September 6, 1947

My dear Mr. Harris:

I think I must have been a little careless or perhaps I took it too much for granted that anyone reading my recent column on the Taft-Hartley Bill would have read my previous columns on this subject. In those I made my position very clear as to the need for labor to clean house - the AFOE to get rid of its racketeers, the CIO to get rid of its communist leaders.

I do not want communists leading our labor unions and the majority of the labor people do not want them either, but that to my mind does not justify setting labor apart as a group that must give certain assurances. From my point-of-view that is not the American way of doing things. We should all have to do it, or we should not expect any particular group to do it.

I know quite well that it was against the law to dismiss employees for union membership but there were many ways which were used to dismiss people and though that was not the reason given, it was the real reason and you know
this as well as I do,

I do not think that two wrongs make a right and I think abuses on the part of unions and on the part of management should both be condemned.

Labor is responsible for the passage of the Taft-Hartley Bill because of its failure to clean house, but that does not make the Taft-Hartley Bill perfect nor does it absolve us from stating why we think it is wrong.

I know that contributions made by the employer are made under agreements and I think these agreements should be lived up to and they have been in the past. If agreements are made whereby money will go into certain things, there is no reason why the trade unions' books should be open for examination than why management's books should not be open to the trade unions for examination. It should be turn and turn about and equal handed justice for all.

Very sincerely yours,
this as well as I do.

I do not think that two wrongs make a right and I think abuses on the part of unions and on the part of management should both be condemned.

Labor is responsible for the failure of the Taft-Hartley Bill because of its failure to clean house, but that does not make the Taft-Hartley Bill perfect nor does it absolve us from stating why we think it is wrong.

I know that contributions made by the employer are made under agreements and I think those agreements should be lived up to and they have been in the past. If agreements are made whereby money will go into certain things, there is no reason why the trade union's books should be open for examination than why management's books should not be open to the trade unions for examination. It should be turn and turn about and equal-handed justice for all.

Very sincerely yours,
August 28, 1947

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt  
c/o New York World Telegram  
125 Barclay Street  
New York City

Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I wish to take issue with you as to some of the statements in your column "Nobody's Business" as reported in the New York World Telegram on August 25, 1947.

You object to labor leaders being compelled to declare themselves communists and state "we had better do the same for the heads of business." Since communists are certainly the enemies of democracy, we certainly ought to list those enemies where those communists are labor union leaders or business leaders. If there were any danger at the present time or if there is any such danger that business leaders are dangerous to democracy either as communists or facists, they should certainly be listed.

You also object to the Taft-Hartley Act limiting the union's right to expel members to the ground of non-payment of dues and claim that management has dismissed employees because of union membership. Certainly under the Wagner Act and the other government regulations, management has been prevented from dismissing "employee of union membership." This limitation on management's powers was quite proper because of the abuse of management of its powers. Your illustration is obviously not in point because management does not have the power you claim. You claim in effect that because y wrong is allowed, therefore, x wrong should be allowed, but y wrong is punished. To continue your analogy, x wrong (abuse by unions) should be punished. In addition one would expect you to take the position that all wrong should be punished wherever found and if certain wrongs are not punished, that should be no reason for permitting other wrongs to the unpunished.

You claim that it is an "infringement of our liberties, to set up for a union, in the matter of health and welfare funds, restrictions for the administration of these funds." Then you state the employer contributes toward them, but he contributes in order that his employees may be able to accomplish through their organization the things that they desire. Your statement just is not so. The contributions made by the employer are made under agreements which
provide that the money is to be used for certain specific purposes and the union has agreed to apply the funds for the specific purposes. Employers have always objected being blackjacked into paying funds into union treasuries which may be used for any purpose whatsoever determined by the union membership or by the union officials who have achieved control of union treasuries. The only "infringement of our liberties" is the infringement of violation of contract. If the union membership should contribute its own funds to a union fund and give the union officials complete liberty of disposal of the funds, then the employers and even the union membership might not be privileged to object, but when employers contribute funds for specific purposes, it is certainly an infringement upon the liberties of the employers to be deprived of the right of compelling the unions to abide by their express agreements.

Very truly yours,

AH:IB

ALBERT HARRIS
MRS. R. M. HARRIS  
120 SOUTH CHURCH STREET  
JACKSONVILLE, ILLINOIS  

May 27, 1947

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt  
29 Washington Square West  
New York, N. Y.

My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

At the time of your husband's death I intended sending you this brief tribute, given by my husband at a memorial service held in the Episcopal Church in Willmar, Minnesota. Not having sent it then, I thought that now, since you met the Rev. Mr. Harris in Jacksonville, you might be interested in having a copy of his address.

Your letter came yesterday to Ed. Horton, our head acolyte. He was thrilled to receive it, and plans to have a photostat made, since the other three acolytes also want copies.

My husband and I were both honored to have met you and only wished we might have had the opportunity for more of a visit with you.

Most sincerely yours,

Dorothy M. Harris
MEMORIAL ADDRESS

in honor of the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt
delivered in St. Luke's Church, Willmar, Minnesota, on Saturday, April 14, 1945,
by the Rev. R. M. Harris, Rector

We have come together at this time to pay our tribute of respect and affectionate esteem to the honored memory of a great soul—a commanding international character.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt was even more than President of the United States. He has become to all the world a symbol of the ideals of our American Democracy.

There have been many among us who disagreed with some of his policies from time to time, but over and above that, we shall always remember his gracious personality, his friendly smile, his warm heart, the genius of his statesmanship, as he guided his ship of state through perilous times.

Because he was a man, and subject to all the frailties of human nature, he did make mistakes, which he himself admitted; but in this hour, friends and critics alike are bound together as one people in a common sorrow and a common sympathy—for a great American has passed away.

President Roosevelt was a man of ideals. He believed in God, and in the Divine Sovereignty in all departments of human life. He believed in the rights and privileges of the common man. He believed in social justice for all as it is embodied in that famous precept: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." He believed in international justice and mutual cooperation which are motivated by belief in the universal brotherhood of man.

For those principles and for poises among men he lived and fought and died. May the spirit of this great American live on in the hearts of his countrymen; and may his ideals be born in every nation's heart.

"May the soul of Franklin Delano Roosevelt now rest in peace; and may light perpetual shine upon him."
May 19, 1947

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
Apt. 6A, 29 Washington Square West
New York 11, New York

Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

Thank you so much for sending me the letter from Mrs. McVey concerning the possible appointment of Mrs. Nora Harris as the Collector of the Port of Connecticut.

This appointment is being worked on very carefully by the State Central Committee and I know that Mrs. Harris' name is before them.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Chase Going Woodhouse
Mr. Harris, a legionnaire, came up with these for Mrs. R. He read that she, a Elliott, were starting to farm, & he thought these pamphlets would help. I told him we'd deliver them.

23, 1947

---

Dear Sir:

This will introduce Dr. R. J. Harris, member of the Faculty of the North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering, who intends to make a trip to Hyde Park.

I would appreciate any courtesies shown Dr. Harris.

Yours very truly

[Signature]

JOSEPHUS DANIELS
August 23, 1947

To the Director
Roosevelt Estate
Hyde Park, New York

Dear Sir:

This will introduce Dr. H. J. Harris, member of the Faculty of the North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering, who intends to make a trip to Hyde Park.

I would appreciate any courtesies shown Dr. Harris.

Yours very truly

[Signature]

JOSEPHUS DANIELS