personality that filled the meeting room and helped explain why he is one of the best known men in the Nation.

He accepted graciously and modestly the introduction Kiwanis President John Sykes had clipped from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which Farley's greatness had been extolled by an orator. Then quickly he told of several instances where he had been deflated by persons who had introduced him on other occasions, and the audience was laughing when Farley smoothly moved into his speech on the ways of winning the minds and hearts of people. It is a need in politics, but also in business, Farley said, for while the politician has to "go to the polls" only occasionally the businessman must have the public's confidence and support daily and even hourly.

It was an interesting and enlightening talk on friendly relations, and again helped to explain Farley's lasting popularity. He touched more briefly on a matter that apparently is close to his heart—the need of integrity and honesty in public affairs.

There was a brief portion of the Farley talk that was especially pleasing to newspapermen present and, like the rest of his speech, had a message. Public men and men in politics must expect criticism, Farley declared, and they should not be thin-skinned. He has had vast experience in public life and has had his share of criticism, but he noted that the newspapers are also ready to praise when the public man is achieving something in the public interest. It evens itself up, Farley has found, and the official and the politician has to learn to take the bitter with the sweet.

Farley did not elaborate the point but the truth is that newspapers seldom indulge in personalities, point their criticism instead toward the office or the duty of public man. The newspaper attempts to show what course of action is for the greatest good of the greatest number, based on its information and belief—and the newspaper ordinarily has considerable information on a public question since it is the business of the newspaper to know what goes on.

The people's leaders, including the politicians, have a duty to keep faith with the people who made them leaders, and with the nation. Marked deviations from a straightforward course invite critical comment. Worthwhile achievements deserve praise.

These are difficult times when numerous investigations throughout the United States have revealed laxity or dishonorable conduct among quite a few men who had the public's trust. The leader who has integrity looms larger than ever in the people's eyes, and the newspapers are eager to sing his praises.

Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 27, 1952

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Politics," commenting upon a recent speech by James A. Farley, and published in the Lynchburg (Va.) News at February 9, 1952.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS

James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and chairman of the Democratic National Committee, said in a recent address in Roanoke that politics is "the most dangerous and noble worldly career open to men and women today."

He said, "It is hazardous because it is beset by hordes of temptations and delusions. He who yields may not only lose respect, personal liberty, and his immortal soul but also may wreak almost irreparable harm on his community, the Nation, and even the world. It is a noble career because nowhere else, save under spiritual vows, can man expect to render so much service to his fellow man."

With the approaching national and municipal elections, Mr. Farley's words are timely. Politics is a serious undertaking. Not only is this true of the candidates themselves but for the citizens as well.

How often have you heard the statement, "Politics is a dirty game and I want no part of it"? That statement or a similar one has been made by persons from all walks of life.

Often persons who have the most at stake and the ones who lose the most under a poorly informed or dishonest government are the ones who set themselves above the "dirty game" of politics. All too often these individuals are too busy even to exercise their franchise at the polls and in some instances have not even registered to vote.

A lackadaisical electorate, in the final analysis, is responsible for the scandals which are being turned up almost daily in Washington. American citizens have not

been interested enough for one reason or another to demand skillful and honest leadership.

Recently there has been criticism in Lynchburg of some of the actions of city council. Now is the time for those critics to act if they are dissatisfied.

Ten candidates are seeking the Democratic nomination for the three vacant seats on the council in the April 1 primary. Let the critics, as well as other citizens, make intelligent studies of the candidates and their views. Then let them register their decision April 1 with the largest vote ever cast in a councilmanic primary. The result will be well worth the effort.

The interest should be maintained through the national conventions and the presidential elections. Politics should be everybody's business from now on. Every citizen has a stake in the undertaking. As Mr. Farley puts it:

"The goals of politics are security and prosperity for a people."

Hon. James A. Farley Praised in Press for High Moral Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES J. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1952

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Davenport (Iowa) Democrat of February 2, 1952:

FARLEY ON MORALITY

No professional politician of either party in this century has commanded as much respect from both political friends and foes, and from the general public, as James A. Farley.

He was scrupulously honest—honest not merely with money, but honest in keeping his word and honest in his efforts to make the sometimes-conflicting arts of politics and statesmanship dovetail.

For that reason a statement by this former Democratic national chairman, quoted in the Catholic Digest, is of particular interest in these times of corruption when pots and kettles are vying at calling each other black.

"We are told that if the act of a public official is not illegal then it is proper and excusable," he says. "I do not see this.

"Our public servants elected to high office have a duty far greater than that of merely enforcing the law. They have the duty of moral leadership in the country. If they

205242—42987

permit things that are improper they are destroying the very fabric of public morals.

"When men in high places make hundreds of thousands of dollars through their improper acts it is hard to maintain purity and integrity in the sports of boys in college and on the sandlots of the Nation.

"Behind all of our relations with our fellow beings there must be faith in the fundamental integrity of man. That faith, in the last analysis, is the faith that makes great people and a great nation."

It is well to reflect on the words of Jim Farley as we contemplate the present state of morality both in politics and business. There seem to be many politicians who are willing to grab a loose dollar, and many big-businessmen who are willing to offer one if they think it can bring two home to roost.

The low state of political morals is in many ways just a reflection of the low state of American morality generally. The old religious props on which morality rests have been rotting away for several decades and the bad effects are now becoming more and more apparent.

Potshots at Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. MCGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 10, 1952

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the following article entitled "Potshots at Politics," by Niel J. Bulger, which appeared in the Waterbury American, February 23, 1952:

POTSHOTS AT POLITICS

(By Niel J. Bulger)

Reporters covering Government and politics are frequently asked: "What are the requirements for being a good politician?" It's a tough question, because every citizen has his own idea of what constitutes a politician and these are seldom in accord with one another.

This week Harmon Genlot, the public-relations man, forwarded to potshots an address by James A. Farley, who, in this observer's humble opinion, is the greatest politician of the twentieth century. Last June the former Postmaster General told the faculty, alumni, and student body of Ithaca College that the key to success in any en-

deavor, but particularly in politics, is the ability to "reach the hearts and minds of men."

The man whose political logic was so powerful as to direct the persuasion of a majority of the people in all but two States to reelect President Roosevelt in 1936, explained that it is difficult to put into exact form just how this art can be pursued most successfully.

However, from his own experience he established a pattern of basic points. Here are those which seemed to him most pertinent to those who would become good politicians.

LIST OF ESSENTIALS

Said Mr. Farley:

"In the first place, a person who is concerned in persuading other people to do something or buy something, or just to be friendly and helpful, must have what I shall call good manners. Now, good manners is something more than knowing how to hold your soup spoon or how to dress when you go to a church wedding. It is much more than capacity to say the pleasant but insincere thing. It is much more than mere tact. It is to feel, and, above all, to show that you have a genuine concern in others. It means caring for people, respecting them, treating them as equals, and sharing their fears and earthly concerns and their ideals. When these matters are felt and shown, there need be no fear about winning confidence and winning friends, for this attitude will make itself known in a hundred ways."

Next in importance to good manners, Mr. Farley rated good humor as the mark of an able politician, and he emphasized that he wasn't referring to chocolate-covered ice cream.

"What I mean," he said, "is the manifestation in all outward dealings with the public of a calm and friendly disposition. This is especially true in politics. We have learned in that very complex art that the most certain way that a man can defeat himself is to get angry. People are not interested in other peoples' angers. Anger does not attract; it repels. It causes the victim to say and do things that he would not otherwise say and do. He loses his balance of judgment. He makes mistakes. He reveals defects in his own personality and in his own ideas. He lays himself wide open to debate. Sometimes it is not easy to maintain a calm attitude, but success in life, in any profession, and success in attaining our own peace of mind is only gained by meeting situations with a smile, by turning aside criticism and the ill-natured attacks of others with calmness and courtesy."

It's no wonder that in or out of public office, Mr. Farley remains the most respected public figure of his time.