"Mac"
1894-1984
Ernest W. McFarland, United States Senator (D-AZ), 1941-1953; U.S. Senate Majority Leader, 1951-1953; Governor of Arizona, 1955-1959; Justice, Arizona Supreme Court, 1965-1971; Chief Justice, 1968, Arizona Supreme Court.

The Ernest W. McFarland Papers

The United States Senate Years, 1940-1952

Edited by
JAMES E. McMILLAN
Central College, Iowa

Project Director
William W. Phillips, Emeritus
Arizona State University History Department

Advisory Board

Elizabeth S. Hughes, Senior Associate Editor
The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower
The Johns Hopkins University

Beth Luey, Director
The Historical Editing and Publishing Program
Arizona State University

L. C. Smith, Associate Professor
The History Department
Arizona State University

The McFarland Historical State Park
Advisory Committee

Sharlot Hall Museum Press
Prescott, Arizona

them voted for the Independent candidate.[3] You naturally lose some of the Democratic votes. You have got to pick up some on the other side. That you soon learn to do . . . .

MP 51/1

1. This undated draft is from long after McFarland's Senate career (see reference to LBJ's minority leadership) and most probably was dictated in the mid to late 1970s in preparation for his autobiography.

2. Elected in 1918, Pat Harrison served in the Senate until his death in June 1941. During 1941, he was President Pro Tempore of the Senate.

3. In the 1948 election, many southern Democrats formed the States Rights party or Dixiecrats and nominated Strom Thurmond of South Carolina for president, and some left-wing Democrats voted for Henry Wallace running for the Progressive party.

Chapter 8

The 1952 Campaign and Aftermath

The 1952 campaign for the United States Senate in Arizona manifested aspiring Republican high expectation versus incumbent Democratic confidence. The Republican party had reason for its positive thinking; in 1950, Howard Pyle became the first GOP governor-elect since 1930. He was recognized as a symbol of party resurgence and accorded the honor of being the first Arizona head of state to speak before a national political convention in 1952.

Pyle's successful campaign had been strongly backed by newspaper magnate Eugene Pulliam, publisher of both Phoenix daily newspapers, the *Arizona Republic* and *Phoenix Gazette*, and managed by the popular Barry Goldwater, a first-term Phoenix city councilman, high-profile department store owner and man-about-the-state. Now, Pulliam backed Pyle again, along with Goldwater, who had clinched the senate nomination virtually unopposed. All supported the candidacy of Dwight Eisenhower for president. In the wake of the Republican convention, the Pulliam press also extended its approbation to vice presidential nominee Richard M. Nixon, long an opponent of Arizona water projects. The *Republic* of July 9, 1952, reasoned, "The Hiss-hunter will help Ike. He is the one who can best dramatize the issue of communist infiltration on the home front. This fact, it seems to us, is more important than Mr. Nixon's opposition to the Central

Arizona Project."

Moreover, by the time of the national conventions, the Republicans had picked up significant support in defections from the Democratic camp. Stephen Shadegg, who had managed Carl Hayden's successful 1950 campaign, now decided to manage the Goldwater campaign even though he had earlier approached Senator McFarland to offer his services. In any case, McFarland's traditional campaign strategies would contrast greatly with Shadegg's, which would bring a modernized, streamlined organizational approach to the campaign along with often vindictive rhetoric. Equally important was the defection of the prestigious Lewis W. Douglas from the Democrats to the Eisenhower-Goldwater-Pyle ticket. Besides Shadegg and Douglas, thousands of fence-sitting "Pinto Democrats" threatened to cross party lines as well.

Senator McFarland, too, had reason to be confident in his chances. As the entrenched U.S. Senate majority leader, he was at the pinnacle of congressional power and his legislative capabilities continued on the rise. He also had the unequivocal support of organized labor, the state branches of which did not support him in the Democratic primaries of 1940 and 1946. Along with this, he could count on the traditional support of agricultural workers, veterans, the rural constituency, and the elderly retired. There were chinks in the Democratic armor, however, most of which could be attributed to the majority leader's perceived tight connection to President Truman, whose popularity ran extremely low over the conduct of the Korean War, the firing of General Douglas MacArthur, and domestic scandals and economic problems. As the national conventions closed in midsummer, the Republicans appeared to be gaining popular support in the U.S. at large as well as Arizona, while the Democratic position appeared increasingly unstable.

With the primaries six weeks away, McFarland, who was unopposed, commenced his campaign in hometown Florence on July 25. By August 22, he had gained momentum, and McFarland Day at Casa Grande proved to be a gala affair for 3,500 people who listened to the strains of Gene Autry's cowboy melodies (including "Cool Water" which he dedicated to the senator) and the

supportive accolades of Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn from Texas.

Goldwater vigorously protested McFarland's reliance on this out-of-state influence, but he too had the support and visits from outsiders such as prominent Republican leaders Albert B. Hermann and Guy Gabrielson, campaign director and chairman respectively for the GOP national committee, and Senators James Duff of Pennsylvania and Robert A. Taft of Ohio, and Congressman Everett Dirksen of Illinois, who had been the first nationally-recognized politician to urge Goldwater to run.

The results of the September 9 primary clearly indicated the popularity of both candidates among their party constituents. While the unopposed McFarland collected 108,992 votes, Goldwater piled up 33,460, outdistancing his nearest rival eleven to one. A post-primary poll of September 23 showed McFarland leading by a firm if less-than-expected forty-nine to forty-five percent. The October issue of *Fortune* magazine acknowledged the incumbent's prestige, experience, and strength, and termed Goldwater's chances "poor."

Barry Goldwater remained unperturbed in his underdog role and commenced a vigorous general election campaign in the family seat of Prescott on September 19. He put McFarland on the defense in his attack on the perceived Democratic deficiencies as listed by the GOP campaign committee: advocating socialism; communist infiltration; corruption; high taxes and prices; and vacillating in the Korean War effort. Specifically, he criticized McFarland's assertive statement that he was one of the four most powerful men in Washington and the implication that the Korean War was a cheap conflict because of the far fewer American casualties than those of the Communists. He had already spoken out against McFarland's use of his own and Lyndon Johnson's franking privileges to mail out his legislative record as placed in the *Congressional Record* of July 5 by Johnson.

Goldwater picked up unexpected support from the traditionally Democratic *Arizona Daily Star* of Tucson, which tendered endorsement and blamed the Democratic party for America's entrance into the three twentieth-century wars. He also welcomed

visitations from presidential candidate Dwight Eisenhower and Wisconsin Senator Joe McCarthy, whom he knew and admired. McCarthy ardently attacked McFarland as a communist sympathizer, and was undoubtedly sensitive to earlier criticism from McFarland who, as majority leader, had been among the first to censure him on the senate floor.

McFarland countered Goldwater's efforts by emphasizing his record and experience, particularly his holding important positions and seniority and his work for veterans and the Central Arizona Project. Along with condemning the bias of Eugene Pulliam's Phoenix newspapers, he also decried the challenger's out-of-state support, highlighting a $4,000 contribution from Texan Howard Hunt and other donations from Texas oilmen. Goldwater outspent McFarland on this campaign by a two-to-one margin with more than half of his money coming from out of state.

McFarland, too, received welcome assistance from big names among Democrats. Along with Sam Rayburn, presidential candidate Adlai Stevenson and Senators Carl Hayden, Robert Kerr (OK), Lister Hill (AL), and Estes Kefauver (TN) visited the state speaking on McFarland's behalf.

The senator toured all fourteen counties with a large entourage in time-honored political tradition. Conversely, Stephen Shadegg and Goldwater concentrated only on the larger urban areas, addressing the rural hinterlands in absentia, using only Burma Shave-type signposts bearing the message: "Mac's for Harry—Harry's all through—you be for Barry—'cause Barry's for you—Goldwater—for Senate." This approach worked for, although the challenger won only five of fourteen counties, he took the major urban enclaves of Phoenix, as expected, and unexpectedly Tucson on his way to a narrow upset victory over Senator McFarland by 132,063 to 125,338.

Barry Goldwater rode to his upset victory on the coattails of both Dwight Eisenhower and Howard Pyle. His margin of victory of 51.4 percent and 6,725 votes, the smallest among Arizona Republicans, lagged far behind Pyle's sixty percent and 53,000 and Eisenhower's 58.4 percent and 44,000 votes. He had also managed to attract an additional 100,000 voters after the primaries, a

five-fold margin greater than McFarland's increase of only 20,000. The votes of Independents and crossover "Pinto Democrats," along with the ongoing influx of new sunbelt residents, mostly from the Republican midwest, accounted for this. Other factors contributing to Goldwater's victory included his own urbane and highly recognized image which appealed to urban and female voters (sales promotions were stepped up in his department stores), an aggressive offensive campaign waged with the modernized organization and strategy of Stephen Shadegg, who revealed himself as a superior, albeit, controversial political tactician, and the party unity and support indicated by such divergent Republican personalities as Eisenhower, Taft, and McCarthy.

Conversely, McFarland was burdened by a divided party and did not benefit appreciably from the visits of leading Democrats. He was hurt by antiquated campaign tactics and organization concentrating equally on the geographically larger but less populated rural areas of the state. Here, he was popular and well known, but he lacked the visual image of and support from the urban areas in which he had never been a resident. Finally McFarland, tied either to the sinking image of Truman or the unknown quantity of Stevenson, was kept on the defensive on the major issues and failed to elicit the support of any major newspapers.

In every respect, it was a political turnover of telling proportions and one which would hold great influence into the distant future. Not only did it return Arizona to a two-party status—not since 1920 had a Republican governor and U.S. senator been elected at the same time, but it also added to the growing resurgence of the conservative wing of the Republican party. From Taft and McCarthy, who both died in the 1950s, conservative leadership passed on to Barry Goldwater and thence to Ronald Reagan. The presidential defeat for this faction in 1964 was offset by the conservative triumph of 1980 and the subsequent election of George Bush to the presidency in 1988 along with Vice President Dan Quayle, Eugene Pulliam's grandson.

Ernest McFarland's defeat in 1952 could little detract from his commendable record over the previous twelve years during which

he proved himself a senate workhorse. His subsequent political comeback and career as Governor of Arizona during the 1950s and Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court in the 1960s lent further credence and commendation to the life of this extraordinary public servant.

TO MR. WILLIAM GREEN[1]

July 15, 1952
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Green:

As you probably know, I am a candidate for reelection to the United States Senate this year.

It has occurred to me that if you consider that my record justifies your support, you might be willing to send Mr. W. C. Hushing to Arizona for approximately thirty days in the latter part of September or the first of October to do some organization work for me there. Mr. Hushing is familiar with our problems in Arizona and would be very helpful.[2]

Thanking you in advance for any consideration you may be able to afford in this matter, and with best regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

MP 134/2

1. President of the American Federation of Labor.

2. Hushing, who chaired the AFL's National Legislative Committee, was sent to aid McFarland's campaign.

PRESS RELEASE[1]

July 1952
Phoenix, Arizona

Addition of Phoenix to live television network service urged by Senator Ernest W. McFarland, Chairman of the communications subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, was approved by the Federal Communications Commission in an order announced this week.

The Arizona capital is slated for the network service via coaxial cable from Los Angeles in time to receive the national political conventions in Chicago in July.

Phoenix is one of several cities that had not been regularly contemplated for addition to the network at this time but the Arizona Senator had strongly urged the action be taken at once.

Phoenix becomes the 65th city thus added to the Bell system nationwide TV network. A joint American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Co. request to the FCC was granted on an emergency basis by the federal commission.

The proposed addition will provide a video channel between Los Angeles and Phoenix over the eastbound protection coaxial cable already in service for telephone use.

The cost of $57,000 includes funds for a receiving terminal at Phoenix and a transmitting terminal at Los Angeles and $36,000 in equalizing equipment.

With the addition of Phoenix service, live television network service will be available to 107 video outlets in 65 cities. Every effort is to be made to have the new service available before the opening of the conventions in Chicago in July.

MP 136/24

1. This press release was hand-labeled "52 Gen." [election] and preceded the opening of the party conventions in mid-July. McFarland took full advantage of Phoenix's entry into the television market by founding Arizona Television Company, KTVK-TV, in 1953.

MEMORANDUM TO MRS. CARMEN DYCHE:
WORK AS MAJORITY LEADER[1]

August 1952
Washington, D.C.

. . . In a recent talk before a group in Tucson, Senator McFarland made the following remarks on . . . legislative-executive relationship:

Another criticism made against Congress in recent years is

that it lacks leadership. It is frequently compared in its disadvantage to the British Parliament where leadership is very highly centralized and very strong. President Wilson was one of the first to make this criticism. Long before he became president he had written a great deal on the subject. He had concluded that the President as the head of the dominant party should assume the party leadership in Congress. This was one reason that he revived the custom which was begun by Washington but never followed by any other President, of appearing in person before Congress to read his important messages.

If the objective is autocratic leadership, then I must admit it is lacking in Congress. There is no one in the House of Representatives or in the Senate who can impose his will upon the Congress. The Senate and the House of Representatives are both composed of rugged individualists. There is however an efficient and effective organization of the parties in both Houses of Congress and substantial party responsibility is recognized. This whole subject of leadership is a very sensitive question in Congress. During the last 20 years, the Congress has been charged with naming leaders who represent the President in Congress and who have been disposed to take their orders from him. . . .

And in my own position of Majority Leader, I certainly was not elected by the support of the President. According to the newspaper reports at the time, Senator O'Mahoney had the support of the President for the majority leadership. However, I want to say to you in frankness that I do not believe that Senator O'Mahoney had it either. My judgment is that Harry Truman recognized that it was a better policy not to actively support either of us. As a matter of fact, in fairness, I may say that the President has never tried to influence or interfere with the organization or procedure in the Senate since I have been in my present position.

My official relationship with the President is based on two broad concepts—my responsibility as party leader and my duties in that post, and my personal views as a senator. I have at all times tried to convey to the President what I deemed to be the views of the majority of the senators in our party. I have done this even when I knew that it did not coincide with the viewpoint

of the President. He has at all times been very courteous and has respected my position. In my personal responsibility as a senator, I have not hesitated to vote to override the veto for the President when I believed that he was wrong. The last veto which the Congress overrode was last year while I was Majority Leader and was the bill increasing pensions and compensations payable to nonservice connected permanently and totally disabled veterans.

MP 51/1

1. Mrs. Dyche is unidentified, and the date of this talk is unknown. For further McFarland comment on the position of majority leader, see the document of April 15, 1952, and the final undated document of Chapter VII.

TELEVISION SPEECH BY FRED IRONSIDE[1]

August 18, 1952
Phoenix, Arizona

To bring this matter of experience into local perspective: As candidates for United States Senator, we have Ernest McFarland as Democratic candidate, and Mr. Barry Goldwater as Republican. In honesty, good character, sincerity, interest in Arizona, and in patriotism—each is the equal of the other.

But from that point on, how different. Mr. Goldwater in matters of politics is quite inexperienced. I do not mean that Mr. Goldwater is inexperienced in "politicking," because in his recent activities and remarks, I see a good deal of plain "garden variety" science of government, especially in federal governmental operations, in national affairs and international problems. True, he has experience of a sort from his relatively brief service as one of the Phoenix City Commissioners and in running Governor Pyle's political campaign. Moreover, he has much public spirit, and he is a dependable sponsor and experienced leader of community charitable and cultural drives. But those experiences obviously would count for little in the Senate of the United States.

Nor do Mr. Goldwater's experiences in owning and running a fashionable department store, automatically qualify him, any more than Senator McFarland's training and experiences would

qualify him to run Goldwater's store. Regardless of desire to do a good job, you could not expect that Senator McFarland's training as a lawyer, his service as a Judge, and his experiences as a Senator and Majority Leader in the United States Senate, his experience and knowledge in the fields of constitutional and administrative law, in the drafting of legislation, in senatorial parliamentary procedure, his ability to get things done for Arizona and Arizonans, his knowledge and understanding of world tensions and problems and their background—you would not expect that to qualify the Senator in fashions for the fashionable or in buying and profitably selling Adrian dresses and John Frederick hats. But that very experience has made him the great and successful advocate of the needs, and the stalwart and skilled defender of the rights of Arizona and of all Arizonans regardless of political affiliations. It has given him the parliamentary experience and congressional respect and standing to obtain the enactment of much meritorious legislation beneficial to the Nation and to Arizona. And that experience has eminently qualified and equipped the Senator to withstand and block the continual, desperate and wily national parliamentary maneuvering of California to move the whole of the Colorado River into California. Because of all that—Arizona's proper interests will be best and most competently served by the reelection of Ernest McFarland to the United States Senate. . . .[2]

MP 135/12

1. Phoenix attorney Ironside presented this address over Station KPHO-TV.

2. A lengthy deletion at the end has been made where Ironside voices his support for Adlai Stevenson over Dwight Eisenhower.

PRESS RELEASE

August 21, 1952
Casa Grande, Arizona

Nearly every Arizona county is planning motor cavalcades to Casa Grande Friday evening when Pinal County stages its mammoth homecoming celebration in honor of Senator Ernest W. McFarland, United States Senate majority leader.

Sam Rayburn, Texas congressman who has earned the name of "Mr. Democrat, U.S.A.," in his long term as Speaker of the House of Representatives, will be the principal speaker. Another nationally known figure sharing in the program is Gene Autry, radio and screen cowboy star and Pinal County cattle ranch operator. He is a close friend of Senator McFarland and will present several of his numbers during the evening.

The event is being held at the Casa Grande High School football stadium and several thousand are expected to attend. Starting out as a homecoming celebration for Senator McFarland, the event has expanded into a gigantic Democratic rally that will be virtually the kickoff of the party campaign pointing to the November elections.

Scores of candidates from all Arizona communities will be introduced, with the speaking program limited to greetings by Pinal County leaders, the response of Senator McFarland, and the address by Speaker Rayburn.

MP 133/13

1. The event described marked the officially announced commencement of McFarland's campaign and was attended by 3,500 people.

FROM LYNDON B. JOHNSON

September 15, 1952
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Harris:

This will hereby authorize Senator Ernest W. McFarland to use my frank in connection with the mailing out of excerpts from the *Congressional Record*.

Sincerely,

Lyndon Baines Johnson Archive; Congressional File,
Container 48, McFarland Folder; LBJL

1. Harris was *Congressional Record* clerk. The excerpt mailed was Johnson's July 5, 1952, summation of McFarland's Senate career (see document of that

date). This use of the franking privilege was criticized by Goldwater, who threatened an investigation but dropped the idea after his victory. McFarland campaign funds paid the cost of printing of this material.

TO SENATOR EARLE C. CLEMENTS
FROM W. P. KENNEDY[1]

September 26, 1952
Hartford, Connecticut

Dear Senator:

As you know, more than six weeks ago I authorized Assistant National Legislative Representative Mr. George W. Nelson to proceed from Washington, D.C., to the State of Arizona which is his official residence, and to work under the direction of Senator Ernest W. McFarland in his campaign for reelection.

Reports reaching me from Senator McFarland and Mr. Nelson indicate that considerable progress is being made in the Senator's campaign fight with Barry M. Goldwater who is the Republican candidate.

We are watching this matter closely as the Brotherhood is vitally interested in Senator McFarland's behalf and I have the assurance that the officers of our Arizona Legislative Board, together with the membership of not only our Brotherhood but the other railroad brotherhoods and organized labor, together with their friends, are all cooperating in bringing out a maximum and overwhelming vote in favor of the Senator in this campaign for reelection.

For your information, Mr. Nelson is a former State Senator from Arizona and has widespread acquaintance in that State and it was my opinion, which was later confirmed by the Senator, that Mr. Nelson would be of considerable assistance in this Arizona fight.

Please continue to keep me posted on any further developments that may occur in connection with the situation in Arizona.

Sincerely yours,

MP 134/3

1. Senator Clements of Kentucky chaired the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. Kennedy was President of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

FROM LEWIS W. DOUGLAS[1]

September 30, 1952
Tucson, Arizona

My dear Mac:

Because of my personal friendship for you I think it only courteous to tell you that for reasons which you may not understand, but which are very persuasive to me, I am going to support Barry Goldwater. It was not an easy decision to make. I hope at least that it will not mar our friendship.

Lewis W. Douglas Papers; Special Collections; UAL
Box 308; File, McFarland, 1952-58

1. A prominent Democrat and copper entrepreneur, Douglas was a former U.S. Congressman from Arizona, Franklin Roosevelt's budget director, and U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain. Douglas also supported Goldwater in 1958. In correspondence of June 16, 1958, to McFarland (Douglas Papers, loc. cit.), he indicated he had supported Goldwater because of Goldwater's tough antilabor domestic stance. He favored McFarland's foreign policy views, but the former outweighed the latter. Douglas also supported Pyle over McFarland for governor in 1954 and considered it a "mistake." He supported McFarland for Governor in 1956.

TO . . .[1]

October 6, 1952
Washington, D.C.

Dear Friend:

You will recall that last year I sent you a copy of the annual summary of the work of the Congress.[2] As an official of a political party, you not only have a right to these facts but I have a duty to report to you what the Congress did. Now I am sending you this year's report, a summary not only of the work of the congressional session recently completed, but including a condensation of the operation of the entire 82nd Congress.[3]

I believe you will find this interesting and informative. By any standards, and regardless of political viewpoint, a study of what has been done will convince anyone that in every field of endeavor—foreign and domestic—we in America are better off than we were four years ago. All of us in Congress know that we alone don't deserve the credit for these accomplishments; they came about because people like yourself worked hard at the local level, knew the problems and issues, and kept us informed and advised of what should be done.

I want you to know that I owe you a lot for your activities in behalf of the party and myself. Your continued determination to see to it that the voters of our State know the facts—all the facts as they are and not as some politicians would like to distort them—will insure a continuation of programs and policies designed to accomplish the greatest good for the greatest number.

Sincerely yours,

MP 51/8
1. This was a cover letter to Arizona Democratic party leaders.
2. See undated document after that of October 23, 1951.
3. The enclosure is not found.

TO FELLOW RAILROAD EMPLOYEES
FROM RAILROAD ORGANIZATION LEADERSHIP[1]

October 14, 1952
Yuma, Arizona

You are probably aware of the fact that all of our Standard Railway Labor Organizations have endorsed the candidacy of Senator Ernest W. McFarland.

We, your elected local union officials, take this opportunity of adding our personal endorsement of Senator McFarland. . . .

The Senator is a valuable servant in Washington, not only for the Railroad people—but for all of Arizona and all of America. Your attention is directed to the fact that he is the Democratic Majority Leader of our entire senate.

Let's not let our endorsement be an idle gesture—let's not forget a good friend—let's not swap national prestige and experience and leadership for some unknown quantity—let's support Senator McFarland, not only with our own Railroad Votes on November 4th, but with all the enthusiasm we can muster between now and election day.

Yours sincerely,

MP 135/14
1. This flyer was marked "mailed to approximately 500 railroad families." A similar document (13 October 1952, MP134/2) from William C. Doherty, President of the National Association of Letter Carriers, indicated strong and continued support from that organization.

TO RESIDENTS:
FROM YUMA COUNTY
COMMITTEE FOR ERNEST W. McFARLAND

October 24, 1952
Yuma, Arizona

Dear Friend:

We know that you, as a citizen of Yuma County, have a genuine interest in the future of our county. We all want to make it a better place in which to live and raise our families. In recent years you have seen Yuma County enter a period of rapid growth, made possible by the work of you and your neighbors and by making the most of our fine opportunities.

One of the men who has done the most to develop Yuma County by opening up new opportunities to us is our own U. S. Senator Ernest W. McFarland. His record of helpfulness to Yuma County has been proved, and because it IS proved, we are proud to support him for reelection.

Farming, of course, is our main industry. May we recall for you just a few examples of how Sen. McFarland has helped us in this respect? All of us remember that it was his bill in Congress which created the great Wellton-Mohawk irrigation project, which at this moment is under construction and due to be

finished in 1957.

With his help, the mighty Davis Dam was built on the Colorado River; and three big generators at Hoover Dam are supplying electric power needed by Yuma County, thanks to Sen. McFarland.

Many of you will recall that we were faced with the loss of the government-owned railroad between Somerton and Yuma, about two years ago. For many years it would have meant losing a million-dollar investment in packing sheds, ice plants and other facilities near Somerton. Because of Sen. McFarland's work, the railroad was NOT destroyed, but was retained and is today serving our Yuma Valley farm area.

So that you may be better acquainted with Sen. McFarland's record, we are enclosing a booklet to freshen your memory on the facts of his outstanding public service.[2]

MP 135/14

1. This flyer was marked "mailed to approximately 8,500 people including everyone in Yuma, Somerton, Gadsden, and Roll. Both Republicans and Democrats were included."

2. See the following document of October 1952.

CAMPAIGN NOTICE
FROM YUMA COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR McFARLAND

October 1952
Yuma, Arizona

Irrigation

McFarland was author and advocate of bills to build and develop Arizona irrigation projects. These include Wellton Mohawk, Davis Dam funds, Arizona electric generators at Hoover Dam, Central Arizona project which was twice passed by two-to-one majorities in the Senate.

Agriculture

He was prominent in fight for fair play for farmers and livestock growers; helped secure guarantee of 90% parity for all basic farm products, and got Arizona long staple cotton included for first time.

Veterans

McFarland was the original advocate of G. I. Bill of Rights for World War II veterans; led successful fights for same benefits for Korean veterans, for terminal leave, for free postage; proponent of combat pay for G.I.'s; a veteran himself, he is unreservedly endorsed by veterans organizations.

Social Security

He sponsored and led, three successful fights for $5 monthly benefit increases for the aged, the blind, the disabled, and dependent children and their mothers; advocated killing "needs clause"; pushed through without tax increase additional monthly payments to retired workers receiving social security insurance.

Indians

McFarland is an outstanding advocate of economic rehabilitation of Indians; author of Navajo-Hopi Rehabilitation Act; obtained needed funds for Papago, Navajo, Hopi people, and Colorado River Indian irrigation development program.

Mining

He is Congressional champion of legislation to aid small mine owners through loans; secured retention of tariff on foreign copper.

National Defense

McFarland was a Pre-Pearl Harbor fighter for stronger defense preparations; leader in effort to boost air force to 143 wings and to build up Army, Navy and Marine Corps to provide balanced defense; advocate of expanding atomic energy weapons as best deterrent to Communist attack.

World Peace

McFarland believes in the United Nations, in buttressing the free world to resist Communism, in building up allies through help and not handouts, in strength and not appeasement as the best insurance for world peace.

McFarland is Arizona's great champion in the Senate. He has the virtually unprecedented record of putting through more than 60 bills bearing his name, many of them vital to Arizona.[1]

MP 135/14

1. For the list of McFarland bills, see document of July 5, 1952, which was placed in the *Congressional Record* of that date by assistant majority leader Lyndon Johnson.

SPEECH:
HELP PIMA COUNTY

October 1952
Tucson, Arizona

Fellow Arizonans:

I would like to direct my remarks chiefly to the people of Tucson and southern Arizona.

Tuesday we will be marking our ballots. I have kept my campaign upon a high plane. On the other hand, I have been subjected to charges which I never dreamed would have been made by an opponent in a campaign.[1]

First, I want you to understand some of the opposition against me in this election. I stated at the outset that I was the number one man the remote control boys had picked out to beat in Arizona. Mr. Dirksen of Illinois is on the strategy board that seeks to beat me. You remember Senator Dirksen who together with Senator Richard Nixon of California were the number one foes of the Central Arizona Project on the floor of the United States Senate. We beat them there—the project bill twice winning Senate approval despite the opposition led by Dirksen and Nixon—and we will beat them next Tuesday in the run off of the remote control versus Arizona control derby.[2]

I am told that thousands of dollars are being poured into Arizona from the outside to beat me. We have the evidence of this by my opponent's own statement filed with the Office of the Secretary of State. One of the outside contributors is one of the richest oil men in the world, Mr. H. L. Hunt of Texas who contributed $3,000. Another is Mr. Corbin Robertson, another oil man from Houston, Texas, for $2,500. I wonder why these Texas oil men are interested in my opponent's campaign. Could it be that these men are interested in someone voting for the tide lands oil bill which would protect their leases?[3]

Then there is a total of $1,500 listed as coming from contributors in California as shown by the statement filed by his [Goldwater's] committee and by himself. All together there has been reported, either by the committee or by my opponent himself, $28,000 in contributions. We can rest assured if there has been that much listed up to date, there will be a much larger sum reported after the campaign is over.[4]

But the worst opposition we have is from these Republican newspapers, two of which are the daily papers in Phoenix, Arizona, which are remotely controlled and operated and which are trying to beat me. But so long as the Democrats have the votes, let these two remotely controlled newspapers go ahead with their propaganda.[5]

Let me recount a few of our accomplishments—monuments all to the faith and the fighting spirits of our fathers: The Social Security Act; old age and survivors insurance; unemployment insurance; collective bargaining; the Securities Acts; the strengthening of the antitrust laws; the establishment of price supports for the protection of the American farmer; and the safeguarding of the bank deposits of our people.

I have mentioned only a part of what has been accomplished. The whole is an imposing record, but there is nevertheless much yet to be done.

I am proud of what we have been able to accomplish for the State of Arizona. We have fought to help our State in every possible way. Some have criticized us because you people here in Tucson and southern Arizona have gotten so much.

First, we have Davis-Monthan Air Force Base . . . let me say that we were able to get this airport for you for nothing. First your city officials were willing to pay $150,000, but I helped secure the passage of an Act in Congress under which Tucson could get this airport which has meant so much to the people here for nothing.

. . . I made the fight to prevent the killing of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which permitted a loan of 75 million dollars for the opening of the San Manuel Mine and the continuation of the work at Silver Belt.

It has also taken an active fight to keep Fort Huachuca open. All of these things mean prosperity to Tucson and this part of our State. . . .

But that is not all. During the last four fiscal years—from July 1, 1948 to June 30, 1952—more than two-hundred and fifty thousand dollars in federal funds have been obtained and spent in Pima County for operation and maintenance of public schools. In addition, in the two-year period ending last June 30, six-hundred and forty-two thousand dollars were appropriated —and spent—for construction at Tucson's Amphitheatre and Sunnyside schools. During the session just adjourned, the Congress appropriated a million and a half more dollars for new construction of schools in Tucson. These funds for schools were—and are—vital to Tucson because of the great population increase brought on by defense activities.

And yet that is not all. During the last ten years there has been a total spent on the highway system of Pima County of approximately four million dollars for county federal aid; and during the year 1951-52, $483,000 on secondary roads; and in fiscal year 1952-53 there is to be expended $580,000; $56,000 federal aid on the East Speedway Road and $4,000,000 for the freeway. An imposing record for Tucson and vicinity which has meant more jobs and better prosperity.

As I have stated before, I am running for United States Senator upon my record. I am proud of my accomplishments. I stand upon my record. I feel very strongly that it is my background that enabled me to have a better understanding of the problems which have confronted our State and our nation.

I was reared on a farm. I had to come up the hard way. I have done everything that there is to do upon a farm. I was forced to work my way through school—clerking in a grocery store, doing janitor work, waiting on tables, and selling life insurance in order to save money. As a matter of fact, doing any type of work that was honorable to get a few dollars which would enable me to continue my education. But I struggled on until I received three degrees—Bachelor of Arts from the University of Oklahoma, Master of Arts and a Juris Doctor's degree from Stanford; and I am

especially proud that our own University of Arizona conferred upon me the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws.[6]

I started out in Arizona as a clerk in the Valley Bank. I have practiced law. I was County Attorney for Pinal County for 6 years; Assistant Attorney General for 2 years; and Judge of the Superior Court of Pinal County for 6 years. I obtained valuable water information as attorney for the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District; and while I was on the bench, I tried cases involving either directly or indirectly most of the water rights in the State of Arizona.

This background of information has been valuable to me in our fight for Colorado River water. The other experience which I obtained has also been valuable in handling mining and other problems.[7]

MP 135/15

1. Essentially, Goldwater charged that McFarland was too closely tied to the Truman administration, which in turn was soft on communism plagued by corruption, scandal, and influence peddling.

2. Illinois Republican Everett Dirkson had defeated former Senate majority leader Scott Lucas in 1950. He was among the first to suggest to Goldwater that he run for Senate in 1952.

3. President Truman, with McFarland's support, vetoed a bill turning over offshore oil resources to individual states, thus retaining the oil under federal control. The Tidelands oil bill was once again scheduled to come up in the new Congress, when it did pass under the Eisenhower administration, turning the oil over to the individual states. Support of Truman's veto marked one of the rare occasions when McFarland broke with close associates Robert S. Kerr of Oklahoma and Lyndon Johnson of Texas.

4. Goldwater outspent McFarland during the 1952 campaign by over a two-to-one margin with more than fifty percent of his campaign contributions coming from out-of-state.

5. Reference is to the "Pulliam Press," the two Phoenix dailies, the morning *Arizona Republic* and the evening *Phoenix Gazette*.

6. He received this degree in 1950 when daughter Jewell received her bachelor's degree.

7. The speech appears incomplete at this point.

FROM LYNDON B. JOHNSON

November 3, 1952[1]
Austin, Texas

TELEGRAM

Your success today is vital to the country and I am confident that you will be reelected. Because of my personal affection for you and my high regard for your ability, I am pulling and praying for you today.

MP, Scrapbook 14

1. On this date Goldwater defeated McFarland by 132,063 to 125,338 votes. Governor Pyle was reelected and Republican John Rhodes defeated John Murdock for the U.S. House of Representatives.

FROM CLAUDE PEPPER[1]

November 6, 1952
Tallahassee, Florida

Dear Ernest:

Mildred [Pepper] and I were inexpressibly shocked to learn that you were defeated in the landslide of Tuesday.[2] You have rendered great and distinguished service to your country and state as Majority Leader and your passing is one of the tragedies of that eventful day.

We wanted you and Mrs. McFarland to know that we were thinking of you and we are very sorry. Warmest regards, and

Always sincerely yours,

MP Scrapbook 14; S

1. Pepper had served in the Senate with McFarland and was in private law practice in 1952. He subsequently was reelected to Congress numerous times, serving in the House until his death in June 1989. Pepper was originally elected to the Senate in 1936.

2. Republicans swept to victory throughout the nation, many like Goldwater "riding Ike's coattails" to victory. The GOP gained control of both houses of Congress for the first time since 1946 and for the last time until the 1994 elections.

FROM SENATOR ED JOHNSON[1]

November 6, 1952
Denver, Colorado

Dear Mac,

Mrs. J. and I are brokenhearted over what happened in Arizona. We could take the rest of the blow but not the loss of good old Mac. It just doesn't seem decent. The Senate will never be the same without you. Your tact, good judgment and needling in which you were so expert made many a difficulty iron out pleasantly. No one else can deal with those wild men who sit on our side of the aisle as could you and keep them half way contented. You had that old touch!

Political careers are not what they are cracked up to be. Too many of them have this kind of an ending. But to heck with all that. We'll be in your corner always. Give my warm regards to the Mrs. and to the daughter.

Affectionately,

MP, Scrapbook 14; H

1. Colorado Democrat, former and future Colorado governor, and member of Senate's "Inner Club."

FROM ERIC JOHNSTON[1]

November 6, 1952
Washington, D.C.

Dear Edna and Mac:

It was good to talk to you last night, Senator. I tried yesterday to write you a letter, but it was difficult, and after talking to you, it is much easier. I am glad, very glad, that you are not bitter. . . .

I realize that perhaps what I am going to say in this letter will appear to you as premature, coming so soon after this campaign. It is easy to want to go away, to forget, to hide. But no responsible man or woman can do this and keep his conscience quiet. We owe our neighbors and our country our best efforts always, and never was this more true than in times like these.

First, therefore, about yourself and your future. You are a

young man yet. To assume that your public life is at an end is, in my judgment, a negative decision. You have never been a negative man; you are a doer; a creative influence; a man of vigor and action. I suggest that you think of the future. Let us think a little —Carl Hayden's term ends in four years. He is very unlikely to try again. If you were to remain in Arizona and participate actively in public and private affairs, it is my judgment that you would ride into office with a huge outpouring of votes by a grateful people who will have realized their mistake long before that time. You owe yourself—and your friends and supporters—that sort of vindication.

In any event, I urge you not to make any decision or take any action that closes that door, or forecloses any further freedom of action. I suggest, for example, that in the next 20 days, you send out a letter. . . . It could be franked since its primary purpose is public business—you are telling the people of Arizona that you intend to turn over pertinent files and memoranda to your successor, so that they can be better served. But it does more than that—it tells them that you are not bitter or vindictive; that you are a good loser and a big man; that you will continue to work and fight for the best interests of the State and its people. You have nothing to lose by sending such a letter, and very very much to gain.

My second point relates to the national picture. You are an important figure in the national Democratic party. You can, by inaction, by dropping out, by taking no interest or action, lose that position. But that would not be fair either to yourself, nor to your many close friends in the national party.

I know that right now they need you, your wise counsel, your leadership, your ability to bring diverse minds together. Let us consider what the problems are. First and foremost, there is the leadership. It is of the greatest consideration now that we are in the minority. An effective leadership of a united party would do more to restore the Democratic party nationally and in the South than any other single thing. I remember well when Pat Harrison was leader, how he goaded and ridiculed the majority to distraction. This time, the opportunities are manifold since the policies

of the President and the policies of the Taft group will vary widely on a hundred matters, and a big knife can be driven between them by adroit leadership.[2] The question is—who should be leader. The plain facts are that there is a substantial group of very bitter Democrats coming back here—men like Gillette, Hunt, Fulbright will and I am told feel just as strongly as do the ultra-liberals of the Douglas-Humphrey-Lehman school that the party has been let down by some of your friends like McCarran and Russell. There will be a drive to elect Sparkman leader, and if it succeeds, there will be a wide schism in the Democratic party in the Senate.[3]

It seems to me that this is where Lyndon Johnson must be considered. Lyndon's political life is at stake; he cannot join the apostate Democrats . . . even if he wanted to. They are out to get him. And if the Democratic party in the Senate plays. . . it is going to allow the Republican party in Texas and the South to be built up on the ashes of the Democratic party. Many people think that Lyndon would be the logical choice as leader, not alone because of his experience as whip, but more important because he is enough of a liberal to satisfy the liberals and at the same time stands as a token of the reorganized Democratic party which intends to be a Democratic party and not an apostate party made up of men who openly supported the Republican party. Lyndon's only hope two years from now is to head a vigorous and driving Democratic leadership which will so embarrass and expose this hydra-headed Republidixicrat party, that the people will return to their common sense. I have confidence that in less than two years the people of this country will learn that they made a fearful mistake, but it is unwise politically to merely assume this will happen; it must be exposed and shown at every opportunity.

I am told that both Dick Russell and Lyndon Johnson will be back here early next week. I also understand that Dick will support Lyndon, although I believe that if this becomes known publicly it could hurt Lyndon badly. I know that your feeling is to do nothing now—to rest. But I ask you to consider the merit of coming back here a little earlier since you have to come back to put things in order in your office and make arrangements about your

house. I know that your friends like Lyndon and Dick will appreciate it. Moreover, and far more important, it will keep you a vital factor in the affairs of the party and the Senate. You would not be butting in; they want you and need you and your help. There are many others who will be coming back early for the very simple reason that there are important matters to be considered before Jan. 3. There are other reasons why you personally should be back here; it would not hurt you that it became known that you have been consulted not only by people in your own party, but, for example, perhaps the President-elect [Eisenhower]. After all, you know him and he you, for some years. It is entirely possible that he may want to remember you for some special mission that may come up in the future, where you could serve your country. . . .[4]

MP, Scrapbook 14; S

1. Johnston was President of the Motion Picture Association of America, Inc.

2. Pat Harrison of Mississippi, Senator from 1919-41, was never actually minority leader, but he capably assisted (often as acting party leader) Oscar Underwood of Alabama and Joseph Robinson of Arkansas while they were minority leaders during the Republican majority of 1921-33. With the Republican victories of 1952, Robert A. Taft of Ohio became majority leader and served in that capacity until his death in July 1953 when he was succeeded by William Knowland. Knowland served until the Democratic majority of 1955 when Lyndon Johnson took over as majority leader.

3. Senators Guy Gillette (IA), Lester Hunt (WY), and J. William Fulbright (AK) were all considered conservatives, while Paul Douglas (IL), Hubert Humphrey (MN), and Herbert Lehman (NY) headed the liberal faction of the Democratic party. Pat McCarran (TN) and Richard Russell (GA) ranked among the Democrats' senior members in the Senate, and the liberal, Southerner John Sparkman (AL) would have difficulty in pulling together the disparate wings of the party.

4. See document of November, 20, 1952. McFarland exerted all of his influence, calling all but an unspecified three Democratic senators and urging them to assist Lyndon Johnson's selection to the minority leadership. As Eric Johnston predicted, Lyndon Johnson became recognized as the most powerful majority leader in senate history.

FROM TATS KUSHIDA[1]

November 8, 1952
Los Angeles, California

Dear Senator McFarland:

It is difficult to express the dismay of your many supporters and admirers outside of your state at the outcome of the election, and I know how painful it has been to your supporters and particularly our chapter in your state. We do wish to commend you for the fine campaign which you conducted and to reaffirm the appreciation and gratitude of Japanese Americans throughout the nation for your outstanding support of measures to eliminate restrictions against them. I am sure you can count on them among your many constant supporters. . . .

Very sincerely,

MP, Scrapbook 14; S

1. Kushida was Southern California Regional Director for the Japanese American Citizens League.

FROM JOHN C. STENNIS[1]

November 8, 1952
DeKalb, Mississippi

Dear Ernest:

Characteristic of the way you have always taken things in stride, I know you will adjust yourself to this unfortunate and, to my mind, tragic turn of political events. In my book, you have been the greatest Roman of them all, and the greatest casualty of the elections.

Your leadership in the Senate has been outstanding. You are neither the prima donna type nor the scintillating type, but real, honest down-to-earth solid, sound leadership was what you furnished us, and I was so glad to see you acclaimed as such at the end of your two-year tenure there. Magazines, newspapers and newsmen who were critical of you in the beginning were almost unanimous in giving you a splendid verdict of approval at the end of your two short years. This was not an act of generosity on

their part, but was based on absolute merit.

We shall long remember and the nation shall long be indebted to you for your fine services in the Senate.

Keep your chin up now out there in that great West and the tide will turn, and I believe will sweep you back into public service. I want you to bear in mind that if there is ever anything I can possibly do in which you are interested, I shall not only gladly do it, but cheerfully and most willingly.

With fond good wishes and with great esteem, I am most sincerely your friend,

MP, Scrapbook 14; S

1. Mississippian John Stennis was elected to the Senate in 1946 and served without break until his retirement in January 1989. He thus equaled Carl Hayden's record of serving seven consecutive terms and forty-two years in the U. S. Senate. Hayden, however, also served fourteen consecutive years in the House before his senate election, thus retaining a congressional record for longevity.

FROM HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

November 8, 1952
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mac:

It is difficult for me to find words to express my great disappointment at your defeat in Arizona. I am sure it is no reflection on you and your valuable service to your state and the nation. We simply faced an avalanche and could not stop it.

Good luck to you, Mac. I do hope we will have many opportunities to work together. You have a great deal to contribute to our country. You have been a good friend of mine and I appreciate it.

Sincerely yours,

MP, Scrapbook 14; S

FROM WALTER P. MARSHALL[1]

November 11, 1952
New York, New York

Dear Senator McFarland:

May I take this occasion to tell you how keenly all concerned in the welfare of the nation's telegraph system will feel your absence from the next Congress?

Your comprehensive knowledge of the problems of the industry and courageous approach in seeking their solution have been of immeasurable aid in preserving and strengthening this vital part of the nation's economy.

The nation, as well as the industry, will miss your wise and statesmanlike counsel.

My sincere good wishes to you, in all your future undertakings, for the success and happiness you have so richly merited.

Sincerely,

MP, Scrapbook 14; S

1. President of Western Union. In 1953 McFarland became attorney representing Western Union, RCA, and ITT. He continued to work for cooperation and improvements in the communications industry until he became Governor of Arizona in 1955.

TO THE PEOPLE OF ARIZONA[1]

November 20, 1952
Washington, D.C.

Dear Friend:

The people of Arizona are entitled to the most effective representation possible in Washington. The problems of our State and our people in these times are of transcendent importance; they far outweigh personal considerations or partisan politics.

I think you will want to know that it is my purpose and desire to aid our State in every way possible. The most important problem confronting Arizona is the continuation of our fight for Colorado River water to its successful conclusion. In order to be of every possible assistance, I am making my files (which have now

become voluminous) available to the Arizona Interstate Stream Commission and its counsel who will, of course, assist our Congressional delegation.

As for myself, I shall be forever grateful to the people of this State for the honors they have accorded me. I am not unmindful that I owe them, just as every decent citizen owes his neighbor, a constant interest in their welfare. I shall continue to make my home in Florence and to participate actively in public affairs, giving to the best of my ability of my experience and such knowledge as I have of public affairs.

To those who supported me in the campaign, I desire to convey my sincere thanks and appreciation; to all the people of my State, my affection for the trust and confidence they always have given me, and I hope I shall continue to earn their respect and good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

MP, Scrapbook 14

1. This constituted McFarland's cover letter to all Arizona voters after his defeat. This particular copy had been mailed back to the senator's office by John L. Sweeney of Winslow on December 1 with the short recommendation "We want you to run for Governor of Arizona in two years, you can win hands down; think this over." McFarland did just that. See also the document of November 6 from Eric Johnston.

FROM ROBERT S. KERR[1]

December 9, 1952
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ernest:

. . . I have not only enjoyed working with you in the past, but I expect to enjoy working with you in the future. I tried to get in touch with you while in Washington, but could not reach you. I sincerely hope I can visit with you sometime this month, if not, early in January. There are a lot of things in which we are both interested and I expect to keep in close contact with you. I hope you will do the same with me. . . .

MP, Scrapbook 14; S

1. Senators Kerr and Russell (see following document) were instrumental in securing McFarland's majority leadership. Kerr had known McFarland since they had attended East Central Normal School together in Ada, Oklahoma, in 1913-15.

FROM RICHARD RUSSELL

December 13, 1952
Winder, Georgia

Dear Mac:

Thank you for your note.[1] Such pleasure as I have found in serving in the Senate will be greatly diminished because you will not be there as our leader in January.

I can only hope that I will have the pleasure of seeing you and Edna from time to time. You must visit with us, as well as give us the benefit of your counsel when you are not in Washington. . . .

MP, Scrapbook 14; S

1. Presumably a note thanking Russell for his concern over the election defeat.

SPEECH[1]

December 29, 1952
Honolulu, Hawaii

Forty days, the length of time spent on our trip, is a short time in which to go around the world—too short for one to derive much pleasure from the trip. But if you really work hard, you can gain an impression of what the people of other nations are thinking. This of course must supplement previous studies.

As I stated, forty days is a short time to circle the globe, and fifteen or twenty minutes is equally as short a time in which to relate one's impressions.

As you know, our trip was made during the latter part of November and December. I shall not attempt to make a physical description of the countries we visited, but would like to talk to you about the people and their problems.

England was our first stop. I have spent more time in England than in any other foreign country, and I was most anxious to see to what extent the people there have been able to adjust themselves to present conditions. The English people are proud and do not like to admit their need of help from any country. Talk to them, and I believe they are sincere when they tell you they do not want aid; they want the opportunity to earn the money to pay their own way. So, when a public official of our country, or a private citizen, makes a statement which even by inference refers to England as a "give me" nation, it hurts their pride and does not help our relations with them. The real question is whether the approximately 50 million people of Great Britain, living on islands smaller in area than our State of Arizona, can ever expect to have a prosperous nation under present conditions.

Today, eight years after VE day, they still have some food rationing—meat, fats and sugar. For example, they are allowed one shilling's worth of meat a week. While meat is subsidized at about half the price it is here, think of living on fourteen cents worth of meat a week—one scant meal. The British are historic meat eaters, and while they live on a balanced diet, they don't like it any more than we would, but I daresay they bear it better than we would.

The British Empire as such is gone. Where are they to go? Well, my advice would be for two-thirds of the people to go to Canada, Australia and Africa, but will they do it? It's hard for people to leave their homes. We have an example of this in Arizona in the Navajo Indians.

I would like to talk more about England, but we must move along if we are to circle the globe in fifteen minutes. So, we take the plane for Denmark, Norway and Sweden. As you look at the people in the streets of these countries, you cannot help but be impressed by their overall resemblance to Americans. But, why shouldn't they, when so many of our own people are descendants of the people of these nations. And let me say, it is these connections with the people in the home land that keep our relations so friendly.

These countries have made a rapid recovery. Sweden is in

better shape than the others because she was not involved in either of the World Wars. Denmark, as you know, is a flat country, dependent largely upon agriculture. There are a great number of cooperatives in Denmark; practically 40 percent of the people are members; one farmer may belong to several—one to take care of eggs, one for pork and beef, and another for the purchase of products. However, they do not depend entirely upon cooperatives; they are competitive with other markets. One of the interesting features of their pig raising is that every one is slaughtered exactly 200 days after it is born. This accounts for the uniform size of the Danish hams.

Norway and Sweden are dependent to some extent upon agriculture, but chiefly upon shipping, timber, fishing, iron and steel.

All three of these nations are so dependent upon trade and their economy so interlocks with adjoining nations that when the economy of one is down it affects all. England needs agricultural products from Denmark and other products from Norway and Sweden, but she has to sell textiles and other manufactured products in order to buy. The same is true of Germany and other adjoining nations. The breaking of the near markets for butter has caused Norway recently to make a contract with Russia. So, it must be remembered that in these countries as well as others any proposed changes in foreign policy are measured largely by the effect they will have on their trade.

We next went to Germany. Because of time, I will talk chiefly of Berlin. The people in West Germany are very friendly to the United States. They know what it is to live under Russian rule, as they had a taste of that before our troops arrived. Our visit to the East Sector proved most interesting. Pictures of Stalin and other Soviet officials were in abundant display on buildings and other prominent locations, as was Soviet propaganda which was interpreted to us. The atmosphere of East Germany is altogether different than that of West Germany. You can tell by the expressions on the faces of the people that they are restrained in their actions and thoughts, and that they are friendly toward us. I can readily understand how this restraint was broken in the recent riots. We visited one of the refugee camps; we saw men, women and chil-

dren coming into that camp with their possessions all on their backs. They were coming in at the rate of 500 a day because the other crossing lines were being closed by the Russians. Since that time I have read that they have increased to as many as 2,800 in one day. These people are given shelter until they are screened. If it is found that they left the East Sector because of threats upon their lives, they are flown to West Germany. About 60 percent are in this category. The remainder may remain in West Berlin and get jobs there, or they may return to East Germany. As a German friend whom I first met when I visited Germany in 1929 put it, "You need have no fear of Germany going Communistic, as the refugees have educated the people as to what Communism is like."

Switzerland, like Sweden, is in better shape than the other countries because she was not involved in the World Wars. In France, it is another story of regulated economy, lack of stable government, and inflation. I asked a prominent French businessman the question, "Why is it that your country, once so proud and able to cope with any situation, now finds herself in the condition she is in today?" He replied, and rather dramatically, "We lost one million men in World War One and over a million in World War Two—it took the cream—we no longer have the men with the guts it takes to solve these problems."

Summarizing the opinion of these sections of Europe, all were anxious about what the United States may do. They were afraid of a new policy which might involve them in a third World War. They are tired of war, and for this reason it has taken time to build up their morale and to where they are willing to do the things necessary to defend themselves.

A much different atmosphere of course prevails in Spain. There is much room for improvement; you see them using the same wooden plow used in the time of Christ, changed only by the addition of a steel point; irrigating from wells with horse drawn pumps of rotating buckets. It would be difficult to determine what the people really are thinking in such a dictatorship, but it is very evident that they would rather endure this than go through the bloodshed of another civil war.

From Spain, we went through North Africa and then to Italy.

In Italy, they have made rapid strides toward recovery, but still have their problems in combating Communism. Our aid has materially helped the people, and I was agreeably surprised at the change I noted in this country since my last visit in 1945, shortly after VE Day. Conditions also have improved in Greece and Turkey.

Our political situation in the Near East is most critical; we are truly on a powder keg there. An embargo against travel and trade between the Arab countries and Israel is in existence. Had it not been for the help of representatives of our Embassy in Greece, TWA would not have taken us to Egypt because we had an Israel visa in our passport. In Egypt the people are friendly enough, but they want to know which side we are going to take in their fight with Britain over the control of the Suez Canal. A depression exists, due largely to the drop in the price of cotton because of the failure of Britain to buy since their dispute over the Canal.

However, our main problem in the Near East has arisen because of the conflict between Israel and the Arab countries. When we visited Israel, they did not hesitate to tell us that they had been willing to accept the boundaries established by the United Nations; that it was the Arabs who had refused; and now they are unwilling to give up their gains. They were going about the establishment of a capital in Jerusalem, which the United Nations had designated as an international city. Old Jerusalem and the Holy land is in Jordan, where once you could go from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, a distance of nine miles, by the old road, in a few minutes. This highway is now cut by the new boundary, and it takes about an hour of winding around over a new road to make the trip.

I can best summarize the feeling of the Arab countries, such as Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, and Iraq, by what was said at a dinner in Beirut, Lebanon. . . . One of the Members of Parliament stated that they would have had their problems settled already had the people of the United States not furnished arms for the Israelites; and when confronted with the Israelites' statement that they had been willing to accept the boundary lines which had been drawn by the United States, the Lebanese officials immediately replied that they had been influenced by the Zionists in the

States. Senator Guy Gillette (D-IA) told them that the big thing was for all of us first to work against the common enemy, the Communists, and then find a solution to the problems there. They stated that their immediate problem was Israel; that Israel would continue to try to expand her border lines; that Israel was their real enemy, not Russia; that we talk about Russia being so bad, but that it hasn't been long since the United States was in bed with her when they were in difficulty. As a further example of the bitter feeling that exists on both sides, I would like to relate a little incident which took place at the airport in Jordan when we were leaving for Beirut. We were held up in crossing the airfield because of the arrival of a plane. We talked to a young man who was a guard, and asked if that were his home. He told us that it was not; that his home was in Palestine; that it had always been his home and that they would return, whether it be in a day, a year, or a hundred years—it still would be his home.

As another example of the feeling which exists in the near and Middle East, we drove by automobile from Beirut to Damascus, Syria. We were held up an hour at the border because of our Israel visa, which delayed us an hour in keeping a dinner engagement, and again had it not been for our Diplomatic Service, we would not have gotten through. One lady told me that because she had visited Israel first, she would not ever have been able to visit the Arab countries had she not stuck the pages of her passport together so they couldn't see her Israel visa.

I believe these problems can be solved, but it will take a firm hand and we will have to try to do equity to both sides. The Arab would want definite assurance that the boundary lines of Israel would not be expanded and, of course, the Israelite would likewise want concessions. There is room for development of natural resources there which would take care of the many displaced persons you see in both Israel and the Arab countries. This is particularly true of Iraq, where a riot had taken place just before our arrival.

I hope that I have given you some insight into the problems which confront us, particularly in the Arab countries. They were friendly toward us personally, but there is a definite feeling against

the United States, and it hinges chiefly on this one question.

Next we visited Pakistan. There we found a different attitude toward the United States—they are very friendly. I flew over some of their irrigation projects in a small plane and saw their farming activities. Incidentally, most of the cotton there is sown, so they get little yield. However, I found one farmer who cultivates his cotton in rows just as we do and gets a similar yield to ours in Arizona.

From Pakistan we flew to India. It would be most difficult, if not impossible, to describe India in just a few words. They have many problems and there, again, you find many displaced persons. For instance, they have taken absolute possession of the railroad stations, which are so crowded that you can hardly get through an aisle. They sleep on the floors of the waiting rooms and in the hallways, and vendors have even set up small shops to sell their wares. The poverty of India is indescribable. We took a train from Calcutta to a small town where Mrs. McFarland's sister is a missionary. The trip was certainly an experience. We travelled at night, but even going by Pullman you have to take your own bedroll, and their first class Pullman service is crude indeed.

I attended a luncheon given by American businessmen in Calcutta, and learned from them that Ambassador Chester Bowles[2] was very popular and was doing a good job because he had come to India and put himself and his family on the level of the people. And this opinion was expressed by Democrat and Republican alike. The reforms in India, as in most other nations, will have to come from within.

From India we took the BOAC Comet to Bangkok, Thailand. It took us approximately 2 1/2 hours to make the flight from Calcutta to Bangkok in this jet plane, whereas the ordinary flight takes about double that time. . . .

Thailand is a beautiful country and it is most interesting and enjoyable to take a boat trip along the canals which are the main thoroughfares of Bangkok. The people there did not seem to be much worried about the Communists taking over their country. I suppose they have become accustomed to the threat.

From Bangkok we flew to Hong Kong. Our visit there was

most interesting, and I became acquainted with some of the Chinese merchants who were refugees from China. Most of the people with whom I talked in Hong Kong wanted to know of me what would happen to Hong Kong in the event of war. They seemed to be living in fear that a third World War would break out, and expected that Hong Kong would be the first to be taken over by the Communists. A Chinese merchant with whom I made acquaintance through a friend, and who was a refugee from Shanghai, had built a beautiful cotton mill in Hong Kong, which I visited. But already he was investigating the possibilities of building a cotton mill in Brazil because of his fear that he would also have to leave Hong Kong. From my inquiries of these Chinese people and of a Catholic priest who had just come from a place above Shanghai, I derived this opinion: that the Chinese people were dissatisfied with the Communist rule, but were afraid to act and would not do so unless they had some assurance of help from the States because otherwise they felt they would lose and would be put to death. Incidentally, the British businessmen with whom I talked in Hong Kong were convinced they cannot do business with the Communists, which is a different attitude to that which they formerly held.

We left Hong Kong on Christmas Eve for Japan, arriving in Tokyo Christmas morning. I immediately took a plane for Korea in order to spend Christmas Day and eat Christmas Dinner with our own Arizona boys on the front. I was happy to have the opportunity to visit with our American troops, and especially to talk with many of our Arizona boys stationed there.[3]

I flew over the front lines in a helicopter. It was cold at that time and I learned first hand what the Korean fighting is like. I want to say that the morale of our men was good. I was agreeably surprised with the Korean people. They are a better looking people than I had expected to find and their morale was good. They were determined. I was told by General Van Fleet and others, who expressed very high regard for President Syngman Rhee, that the Roks [Republic of North Korea soldiers] were good fighters. They of course occupied most of the front line. They now have 16 divisions to our six Army divisions and one Marine division. At the time I was there, they had eleven divisions on the front line and we had three, and just at that time the Roks were in the process of moving up another division, to make a total of twelve on the front line.

So it is understandable why Syngman Rhee has held out for so long. General Van Fleet stated that he had no choice other than the action he took in the release of the prisoners. In defending President Rhee, he stated, "I have great sympathy for Rhee and his people. I don't think Rhee could have taken any action other than he has. We encouraged the enemy to surrender with the promise that none would be forced to return to the Reds against their will."[4]

Now that we have a truce, only history will tell whether it will bring about the peace which we so much desire. There are those who claim that had we held out with a firmer hand the Chinese would have had to give in; that a drought has prevailed in China and that economic conditions are bad; that Russia is having her troubles behind the iron curtain and a cease fire on their part was very desirable; that Russia has moved herself into an uncanny, and for us an uncomfortable, position on the international chess board—by making peaceful noises she can slow down the production line in Detroit and stop the New York banker from lending money; she is also able to produce a similar result in Europe. Thus, she holds at the present time the advantage of disrupting the economies of the rest of the world. History says that this is indeed a fine advantage, for populations overthrow governments because of poverty, taxes and want, and seldom care what takes the place of chaos. There are those who believe that she wanted a truce in Korea to lull us into a sense of false security so that we will let down in our defense efforts.

Our top military men estimated back in 1951 that the summer of next year would be the time when the Soviets would have enough long range planes, submarines and atomic bombs to seriously cripple if not destroy the United States in an all-out air, submarine and atomic attack against this country.

I know that it has been a difficult decision for the President to make. I am not of course on the inside and do not know what our

intelligence tells us at this time. Nor would time permit a discussion of these subjects. But let me say this: We must not falter now that we have mounted the steed of leadership; we must ride it into the future. We must solve this Korean situation and at the same time we must cultivate peaceful markets in the big population centers of the world, or Russia will. We will do these things if we expect to remain a strong nation. We must not let down our guard. We must be prepared to meet any and all emergencies both militarily and economically.

Mrs. McFarland remained in Tokyo over Christmas, as she was not permitted to go to Korea, and I rejoined her there on my return. I found that the Japanese people have made rapid strides toward recovery since 1946 when I was there. The people were happy and grateful to us for permitting them to run their own government and for our assistance in so many ways. However, the one difficult thing for them to understand is why we now want them to rearm when at first we talked so much against militarism.

My time is up; we must take the plane back home. It is a long flight, and the biggest ocean I have ever flown![5]

MP 160/7

1. See note 5.

2. McFarland was one of Bowles's staunch supporters during his Senate confirmation hearings earlier in the 82nd Congress.

3. The material following this note and going on until note 5 was inserted for later speeches. He did not speak in detail on his Korean visit during the Hawaii speech because the war was still ongoing.

4. South Korean President Syngman Rhee released North Korean prisoners of war but did not force them to return to their homeland where they feared communist persecution. North Korea wanted their forced return and the incident help up armistice negotiations for much of June 1953. James Andrew Van Fleet had replaced Matthew Ridgeway as commander of the 8th U.S. Army in April, 1951 when Ridgeway replaced MacArthur in overall command.

5. The speech is not labeled as to date or place. It is on the basis of this statement that the editor placed the speech in Honolulu on the return trip. The complete itinerary of this circumnavigation of the globe via Pan American World Airways is as follows: Nov. 20—depart Washington for New York and New York for London; 21—brief stop in Shannon, Ireland, and land in London; 23—to Oslo, stopping enroute at Copenhagen (while in Oslo, a trip to Helsinki was

cancelled due to inclement weather); 24—to Stockholm; 26—to Frankfort and to Berlin; 28—to Bonn; 29—to Geneva and return to Bonn; 30—to Brussels; Dec. 1—to Paris; 3—to Madrid, visiting Lisbon enroute; 5—to Rome, visiting Algiers and Tunisia enroute; 7—to Istanbul; 9—to Athens and thence to Cairo; 11—to Jerusalem; 13—to Beirut; 14—to Bagdad, visiting Damascus enroute; 15—to Karachi; 16—to Calcutta (from Calcutta, the party visited smaller interior Indian towns, including one in which Edna McFarland's sister taught at a missionary school); 19—to Bangkok; 21—to Hong Kong, visiting Singapore enroute;

24-25—to Tokyo (upon arriving in Tokyo, McFarland left his wife Edna and immediately made an unscheduled flight to Korea where he observed the front lines and celebrated Christmas dinner with the GI's. He then returned to 28—to Honolulu; 29-30—to Los Angeles and thence to Phoenix; 31—to Washington, D.C.