For Mrs. Jones address - I think Mrs. L
is very well fitted to
advise on a plan
Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I understand that you were proposing to discuss with Mr. Lie certain possibilities of cooperation through the radio between women all over the world and that you had intended for this purpose to introduce Mr. Lie to Mrs. Lewis. As Mr. Lie is now abroad, it has been suggested that contact might be made with Mrs. Lewis before he returns, and I am writing to ask you whether you could be so kind as to let me have Mrs. Lewis's address, so that I can either get in touch with her myself or arrange for Mr. Hugh Williams, our Chief of Radio Liaison, to do so.

I believe that Mr. Williams expressed to you in a recent letter the deep gratitude of our Radio Division for all that you have done to help us. May I add my own personal word in support of what he says? Your cooperation and the unfailing generosity with which you have given us your valuable time will always remain one of the most inspiring memories of these hectic early months at UN headquarters. Thank you again very much indeed for a measure of assistance which is beyond thanks.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Director
Radio Division

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
29 Washington Square West
New York City 11
January 8, 1947

Dear Mr. Lie:

I see by the papers that you are leaving on a trip, so I doubt that you will able to lunch with me on the 14th.

I am sending this hasty note to say that I have been wondering whether we could not develop with Mrs. Lewis, who has so much experience in the radio field, some work for women which would improve the relationship among them all over the world and bring them closer together.

If at some later time you felt you could talk this over with Mrs. Lewis, I should be grateful, or perhaps you could refer her to the proper people. She is working with commercial radio now and of course, could not on a formal basis suggest that she is interested in anything of the kind, though I feel it might be useful.

With best wishes for a successful and pleasant trip, I am,

Very cordially yours,
January 19, 1947

Dear Dr. Lerner:

Mr. Alfred Baker Lewis sent me a copy of the letter which he had written you and this gives me an opportunity to write you just a line, but not for publication in PW.

It seems to me that the "Americans for Democratic Action" is trying to do something which may not succeed, but if it does succeed, might be of great value to a great many liberals. The American communists seem to have succeeded very well in jeopardizing whatever the liberals work for. Therefore, to keep them out of the policy making and staff positions in an organization, seems to be very essential even at the price of being called red-baiters, which I hope no member of the new group will really be.

Very sincerely yours,
January 19, 1947

Dear Mr. Lewis:

I wrote to Mr. Max Lerner, but I do not think that it is very wise for me to appear in his
because I do not want to seem to be forming
an organization when I am primarily a member
of the Democratic Party, and look to this
new organization to needle that party into
more effective progressivism.

Very sincerely yours,
January 16, 1947

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
29 Washington Square South
New York City

Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I sent to P.M. in reply to one of Max Lerner's editorials. I rather doubt if it will be published but I think it will help if you will write a letter along roughly similar lines. The more that are sent in replying to his criticism of us, the more likely they are to publish at least one of them.

Fraternally yours,

Alfred Baker Lewis

ASL:VG

ENC.
EDITOR OF P.S.M.

I think you are not quite fair when you criticize the newly formed Americans for Democratic Action for allegedly failing to make a distinction between being non-Communist and being anti-Communist. There is only one sense in which genuine liberals should not be anti-Communist, and that is that they should never permit the government, so far as they have the power, to deny to Communists the fundamental civil rights of free speech, press, and assembly. Neither I, nor, so far as they know their records, any of the other persons who joined to form the A.D.A. have ever done that; on the contrary, they have worked to preserve the civil rights of Communists. Of course that stand in support of the rights of Communists is perfectly consistent with political opposition to Communism and exposure of their attempts to infiltrate liberal organizations under various disguises.

For Communists are not liberals. They support enthusiastically the totalitarian dictatorship of Soviet Russia, which denies all the fundamental rights which are dear to liberals such as the rights of free speech, press, and assembly, and the right to hold elections after free discussion and with opposing candidates. In support of that dictatorship and to spread its power and influence, the Communists have not hesitated to use any methods whatever. They even made an alliance with the Nazis to divide up Poland and to give each other mutual economic assistance as the beginning of World War II. During the life of that alliance the representatives of the Soviet government, including Molotov specifically, officially described England and France as the aggressors in the war against the Nazis, and the Communists throughout the world did everything they could to oppose and interfere with the efforts of the democratic nations to prosecute the war against the Nazis or, as in the case of our own government, to prepare for doing so. This past of mutual friendship and assistance between the Nazis and the Soviets was not broken by the Soviets but by the Nazis, and if Hitler had not attacked Russia there is little evidence to show that this friendly relation between the German and Russian totalitarian dictatorships would not still be in existence.

Alfred Baker Lewis
TO THE EDITOR:

Mr. Pegler is still busy fighting the ghost of our ex-President, and his family, especially his widow, who is one of our delegates to the United Nations and the chairman of the UN Commission on Human Rights. As such she has on numerous occasions opposed the Soviet delegation's demands.

Mr. Pegler in a recent column even goes so far as to speak of the "Roosevelt S.S." likening the army or the draft board, it is not clear which from Pegler's hysterical column, to the special Nazi Storm Troopers which were the S.S. This is so absurd that it is laughable. Hitler used the S.S. to suppress all civil rights. Roosevelt never in any way interfered with civil and political liberties. On the contrary, his appointees to the Supreme Court enlarged the scope of such rights in several important respects, notably in declaring unconstitutional ordinances which were interpreted to forbid the distribution of political leaflets in a number of cities and towns, and in giving the right to vote effectively to Negroes in the South by declaring the so-called "white primaries" there unconstitutional.

So far as Mrs. Roosevelt is concerned, I am sure that she will regard it as a compliment to be denounced by the man who has recently given high praise to Pearl Berghoff, who ran a strike breaking agency as a sort of hiring hall for thugs to do the dirty work of the rich in labor disputes.

I feel sure that nearly everyone who is not a fanatical partisan for Mr. Pegler's point of view will be repelled and antagonized by his shocking bad taste and hysteria in continually attacking a dead man and his widow in the way he does, so that anti-New Deal editors must find him a very poor propagandist for his point of view despite the violence of his expression.

Alfred Baker Lewis
TO THE EDITOR:

Mr. Pegler in a column about a week ago came out against Americans for Democratic Action and called it Communist. So far from Americans for Democratic Action being Communist, Mr. Pegler has lined up with the Communists in denouncing A.D.A., for A.D.A. is the object of their attack just because it is liberal and pro-labor, 100% pro-Fair Deal in its domestic policies, and vigorously anti-Communist in its stand on foreign policies.

For example, the A.P.A. supported President Truman's offer back in 1947 of aid to Greece and Turkey so that they could resist the threatened, Russian-inspired aggression. It supported the Marshall Plan, which the Communists have been vigorously denouncing. It supported the principle of collective security and the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty organization, and economic and military aid to our European allies. It supported President Truman's Point Four for American aid for industrially backward nations where poverty might make the people easy prey to Communism, unless they got American help. And it supported resistance to Communist aggression in Korea. Mr. Pegler, if he knows anything at all about politics, knows all this, and knows that such a stand is definitely and vigorously anti-Communist, because Russia has opposed each of these policies.

Just because A.D.A. has offered a home to genuine liberals and stopped them from belonging to Communist innocents' clubs and transmission belts in order to work for liberal domestic measures, it has drawn the attack of the Communist Party and the Daily Worker.

Of course, A.P.A. has also opposed, rightly, the Smith Act and the McCarran Act under which the Communists are being indicted, for we believe in free speech for all, even for our opponents like the Communists and Mr. Pegler. It is actually easier to oppose the Communists when they are above ground where we can see them and identify them than when they are underground. The stand for civil rights for our opponents could not make us Communists, even in the opinion of the most ill-informed persons.

ALFRED BAKER LEWIS
TO THE EDITOR:

Mr. Pegler in a recent article asserted that our country and Great Britain were both "in the grip of a form of Nazism-Fascism which the British Socialists call planning and we call the Fair Deal". He went on to describe John L. Lewis, Amarin Bevan, and David Dubinsky as "noisy tyrants" and to say that the working man always winds up colder and hungrier than ever before when such noisy tyrants get control.

Mr. Pegler does not know what he is talking about. Both Nazism and Fascism, like Communism, are dictatorships, where only one political party is legal, and the rights of free speech, press, and assembly, and the right to hold elections after free discussion and with competing candidates are all abolished. That is clearly not the situation in either the United States or Great Britain, and in saying that it is, just because Mr. Pegler does not like the British Government or our own, he is misleading his readers.

Mr. Pegler's characterization of John L. Lewis and David Dubinsky as noisy tyrants is certainly not true. Lewis is a staunch Republican, who was active in working for the Republican candidates for president in 1932, 1936, and 1940. He cannot be a tyrant for he has no governmental authority, and when his union went out on strike some years ago he was given a fine of $20,000 and the union a fine of over $1,000,000. That is not the fate of tyrants.

Mr. Dubinsky's union, the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, is run in a truly democratic way. Mr. Dubinsky does support the Liberal Party, whose candidate, Mr. Halley, a Democrat nationally, has won the recent New York City election; but even the most naive of Mr. Pegler's readers can hardly believe that that will usher in a reign of tyranny in New York City.

Mr. Bevan is a British labor politician, who cannot be a tyrant, noisy or otherwise, for he controls nothing, not even the British Labor Party, where he and his supporters are a minority.

As for the statement that the workers, whom Mr. Pegler calls "poor saps", wind up colder and hungrier than ever when such union leaders gain influence or control, that is sheer absurdity. I was born and brought up in Pennsylvania, the greatest coal-producing state. Anyone who is old enough can tell you that the miners are far, far better off now than they were in the bad old days before the miners' union was strong. Older men living in New York have told me from personal experience that the conditions as to health, pay, security, and hours worked, are several hundred per cent better in the New York clothing trades, now that the unions are strong, than they were back in the sweatshop days before the union was a power in the industry.

In the same article Mr. Pegler proves his patriotism by saying that "our money is falling to pieces". This statement is as wrong as his other misstatements.