For many years Hamilton Fish has been in very close touch with fascist influences here and abroad. In 1934, for example, Luke Myshuha published a booklet called "Famine in Ukraine" containing material written by Hamilton Fish. The booklet was published by the United Ukrainian Organizations of the United States. Ukrainian Fifth Columnists, working with the Nazis, were active in this outfit. Luke Myshuha is himself nothing more than a Ukrainian agent of the Third Reich. He is closely connected with the ODU (Organization for the Rebirth of the Ukraine), a fascist terrorist group which receives its guidance from the Provod (headquarters in Berlin). Myshuha's intimacy with the Nazis is evidenced by the fact that in 1938, as a guest of Dr. Joseph Paul Goebbels, he spoke in Germany over a Nazi radio network. Myshuha is editor of Svoboda, a Ukrainian language newspaper published in Jersey City, New Jersey, and having a circulation of approximately 40,000. On February 1 and 3, 1941, Svoboda published detailed instructions regarding the making of bombs and other explosives. The following quotation from the March 18, 1938, issue of Svoboda indicates the proclivities of the paper and its editor:

"It is quite evident that smashing Russia to pieces must be regarded as an axiom of our policy. ... The Hitlerite Germany, prompted by its own interests, alone strives to weaken Russia. It fights Communism and international Jewry. ... It is a fact that Germany, while it fights Communism, fights at the same time the greatest enemies of the Ukraine. ... We have no illusions. We know that we must help ourselves. But the powers which, without violating our interests, have a desire to ruin Russia -- such, for instance, as Japan, Germany or Italy -- must not meet with enmity on our part."

The writer of this report is informed that Hamilton Fish came in touch with the Ukrainian-Nazis through the efforts of Jacob McCohen, a notorious agent of the Nazis who fled this country some time ago.

Shortly before the outbreak of the war, Hamilton Fish was doing everything he could in Europe to promote "peace offers" of the Nazi Government. He traveled extensively at the time in Europe spreading propaganda in support of another Munich. He himself said, "I don't care about Munich, or if one group or another of the powers gains some small benefits by an arrangement. The only thing that matters is to prevent war."

In August 1939, Fish was in Germany and met with various Nazi leaders, including Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop. He "vacationed" at Ribbentrop's Fuschl Castle. In Germany he also met with Count Galeazzo Ciano, Italian Foreign Minister, and he stayed at the same hotel that Ciano was staying at, the Osterreichischer Hotel.

At the time of Fish's presence in Germany there was a debate in Congress regarding Fish's activities, during which Congressman Woodrum of Virginia read
a quote from a Berlin newspaper, the Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung, which quoted Fish as saying he believed Germany's claims were just. (At the time Fish was head of the National Committee to Keep America Out of Foreign Wars; the headquarters of this organization were in Mr. Fish's congressional offices in Washington.)

The following are some additional facts regarding Hamilton Fish's activities in the United States.

He was the main speaker at a German Day celebration at Madison Square Garden on October 3, 1938. On that occasion the swastika was displayed with the American flag and the audience sang the Horst Wessel song (Nazi Party hymn).

He was instrumental in the organization of two isolationist neutrality groups. He was Honorary Chairman of the Citizens National Keep America Out of War Committee, run by L. M. Bailey. They worked closely with Fish's own group, the National Committee to Keep America Out of Foreign Wars. Fish was one of the speakers at a meeting of the Citizens National Keep America Out of War Committee at Mecca Temple on October 26, 1939. He attacked the "internationalists and interventionists" who would repeal the embargo, which would result in the "un-Christian, immoral and vicious traffic in arms." When he asked: "Who made our foreign policy up; where did our foreign policy originate from," the audience chorused: "The Jews, the Yiddles, the Kikes." Fish smiled and got a big applause. He made no attempt to halt the anti-Semite remarks. (Herald Tribune, October 27, 1939)

On May 8, 1940 Fish stated in Congress (Congressional Record, p. 8871) "It is a sad and deplorable tragedy to read the constant Germanophobia and 'I don't want to go to war but' propaganda of certain well-known columnists who are apparently unable to disassociate their war-like and interventionist sentiments from the barbarous treatment of their racial groups in Europe. I am convinced that these columnists are not serving the best interests of America or their own race by ... their brazen attacks on the peace elements in America ... It is none of our business what form of government any foreign nation has ..."

Hamilton Fish, was one of the contributors (another was George Sylvester Viereck) to the first issue of "Today's Challenge," organ of the Nazi-directed American Fellowship Forum, of which Frederick E. Auhagen was head. Fish's article was entitled "Our International-Minded Press."

On September 26, 1940, at the New York World's Fair, Fish declared with regard to the Japanese situation: "We cannot object to Japan holding the same use as the United States in its declaration of a Monroe Doctrine for Asia. Japan's declaration may become one of the most important papers in the history of the world. I urge good will, peace and understanding between Japan and America. I hope for an agreement to internationalize the Phillipine Islands and I favor withdrawal of all American armed forces from China."

Fish belongs to that small group of Congressmen and Senators who are trying to inject racial and religious issues into Congressional debates in order to foster their political aims.
On May 6, 1941 (Congressional Record, p. 3663) Fish said, "When I use the term international bankers, I do not mean merely the Jewish bankers. I mean Jews and Gentiles. I mean J. Pierpont Morgan and Thomas Lamont, and also such Jewish bankers as Kuhn, Loeb & Co., Lehman Brothers, Jules Bache and James Warburg. I also mean that the President is standing up against the expenditure of two hundred million dollars of British propaganda."

Fish has been a favored speaker at America First meetings and other isolationist groups. At an America First meeting at Bayridge High School, Brooklyn, on June 3, 1941, he again used his conception of the international bankers trying to influence the President in order to drag America into the war. Again he said, "International bankers - and I don't mean Jews, I mean Gentiles and Jews." He ridiculed stories of a possible German invasion.

On December 16, 1940, Fish was the main speaker at a meeting of the National Legion of Mothers and Women of America at the Hotel Adelphi in Philadelphia. This outfit has been notorious for its pro-Nazi leanings. When Fish was a speaker at an America First Committee rally on the 20th of August, 1941, in Town Hall, Philadelphia, the Mothers and Daughters of Pennsylvania, a group similar to the National Legion of Mothers, postponed one of their own meetings so that their members could attend the Hamilton Fish rally.

In 1940 Fish was listed as a speaker at the annual Steuben Society meeting at the Hotel Astor. In the June, 1939, issue of "Einheitsfront," organ of the Nazi German-American Alliance, Fish received favorable comment on his radio talk "Keep America Out of Foreign Wars." Reprints of Fish's speeches in Congress were sent out by Charles B. Hudson, fascist anti-Semitic publisher and editor of America in Danger and close collaborator with Elizabeth Dilling, under Fish's frank.

When Prescott Dennett was subpoenaed by the Grand Jury in Washington in September of this year, the closeness of his relationship with Congressman Hamilton Fish was established. George Hill and Hamilton Fish tried to help Prescott Dennett by removing from his office franked envelopes which they had supplied him. There can be little doubt that Fish knew the role of Prescott Dennett and his connections with the Nazi agent, George Sylvester Viereck, as Fish himself was in touch with both Dennett and Viereck.

The writer of this report has received information to the effect that Hamilton Fish accepted a number of checks for fairly large sums from a company in the United States which has allegedly close connections with the Nazis. The name of this company is Caviar Romanoff. One of the checks was in the amount of $1500 another was for $1000. The writer has seen a photostatic copy of a report in the handwriting of a Nazi agent, which describes how this money was paid over to Fish. The writer, however, has never seen the checks themselves, or photostats of the checks. It is, of course, quite possible that these checks do not actually exist.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

January 24, 1941.

CONFIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM FOR
✓ PAUL McNUTT
✓ FLORENCE KERR
✓ ELLEN WOODWARD
✓ FRANK BANE

Please read this in strict confidence and let me have it back.

F.D.R.

Contents noted by all members of the Committee.

"1/21/41"
Mrs. Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I recall that you asked us for suggestions following our study of the plan submitted concerning the "Home Defense Commission". I think you know me well enough to know that I am intensely interested in this question and I am sure you must know that whatever I say is not said in the spirit of criticism, but rather to try to be helpful. You have been such a fine example of what can be done through sincerity and devotion to our country, that I could not do less than give you my honest opinion. I want to help.

My first suggestion is not to do anything about the plan until we have succeeded in passing H. R. 1776. If I may borrow the words of the President, I too believe in "doing first the things that are first" and it is of the greatest importance to let nothing interfere with H. R. 1776 at this time. Much opposition is developing to certain parts of the bill and the opposition will try to amend it. That is why I believe it would be unwise to give them any information about "Home Defense" at this time.

Now for the plan itself. I think it is too ambitious. I believe if it were to cover projects directly related to defense only, at this time, it would have greater support. There are existing agencies which could be utilized for much of the plan, otherwise the cost of the program would be very considerable. If it could be started modestly, all that we hope for would come in time. In other words, educate to make people want and support such a program.

Then its political aspect, as I see it, is important. Already we are hearing much talk about regimentation, socialization, propagandizing, etc. I am afraid that the opposition would build up a case on this plan. I find it very difficult to get women aroused to the fact that our country is in real danger and until we can bring to them a realization of the
dangerous situation confronting them, I'm afraid they will not take the personal interest in the plan that must be taken if it is to succeed. I hear on every side "we are not at war, why become hysterical?"

Now my dear, I want you to take this letter for what it is worth. I may be all wrong, but I have kept my ear to the ground and I have even sent up some "trial balloons" among a few intimate friends and all of this leads me to tell you my reaction. You are doing a great work—God bless and keep you well to continue to be the inspiration to the women of America. You have done much for me and have helped me to keep my courage. Thank you and believe me to be always,

Sincerely and affectionately yours

Mary Norton
Honorable Franklin Delano Roosevelt
The White House
Washington

Dear Mr. President:

In these times when people are not smiling as much as they should I thought you might get one out of the enclosed copy of a letter a mutual friend of ours wrote me.

You know the John who wrote this letter mighty well, but I fear if I disclosed his full name proceedings might be started against him.

With every good wish, I am

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Dear Sam:

It was sad and hard on my good friend Mr. Garner to leave Washington. I can understand the tears—rather proud of them, but I can't quite understand the kiss as reported in all the papers. My God, what is coming next in this Republic, when a hard-boiled he man from West Texas Kisses a man? A Cactus and a Kiss can no more be associated together than a machine gun and a powder puff. Many strong men are given to deepest emotions and overwhelming sentiment, but when a red-blooded American, of the pioneer blood, who would go bear hunting with a buggy whip, kisses a man, I grow quite anxious over the destiny of my country. Evidently the "bottle was not allowed to pass" as the ancestor of Harry Hawes might say, on inauguration day--Can you explain the kiss

Your friend,

JOHN

Maybe Paris is our front line after all
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

February 21, 1941

MEMO FOR THE PRESIDENT

This is Pittenger's third matter.

He feels that you will have to put the heat on Rayburn, Pat Boland, et al to off-set this.

MAC
February 20, 1941

Memorandum

Attention: Mr. McIntyre

Files will disclose that I have had correspondence with the President in connection with the proposed St. Lawrence Seaway project. All reports indicate that negotiations are being successfully carried on in Canada and that soon this proposition may come before the Congress of the United States.

Enemies of the St. Lawrence Seaway project recognize this as almost a certainty, and the President ought to be advised as to their activities. For some time, it has been known here that the railroads have enlisted the aid of twenty-one standard railroad brotherhoods, that headquarters have been opened, and that the railroad brotherhoods are now busy contacting different Members of Congress to enlist their support in opposition to the Seaway.

Further, one Member of Congress has been quoted many times to the effect that the coal miners throughout the various sections where coal is mined, are being told that the St. Lawrence Seaway project will develop power which will take the place of coal, and that if the Seaway project is successful, they will lose the opportunity to mine coal and hold their jobs. In other directions, the old enemies of the St. Lawrence Seaway project are active. I do not here enumerate them, but they include shipping interests on the Great Lakes, the railroads, etc., etc.

The situation is so serious that unless Administration leaders on Capitol Hill are called into conference and a program worked out by them to secure votes for necessary legislation for the St. Lawrence Seaway project, this proposition may be defeated. In fact, I feel that if a vote were taken tomorrow, such would be the direct result.
PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. President:

In our conversation the other day you said you would prepare me a memorandum as to the provisions you desire inserted into these various Authority bills,—such as Columbia River, Central Valley, Arkansas Valley, etc.

You also asked me if I thought we could get a bill through covering the whole country as outlined in the map you drew for me. I have made considerable investigation, and I believe we could get a bill of this kind through the House more easily than we could an individual Authority bill.

In your memorandum please state whether or not you want the Administrator, or the Directors, of these Authorities to report directly to you, or through some cabinet officer, and if the latter, state which one.

I hope you can get this memorandum up to me.
right away, for I think we should get to work on this proposition immediately.

Sincerely your friend,

J. E. Rankin.
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT:

Congressman Albert Thomas phoned and asked if you would defer action on the Houston Flood Control project until he (Thomas) returns from a two weeks inspection trip extending to the West Coast, as a member of the Appropriation Committee, starting this afternoon.
4-23-41

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT:

Congressman Kopplemann gave me this message, which I promised to deliver to you verbatim:

"I saw that man Friday. He said, 'We will not do anything to destroy our friendship with China, but of course will continue to send our goods. Today I told the State Department the same thing'."

"He called my attention to my previous conversation with him by saying, 'Didn't I tell you that big things were going to come out of Japan?'

"He then very sharply criticized the activities of Halifax against his country by what Halifax was doing here in America. I asked him if he had seen you. He answered, 'No, I have not'. When I ventured the thought that you were a pleasant man to talk with and that he might get somewhere if he did, he answered, 'Not now' -- but from the tone of his voice you may expect that possibly in the near future he will request an audience."
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

May 10, 1941

Memorandum for The President.

Wright Patman

I gave Wright Patman your confidential message about his running against Lyndon Johnson.

He told me today he sent you a note saying he will not run.

He said that in the event Lyndon is defeated (which he considered probable), he would like your support next year in the same race. I said that of course he would have to discuss that with you, and he said he would do so "when it is convenient to you".

James Rowe, Jr.
My dear Mr. President:

I have neither the desire nor the inclination to fail to comply with your expressed hope that I not make the United States Senate for United States Senator in Texas to fill out Senator Sherman's unexpired term. It has been my pleasure and privilege to cooperate with you in the past and I expect to continue to do so.

Wishing you a speedy recovery, with kind regards and best wishes, I am your friend,

Wright Patman
May 19, 1941.

Private and Confidential

Dear Jim:

This is the first chance I have had to thank you for yours of May sixth. Slowly, and in spite of anything we Americans do or do not do, it looks a little as if you and some other good people are going to have to answer the old question of whether you want to keep your country unshackled by taking even more definite steps to do so -- even firing shots -- or, on the other hand, submitting to be shackled for the sake of not losing one American life.

When will you Irishmen ever get over hating England? Remember that if England goes down, Ireland goes down too. Ireland has a better chance for complete independence if democracy survives in the world than if Hitlerism supersedes it.

Come down and talk to me about it some day -- but do stop thinking in terms of ancient hatreds and think of the future.

Always sincerely,

Honorable James F. O'Connar,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.
My dear Mr. President:—

I am enclosing herewith a communication I have received from the Cascade County Trades and Labor Assembly in Montana. This organization is one of the most conservative in the State. It has a membership of approximately 6000. These people voted for you. War was the issue. I read to them your statement made in Boston, which was as follows:

"And while I am talking to you fathers and mothers I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again — your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

I quoted other statements which you made with reference to the same subject and told them that they could count on you to keep us out of Europe's shambles. The labor vote and a large farm vote placed Montana in your list. The very people who are now urging you to get into this war are people who opposed you and voted against you the first, second and third time you ran for President.

If your advisers induce you to put one hundred and thirty millions of people into this war in Europe it will cause these people to lose faith in pledges, commitments and platforms made and given to the people in election times. They will put us in the same class as the American public today places Willkie — that all of his great talk was "campaign oratory". The masses of the people of the country who will have to fight and pay for this war are 80% against our entry and they have been and will be your friends unless you let them down. I feel you will not do this. My mail, not only from Montana, but throughout the country, following a broadcast which I made on the Lease-lend bill, definitely shows the sentiment as stated. I opposed the bill because, first: I did not want to see this responsibility placed upon you. Second: Such power is not in keeping with the spirit of the Constitution, namely: That Congress has the power to declare war. I fully realize that this bill places in your lap the destiny of this country. Your sincerity I do not question, the judgment of your advisers, I do.
After our entry into the last war, I stood on the streets in Helena, Montana, and saw President Wilson with Senator Walsh lead a parade up the street at the time he went to the country on the League of Nations, and it was the saddest exhibition that I have seen in my time. The streets were lined, but the people stood in grim silence as President Wilson passed along. They did not see him as their President but as the man who led their country to slaughter. Although Congress had not given him Lease-lend power, yet he was the man the country blamed. Wilson returned to Washington, as Senator Walsh told me, a broken hearted man. I do not want to see this tragedy repeated.

Do not let Churchill run this country. Churchill never uttered a more untrue statement than when he said over the National Broadcasting system, as follows:

"The President and the Congress of the United States having duly fortified themselves by contact with their electors, have solemnly pledged their aid to Britain in this war because they deem our cause just, and because they know their own interests and safety could not but be endangered if we were destroyed."

He was trying to have the world understand the existence of an Anglo-American war alliance to save his Empire. It was the trickiest piece of propaganda ever given out and perhaps the most effective.

Our people voted for you and for me upon our pledges that we would help England, SHORT OF WAR, and that is all. They took us at our word and voted for us.

I am deeply concerned about the future of this country if you take us into this war. First, it will undermine the faith the people now have in you and high officials which would be the worst blow to democracy that could happen. Second: Our best manhood will be destroyed. Third: It will bankrupt us and we will lose the thing we think we are fighting for in Europe. War, of course, is fascinating, glamorous and all of that. A great consuming fire is fascinating also, but when it is burned out it leaves an awful nakedness and nothing else but ashes. It will be gray ashes after this war is over in Europe, for them, and for us, if we get in, regardless of the
outcome. British diplomacy, intrigue and the financial oligarchy of England will see to it that the United States will be the prime sucker Nation of the world again.

Where did Wilson's Fourteen Points go? The statement of Will Rogers might be apropos: "We have never won a conference or lost a war."

Assuring you of my continued faith, respect and admiration, I am,

Yours sincerely,

James F. O' Connor.

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt,
The White House.
April 29, 1941

The Honorable James F. O'Connor
The House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

My dear Congressman O'Connor:

We can see no permanent benefit to be derived from entering the present European War. The tendency is to dislocate the functioning of our economic units which results in much suffering for all workers and their families since it is they who must both actually fight and finance any armed conflict.

To convoy ships in any war zone will eventually lead to further participation. We the members of Cascade County Trades and Labor Assembly, therefore, desire that no United States convoys be permitted and wish that our request be communicated to those who wish that such be done and to those having power to allow use of convoys.

Very truly yours,

John Evanko, Jr.,
Secretary
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

CONFIDENTIAL

June 19, 1941.

MEMORANDUM FOR

THE PRESIDENT

The attached copy of letter which the Secretary of the Navy has sent to Congressman Vinson, re machinery vibration which has developed in NORTH CAROLINA and WASHINGTON, may be of interest to the President.

Respectfully,

J. R. BEARDALL
My dear Mr. Vinson:

Because of the concern with which we regard the vibration that has developed in the NORTH CAROLINA and WASHINGTON machinery, the Commandant at New York has referred your letter of 10 June to Captain J. J. Broshek to the Department. Informal reports of the difficulty have apparently reached you and I am desirous of giving you full information authoritatively.

Referring to the specific question in your letter to Captain Broshek:

1. Has the NORTH CAROLINA had full power trials?

   A. Neither the NORTH CAROLINA nor Washington has run full-power so far. Both have been at sea for so-called "builder's trials". Usually these initial trials are not carried to full-power although in the case of the WASHINGTON it was planned to go up to full-power on the first trip out.

2. If the NORTH CAROLINA has had full power trials what was:

   (a) the maximum speed made?
   (b) the maximum horse power developed at full power?

   A. On the first sea trial of the NORTH CAROLINA she was carried up to about 25 knots speed and about 70,000 horse power. During this trial unexpected longitudinal vibration developed which made continued operation at higher speed appear inadvisable. Steps were immediately taken to run a subsequent trial with necessary instruments and personnel to isolate the cause of the vibration if possible and to determine upon corrective measures.
The problem is to determine the number of blades in the propellers which are necessary for the ship to make the speed of 27 knots. It is also necessary to have the propellers working at a power of 120,000 horsepower, which is not considered in the determination of the propellers. One solution would be change the propellers with the number of blades in the propellers which are necessary for the ship to make the speed of 27 knots. The determination of the propellers which are necessary for the ship to make the speed of 27 knots can be done by trial and error if you can afford the expense.
Honorable Carl Vinson (Cont.)

6. Who designed the propellers?

A. The propellers were designed in the Bureau of Ships, Navy Department and tested at the D. W. Taylor Model Basin.

7. Was there more vibration of the ship during the trials than normally expected? If so, was it caused by the design of the hull, by the design of the propellers, or by the machinery?

A. As stated above, there was more vibration in these ships than was expected and of a type which was entirely unexpected and which has not been experienced heretofore in such degree as to attract or require attention. The cause is not easy to isolate, being the result of resonance in the very complex mass - elastic system of propellers, - shafting, - machinery and hull - with vibratory impulses which are always present in some degree with a propeller which necessarily has a small number of blades in order to obtain acceptable efficiency.

8. If there was an excessive amount of vibration, was it to such an extent that the trials were discontinued on account of vibration before full power was reached?

A. As stated above, the WASHINGTON trials were limited to less than full-power which it was planned to make during her first sea trials to assure that no possibility of permanent injury to machinery should be incurred.

9. If any deficiencies were found to exist as a result of the trials, are any changes contemplated to correct such deficiencies? If so, what changes?

A. As a result of the observations made on the NORTH CAROLINA'S second sea trials, three measures for improving the situation in these ships are being investigated actively. These include changing the number of blades of the propellers and stiffening the machinery foundations, both of which offer but limited promise, and a third
scheme to provide shaft restraining blocks which have already been designed and which offers great promise of success. These will be tested, however, in a one-third full-size model at the D. W. Taylor Model Basin, before the installation is completed in the ships.

10. What is the estimated time to make the changes contemplated?

A. Decision as to when the work of installing these shaft restraining blocks should be undertaken will depend on circumstances. It is anticipated, however, that if started immediately, it could be completed by the end of September. This would require the ships to be held at the Navy Yard continuously from about the middle of July.

11. What is the estimated cost to make the changes?

A. The preliminary estimate of cost of installing the shaft restraining blocks is $50,000 per ship.

12. Was there any failure of the machinery (main propulsion or auxiliary) to meet the design requirements during the full power trials? If so, state what it was.

A. During the trials so far held, there have been no failures in machinery, either main propulsion or auxiliary, to meet requirements. The capacity of the evaporating plant on the NORTH CAROLINA was slightly below requirements as first tested, but this is being corrected by necessary adjustments.

13. Do you know whether a model of this ship was tested in the model test basin? If so, were any of the deficiencies that have developed detected in the test?

A. A number of models for the NORTH CAROLINA and WASHINGTON were tested at the Model Basin before the present lines were adopted. The model of
Honorable Carl Vinson (Cont.)

the present lines was thoroughly tested at the Basin, but without disclosing the present difficulty. It is not one, however, which would be predicted by usual model procedure. As a result of these tests certain changes were made in the sterns of the NORTH CAROLINA and WASHINGTON even after construction had started. It was anticipated during the design of these ships that there was a possibility of lateral vibration in the skegs of these ships and most careful attention was given to this question, extending to tests which forced vibration on the WASHINGTON after that ship was launched. This mode of vibration has not appeared in the completed ships.

I shall be pleased to keep you informed of developments in this matter. While it is not anticipated that this difficulty will arise in subsequent battleships, this question is being investigated.

In view of the present international situation, the Department considers, and I am sure you will agree, that the contents of this letter be considered as confidential.

I am sending copies of this letter to the Commandants at New York and Philadelphia so that they may know that you have been informed, and am sending a similar letter to Senator Walsh for his information.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK KNOX
SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Honorable Carl Vinson,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Copy to:
Comit. New York
" Philadelphia
July 14, 1941

My dear Mr. President:

I want to tell you how very much I appreciated the fine picture of you, with the greeting on it, to me! It shall have the place of honor in my office. And I indeed feel honored to have it!

My late husband and I have always been ardent admirers of you. And you can count on my whole hearted support of your program.
during these prosperous times. I deeply appreciated Mr. Roosevelt stopping in Cumberland, Maryland, while I was campaigning to get me and I feel sure it aided me in winning my election.

Through your s and Mr. Roosevelt's intervention it is almost assured that Mr. John L. Miller of Cumberland, who was so helpful to me during my campaign will be placed in a national defense position in Baltimore, I am indeed grateful.
With kindest personal regards to you and Mrs. Roosevelt!

Sincerely yours —

Katharine Edgar Byron
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

PRIVATE

July 19, 1941.

MEMORANDUM FOR
THE SPEAKER

Dear Sam:—

I wish you would have a check made on the St. Lawrence Bill because there is real need of speed on account of the early approach of Winter. If we can get the work started fairly soon, we can take full advantage of the entire construction season which begins early next Spring. Otherwise a part of the 1942 construction season will be lost, and the probability of getting ships out of the Great Lakes by 1944 will be lessened.

Incidentally, I hope you can get Barden of North Carolina, Peterson of Georgia, Green of Florida, and Boykin of Alabama to go along with the Bill. That would give a good-sized majority in the Committee.

Can do?

F. D. R.
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

Re: St. Lawrence Project.

It would be helpful if you could request Democratic leaders in the House to take a poll through the steering committee machinery on:

(a) Their present attitude on H.R. 4927 (The St. Lawrence bill).

(b) Whether or not they would be available for a vote during the month of August.

From the standpoint of the construction schedule political approval by early autumn is highly desirable. An early approval would permit certain preliminary construction of camps, etc before the winter. Thereby it would be possible to take full advantage of the entire construction season beginning next spring. Otherwise, full utilization of the early months of the 1942 construction season will be lost and the probabilities of getting ships out of the Great Lakes in 1944 would be lessened.

It is anticipated that the project will be recommended favorably by the House Rivers and Harbors Committee sometime after the conclusion of the hearings which are scheduled to end this month, probably next week. Our chief concern now is to establish at least a 2-to-1 majority in the House Rivers and Harbors Committee. In view of the Committee's known friendliness to waterway developments, a narrow majority might be interpreted unfavorably by the House. The votes of Representatives Berden of North Carolina, Peterson of Georgia, Green of Florida and Boykin of Alabama, all Democrats, are somewhat doubtful. Their favorable vote would probably insure a 2-to-1 vote in Committee. Might the Democratic leaders contact these members for their support?

Adolph A. Berle, Jr.
Leland Olds
JOINT RESOLUTION

To furnish material support to nations whose defense is vital to the defense of the United States.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Resolution Numbered 83, approved June 15, 1940, entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the Secretaries of War and of the Navy to assist the governments of American republics to increase their military and naval establishments, and for other purposes," is amended to read as follows:

"Section 1. This Act may be cited as 'An Act to promote the Defense of the United States.'

"Sec. 2. As used in this Act —

"(a) The term 'defense article' means:

"(1) Any weapon, munition, aircraft, vessel, or boat;

"(2) Any machinery, facility, tool, material, or supply necessary for the manufacture, production, processing, repair, servicing, or operation of any article described in this subsection;

"(3) Any component material or part of or equipment for any article described in this subsection;

"(4) Any other commodity or article for defense.

Such term 'defense article' includes any article described in this subsection: Manufactured or procured pursuant to section 3; to which the United States has or hereafter acquires title, possession, or control; or owned, leased, or otherwise held by any foreign government.
(b) The term 'defense information' means any plan, specification, design, prototype, or information pertaining to any defense article or to defense.

"Sec. 3(a). Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President may, from time to time, when he deems it in the interest of national defense, authorize the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the head of any other department or agency of the Government:

"(1) To manufacture in arsenals, factories, and shipyards under their jurisdiction, or otherwise procure, any defense article for the government of any American republic, England, Canada, Ireland, any other government of the British Commonwealth of Nations, Greece, or any other country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States.

"(2) To sell, transfer, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of, to any such government any defense article, including, but not limited to, a sale, transfer, exchange, lease, or loan, providing for payment or repayment in kind or property, or for any other direct or indirect benefit to the United States which the President deems satisfactory.
"(3) To test, inspect, prove, repair, outfit, recondition, or otherwise to place in good working order any defense article for any such government.

"(4) To communicate any defense information to any such government.

"(5) To export any defense article to any such government.

"(6) To furnish to any such government any other aid of a supply or materiel character which the President considers necessary or proper in the interests of the national defense and to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

"(b) The powers conferred by and the actions authorized under paragraphs (2) to (6), inclusive, of this section shall be exercised and carried out upon such conditions and in such manner as the President deems satisfactory.

"Sec. 4. All contracts or agreements made for the disposition of any defense article or defense information pursuant to section 3 shall contain a clause by which the foreign government undertakes that it
will not, without the consent of the President, transfer title or
possession of such defense article or defense information by gift,
sale, or otherwise, or authorize the use of such defense article or
defense information by or under the direction of any other foreign
government.

"Sec. 5. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the
head of any other department or agency of the Government involved shall,
when any such defense article or defense information is exported, immediately
inform the department or agency designated by the President to administer
section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), of the quantities,
character, value, terms of disposition, and destination of the article and
information so exported.

"Sec. 6(a). There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from
time to time, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appro-
priated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions
and accomplish the purposes of this Act.

"(b) All money and all property which is converted into money
received under section 3 from any government shall, with the approval
of the Director of the Budget, revert to the respective appropriation
or appropriations out of which funds were expended in acquiring the
defense article or defense information for which such consideration is
received, and shall be available for expenditure for the purpose for which
such expended funds were appropriated by law, during the fiscal year in
which such funds are received and the ensuing fiscal year.
"Sec. 7. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the head of the department or agency shall in all contracts or agreements for the disposition of any such defense article or defense information fully protect the rights of all citizens of the United States who have patent rights in and to any such article or information which is hereby authorized to be disposed of and the payments collected for royalties on such patents shall be paid to the owners and holders of such patents.

"Sec. 8. The Secretaries of War and of the Navy are hereby authorized to purchase or otherwise acquire arms, ammunition, and implements of war produced within the jurisdiction of any country to which section 3 is applicable, whenever the President deems such purchase or acquisition to be necessary in the interests of the defense of the United States.

"Sec. 9. The President may, from time to time, promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this Act; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred on him by this Act through such department, agency, or officer as he shall direct."
July 31, 1941.

My dear Bob:

Because of some uncertainties which seem to have developed in regard to the position of the Treasury Department about some phases in the Tax Bill as reported out by the Ways and Means Committee, I asked the Treasury Department for a clarifying letter, and I think it is only fair to send this to you. I enclose a copy, and also an appendix showing examples of corporations which would largely escape excess profits taxes under the bill.

I am sure that I make it clear that the Treasury Department does not approve of mandatory joint tax returns except on the condition of granting substantial relief to earned income of the husband and wife. In this respect I heartily concur. But the Committee draft leaves out the proviso altogether.

You and Jere Cooper have talked over the problem of the excess profits tax in its relationship to the omission in the bill of application of this tax to certain types of corporations. These corporations may be making 20 or 30 or 50% on their equity capital. It is my definite opinion that they ought to contribute to the cost of our great defense program far more heavily this year than last year or the year before. But just because they happened to have made equally large profits in recent years, they should not be made to contribute no more to the national defense under the proposed bill than they did before. That seems to me clearly a discrimination in their favor.

There is one other subject which I did not have a chance to talk with you about. It relates to lowering the exemptions in the lower brackets. I know that very few tax experts agree with me but I still think that some way ought to be found by which the exemption of a single person should be reduced to $750.00, with a provision for a straight simple payment of some small contribution to the national tax income through some simple agency like the post office, mail in week simple form.

In the same way I think that the married exemption should be reduced to $1,500.00, again with a simple method of paying the tax through a simple agency and on a simple form.
Further, I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of our citizens want to contribute something directly to our defense and that most of them would rather do it with their eyes open than do it through a general sales tax or through a multiplication of what we have known as "nuisance taxes". In other words, most Americans who are in the lowest income brackets are willing and proud to chip in directly even if their individual contributions are very small in terms of dollars. After all the majority of all Americans are in.

Your Committee thinks it worthwhile to study the filing of low income returns through the machinery of the Post Office. This will undoubtedly save a good deal of the cost of collection under the present system. These simple returns could be sworn to before the local Postmaster who, of course, would have to be authorized to administer the necessary oath.

Very sincerely yours,

Honorable Robert L. Doughton,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.
PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

October 9, 1941.

Dear John--

This one gave me a real laugh. To think that the Pope blessed the banners of the Orangemen is, I think, something that should be kept in strict confidence! You will notice that the name of the Pope at that time was "Innocent"! Please send this back for my files.

Always sincerely,

Honorable John W. McCormack,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

(Enclosure) Letter from Captain William Macdonald of 420 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa., on religious discussion which has arisen over aid to Russia and pointing out that many opposites meet in the waging of wars.
October 9, 1941.

Dear Captain Macdonald:

The President has asked me to thank you very much for your letter of October sixth, which he was interested in reading.

Very sincerely yours,

GRACE G. TULLY

Captain William Macdonald,
420 Walnut Street,
Philadelphia,
Pennsylvania.
October 28, 1941.

Dear Mr. President:

I got "a real kick" out of reading the within letter, and there is probably some truth to it, as I assume Mr. Macdonald looked up his history before writing you. It was awfully good of you to send the same to me, with your kind personal message, which I appreciate and value very much.

With kind personal regards, I am

Very respectfully yours,

Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.
Dear Mr. President:

In the present religious discussion which has arisen over aid to Russia, I thought in one of your press conferences you might point out that many opposites meet in the waging of wars.

You might point out that Pope Innocent XI blessed the troops and banners of the Protestant, William of Orange, and his English allies, at the Battle of the Boyne, July 11, 1690, which led to the defeat of the Catholic Irish who were fighting for their faith and their king. The reason the Pope so acted, was to curb the power of Louis XIV of France, who had started out to conquer Europe, or to acquire it by duplicity, as Mr. Hitler is attempting at the present time.

Please remember me to my cousin, Mrs. Roosevelt, and express the regret I entertained on the recent death of her devoted brother.

Respectfully,

William Macdonald

Captain William Macdonald

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt,
The President.
Very sincerely yours,

[Signature]

November 6, 1941

Postscript:

[Signature]
November 6, 1941.

Personal and Confidential.

My dear Mr. Congressman:

The President has asked me to send you for your confidential use, copy of letter which he has written to Congressman Steagall.

Very respectfully,

EDWIN M. WATSON
Secretary to the President.

Honorable John W. McCormack,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Enc.
November 6, 1941.

Personal and Confidential.

My dear Mr. Speaker:

The President has asked me to send you for your confidential use, copy of letter which he has written to Congressman Steagall.

Very respectfully,

EDWIN A. WATSON
Secretary to the President.

Hon. Sam Rayburn,
Speaker,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Enc.
November 6, 1941.

**Personal and Confidential.**

My dear Mr. Congressman:

The President has asked me to send you for your confidential use, copy of letter which he has written to Congressman Steagall.

Very respectfully,

EDWIN M. WATSON
Secretary to the President.

Hon. Jere Cooper,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Enc.
November 5, 1941

General Edwin Watson
Secretary to the President
The White House

Dear Pa:

This morning the President told me to prepare a letter for his signature to Henry Steagall. A draft is herewith enclosed.

Incidentally, please remind the President again when he sees Patman this afternoon to talk with him about the need for fixing up the Farm provision in the Price Bill.

The President asked that copies of his letter to Steagall go to the Speaker, and to Congressmen McCormack and Jere Cooper.

Sincerely yours,

Leon Henderson
Administrator

The boss wished each of the 4 copies to be marked in some way like "For the confidential use of --" and to have the covering envelope enclosed in another, marked similarly. I expect Roberta knows how he means.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Date this letter November 5, 1941

I was very happy to be told by the legislative leaders this morning that the House will take up the Price Bill immediately after the Neutrality Bill is disposed of.
Dear Henry:

This morning I talked with Leon Henderson about the changes made by your Committee in our Price Control Bill. Some of the changes struck me as being very serious.

The provision governing agriculture prices is entirely unsupportable and unacceptable. Some time ago when Ed O'Neal was in to see me with Claude Wickard, I told Ed that I would accept 110% as a maximum but only for the purpose of helping to secure an average of 100% of parity the year round. I also told Ed and Claude that they could say that I would veto any bill which went beyond what we agreed upon. If the Price Control Bill comes up to me with a limitation on farm prices substantially higher than 110% of parity I will not be able to accept it.

The license provision, I understand, was completely stricken out by the Committee. This should be restored because I don't see how retail prices can be controlled in any other manner. The way the cost of living is going up now we will be under increasing pressure to do something substantial about it. As I remember, Hoover and Garfield used licenses to control food and fuel prices in the last war.

I am sorry the Committee weakened the Bill by other actions, but of these the one which concerns me most is the limitation on the buying and selling authority. It seems to me that you can't have effective price control without something like the original provision in the Bill.

I told our legislative leaders this morning that I would like to see the Price Bill taken up in the House immediately after the Neutrality Bill is disposed of.

Yours faithfully,

Hon. Henry B. Steagall
Banking and Currency Committee
House of Representatives
November 15, 1941

Dear Mr. President:

Your personal note of November 13th was handed to me by a messenger about thirty minutes before the vote was taken on the Senate Amendments to the Neutrality Bill.

Previous to receiving your note and for many days and almost sleepless nights, I had been pondering and wrestling as to what my course of action should be touching the Senate Amendments to the Neutrality Bill.

You are aware of course that up to this vote I had supported each and every measure proposed by the Administration for National Defense and had at all times felt my safest course was to follow the leadership of yourself and Secretary Hull, especially as to the International Policy of our Government.

When we passed the House Bill, I, perhaps mistakenly, understood that Bill to express the views of yourself and Secretary Hull and cheerfully gave it my support. However, in the light of all my thinking I did not feel safe in going further.

I shall, of course, not go into detail in this letter as to the reasons that impelled me to reach a decision, but this letter is to tell you that no experience through which I have ever passed, for the more than thirty years I have served in Congress, has given me so much real pain as not being able to comply with your request.

Your uniform courtesy and unwavering kindness to me since 1933 will ever be one of the most sacred and precious heritages of my entire public career.

I trust you will feel that if I have made a mistake in this matter, it was an error of judgment and not a willful or deliberate act.

Replying to the second paragraph of your letter, in which you express the desire to see me early
Next week concerning matters in which we are jointly responsible, will say that I shall be glad to see you any time at your convenience, day or night.

With my highest consideration, I am, faithfully and

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

The President

The White House
November 18, 1941.

Dear Mr. Gathings:

Many thanks for your letter. The situation seems to be coming to a head and I am trying to get responsibility for it placed unequivocally on the right spot.

Very sincerely yours,

Honorable E. C. Gathings,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.
Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt  
President of the United States  
The White House  
Washington, D. C.  

Dear Mr. President:

The strike situation continues to imperil the safety and security of our country, and it is even more serious today than when I discussed this matter with you a few days ago. I feel that I am expressing the views of practically the unanimous citizenship of the First District of Arkansas, which I have the honor to represent, when I say that strikes and work stoppages in plants filling defense contracts must end, and now, if Hitlerism is to be defeated. The American people's patience is wearing to a very thin edge when labor leaders of the John L. Lewis stripe continue to sabotage the defense efforts of this country. We all realize that labor has certain rights and that these rights are to be protected, but in these critical times some legislative safeguard regarding strikes should be thrown up, particularly in reference to our Defense Program. The workers themselves are not wholly responsible for the work stoppages and strikes and I am of the firm belief that the great mass of defense workers is primarily interested in the advancement of the Defense Program. The mail that I am receiving from my district and the state of Arkansas discloses that the people demand action at once against the further encroachment of labor gangsters in connection with our defense efforts.

I do not favor recessing or adjournment of the Congress until drastic strike legislation shall have been enacted. I urge that you confer with Speaker Sam Rayburn and Majority Leader John W. McCormack and demand the immediate passage through Congress of urgent legislation that will assure continued and un-interrupted production of direly needed essentials in our National Defense Program. I am confident that without your full and complete support it would be difficult, and probably impossible, to enact this needed legislation since
President of the United States  

November 15, 1941

every effort that we members of Congress, who have worked tirelessly for several months in behalf of proposals to prevent the loss in production by strikes, has been futile.

According to the figures which I have obtained from the Department of Labor, there was a loss of 15,750,000 man-days, due to strikes, for seven months in the year 1941. The war goods that would have been produced had there been no strikes during 1941 would have prevented many of the successes of the Hitler advance and furnished needed weapons to the armed forces of the United States.

I listened with great interest to the speech of Hon. Sam Rayburn on the floor of the House during the debate on the Neutrality Repeal Bill. He quoted a letter from you which said, "This government proposes to see this thing through." I am wholeheartedly in accord; but the people are interested in being assured that no interruptions through labor disputes will continue in the future. A specific request on your part to Congressional leaders for the passage of a bill to stop defense strikes would unify America for the great trials and sacrifices that lie ahead.

With the hope that you will give this matter your immediate attention, I am

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Jrh

E. C. Gathings
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

November 27, 1941.

Personal and Confidential

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN W. MCCORMACK:

I hope you are keeping in touch with this situation.

F.D.R.

Memo for H.H.M. from ToI 11/24 saying that Howard Hunter telephoned that the America First Committee has a candidate for Larry Connery's seat (caused by Connery's death) etc.
MEMORANDUM FOR

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

F. D. R.

Copy of Under Secretary

Welles' letter sent with this memo.
My dear Mr. President:

With reference to your memorandum which accompanied the correspondence sent to you by Congressman McCormack under date of November 27, I am glad to let you know that all of the licenses and navicerts necessary for the shipment from the United States of the material desired by the Vatican have now been issued by the British Government and the supplies can consequently be embarked on the next steamer leaving for Lisbon.

I am informing John McCormack in that sense.

I may say that I have been working on this matter for some weeks past and that, notwithstanding the apparent bitter opposition on the part of some of the members of the British Cabinet, a favorable decision was finally reached as a result of a personal recommendation sent to the Prime Minister by Lord Halifax.

Believe me

Faithfully yours,

Encs.

The President,

The White House.
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D.C.

November Twenty-seventh

My dear General Watson:

I am enclosing a memorandum for the President, and I will appreciate it if you will call it to his attention as soon as you can, as I consider it to be a matter of importance, particularly if some of the vicious enemies of the President in his foreign policy obtained this information they would use it in their destructive effort to inflame and divide our people. Furthermore, from the affirmative angle, I know the President would be anxious, if he can, to have something done on this matter.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

General Edwin M. Watson
The White House
Washington, D.C.
I received a telephone call from Archbishop Spellman of New York, in which he told me that some food and articles had been purchased in the United States for the Vatican, and the Pope was very much interested in their delivery. It is my understanding that Archbishop Spellman has made the purchases in the United States at the request of the Vatican, and he has made arrangements for their shipment through the American-Export Line. I also understand that navicerts have been issued by the British Embassy or by Britain, and that some have not as yet been issued, particularly in relation to the purchase of three or four trucks, which are necessary to transport the goods from Lisbon to Rome. The issuance of the navicerts on the trucks is a matter of great importance, and one which Archbishop Spellman is deeply interested in and concerned about. To date the British have held up the issuance of these navicerts.

Under Secretary Wells has been very cooperative and has done great work. He is aware of the situation. I talked with him this morning.

I understand that the trucks are necessary to transport the goods which has been purchased. Naturally the British are deeply concerned about the trucks being used by the Italian Government after they reach the Vatican. I am assured that if definite assurance will be given to the British Government that the Vatican will not permit the trucks to be used in any way by the Italian Government.

Archbishop Spellman is very anxious to have the navicerts issued for the shipment of the trucks as soon as possible. It is this matter to which I particularly call your attention in this memorandum.
I do not like to bother you but the importance of this is such that I feel that every effort should be made, particularly in view of the fact that if some of the vicious opponents who are seeking to inflame and divide our people got hold of this information, they would use it for that very purpose.

John W. McCormack
MEMORANDUM

December fifth. [1941]

Dear General:—

Will you kindly tell the President in connection with the within matter, Dave Niles and I are keeping in touch with the situation. Tell the President that we feel that State Senator Lane of Lawrence, Mass., appears to be the best one to support. He is the only candidate from Lawrence, and that district has not had a congressman from Lawrence for twenty years. The people of that city ought to support a strong local candidate, which is the best evidence that I have. That seems to be the feeling of those who know this district. There are some other fine candidates in the fight, former Mayor Manning of Lynn, at present County Commissioner, State Representative O'Shea, and Judge Kiley, all coming from Lynn, as well as some other candidates on lesser political vote getting ability from other sections of this district. From the reports I have received from those who ought to know, Lane seems to have the best chance against Harrington, who is running on an American First Ticket. Harrington is also a State Senator—well liked, and must be watched. I understand that labor leaders in the A.F. of L., and the C.I.O. will support Lane. I have talked with some. Bob Watts also agrees with this position. Lane is also first cousin of Denis Delaney, State Director of the W.P.A. However, Lane should receive all assistance possible.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

November 27, 1941.

Personal and Confidential

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN W. MCCORMACK:

I hope you are keeping in touch with this situation.

F.D.R.
MEMO FOR M. H. M.

Howard Hunter phoned to say that the America First Committee has a candidate for Larry Connery's seat (caused by Connery's death) - it is the first candidate they have sponsored since it is the first election held. They are getting Nye, Wheeler and Lindburgh behind their candidate.

Mr. Hunter says he is getting his Massachusetts crowd behind his candidate and thinks the America First crowd should be beaten.

He could not tell me the name of either candidate but said he would find out.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

12-4-41

Confidentially referred
to the President:

E.M.W.
Office of the Majority Leader
House of Representatives U.S.
Washington, D.C.
February 28, 1942

Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President:

You will remember a few weeks ago you spoke to me concerning
the resolution to investigate the Federal Communications Commission,
which is now pending the Rules Committee. You suggested that I
speak to Gene Cox. I have done so. As a matter of fact, I have
done so on several occasions, and he is still considering the matter.

However, Wednesday afternoon I was informed the Rules
Committee intended to hold a hearing on the resolution Thursday
morning. Wednesday evening I talked with Adolph Sabath, telling
him it was my wish that the hearing would not take place and that he
would have the hearing postponed. Fortunately, because of a cold,
Adolph called off the meeting the next morning.

I have talked with various Members of the Rules Committee
in an effort to obtain enough votes to prevent the resolution from
being reported out, if Gene Cox decides to go ahead. I have talked
with Sabath, Clark, Nichols, Delaney and Lawrence Lewis, and they
have agreed to vote against the resolution. I have asked Sabath
not to call his hearing until I have had an opportunity to talk with
some of the other Members with whom I feel I can discuss the matter.
There are a few Democratic Members on the Committee with whom I
prefer not to talk, and I think you know the reason why.

I am making this confidential report to you, and which
I am personally typing. I will make a further report to you as
soon as I have any information.

With kind regards I am, as always,

Very respectfully yours,

[Signature]

John W. McCormack
Office of the Majority Leader
House of Representatives U.S.
Washington, D.C.

February 28, 1942

Secretary to the President
White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear General:

I will appreciate it if you will that the within report is given to the President.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
March 23-24

Dear Mr. President: I hate to add to your troubles, but the fact is, about twenty members of the House came to me today and asked me to suggest to you that you discuss in a "futile chum" the truth of the "forty hour" week. I explained that you had given a very comprehensive explanation to the press several days ago but they countered that many people did not read the newspapers and others could not understand when they did read. Therefore, because feeling is running high in the House on the Republican side and the Southern Democratic side, I believe it is my duty...
Mrs. Lucille M. Considine, Clerk

To transmit to you just how your real friends in the House feel. They contend that you and you only have the complete confidence of the majority of the people and because this is true you can do the job.

Now I know it isn't fair to burden you with this matter at this time, at the same time I feel I have a very great responsibility to the working people of America. So what else can I do.

Kattenhorn should be first in his place. He is not a loyal American.

I attempted today to present some facts concerning the forty hour week and what it has done. This is merely a voice crying in the wilderness. I am appealing to your dear friend as the only person...
who can combat this range of misinformation.
If you feel you many duties will permit you to do so, I believe it is the opportune time and those of us who love and respect you will be eternally grateful.
With every good wish,

My sincerely yours,

Mary Norton

The President
The White House
Washington D.C.
March 24, 1942.

Dear Mary:—

You are right about my going on the air — but there is also the other side of it. From now on, for the duration of the war, there are going to be periods of hysteria, misinformation, volcanic eruptions, etc., and if I start the practice of going on the air to answer each one, the value of my going on the air will soon disappear. I think this particular anti-labor outburst is already beginning to diminish — and will continue to do so unless some new circumstance develops.

I think I will go on the air in about two weeks. For the sake of not becoming a platitude to the public, I ought not to appear oftener than once every five or six weeks. I am inclined to think that in England Churchill, for a while, talked too much, and I don’t want to do that.

Meanwhile, do your best to stop the lions and tigers from roaring!

As ever yours,

Honorable Mary T. Norton,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.
Dear President Roosevelt:

Just a note to tell you how very interesting and helpful it was to personally confer with you this morning, and to again thank you for taking time out in your busy day to talk with me.

I was deeply impressed by the information you gave me anent the military and naval training and backgrounds of James, Elliott, Franklin Jr. and John, and the activities in which they are presently engaged. I now fully and clearly realize that each of them is wielding a keen and flashing blade for our country.

It was great to find you looking so well, Mr. President. In the vernacular of my old home bailiwick, the Texas Panhandle, you appear fit and ready "to tangle with a mess of wildcats."

Trusting that our paths will be crossing often in the future, and with my kindest personal regards, I remain

Cordially,

WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER.

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.
BENNET APPEALS TO COUNTY COMMITTEE FOR APPROVAL

Augustus W. Bennet, in a letter to members of Orange County Republican Committee, notes that their endorsement of a candidate for Congress "will be a tremendous asset" to the person favored, and says "I would like to have it." The principal question, he says, is: "Who may the better ensure Republican success, Mr. Fish or myself?" and continues:

"If I am nominated, my time will be devoted to attacks on the shortcomings and inefficiencies of the bureaucracy. If he were nominated, Mr. Fish, on the contrary, would be forced on the defensive by attacks on his own mistakes. You and your other candidates would have to bear the burden of his many blunders and unfortunate connections, should you endorse him. For in endorsing him, you would be necessarily endorsing his record also.

"It is no exaggeration to say that not only the county and the district but the whole county waits to see whether you ratify his course and actions.

Orange County Background

"I have an Orange County background dating from pre-Revolutionary days. My great-grandfather represented Orange in the Assembly. My grandfather was a member of the Board of Supervisors, and my father was once clerk of that board. I myself may cite years of civic service in the County of Orange. Mr. Fish has no such claim to your support. He is not a resident of our county. It is not even clear that he is now a resident of the Congressional District. His proposal to move into Orange County naturally will alienate some Putnam County voters without, under the circumstances, gaining him any friends here.

"There is no organized opposition to me in any Republican group. Republicans will vote for me. So, I am certain, will a substantial number of independent and Democratic voters. This would ensure success of the entire Republican ticket. The nomination of my opponent would, on the other hand, antagonize thousands of Republican voters. In the light of recent political history can our party stand further losses?"
The following is an article copied from the files of the Newburgh News. Of the seventeen charges the Independent Committee makes against Hamilton Fish, eight had already taken place at the time Bennett wrote this item, and sent it to the News.

Newburgh News, Saturday, November 2, 1940 - - - - -Page 15

FISH Smeer DENOUNCED
BY LOCAL ATTORNEY

Attacks made on Representative Hamilton Fish are likened to New Deal tactics in general in applying the smear to Republican candidates, in a statement to the News by Augustus Bennett today.

"I have consistently opposed many of Congressman Fish's policies, as the Congressman knows, but I am convinced that in everything which he has done he has been activated by a belief that his policies were in the best interest of our country.

"In common with every other fair minded citizen of this vicinity, I am outraged by the unfair and libelous attacks upon Congressman Fish's motives, contained in a pamphlet being distributed by the Steeholm Committee, and am also disappointed to find that Mr. Steeholm has not seen fit thus far to repudiate the Pamphlet, although disclaiming responsibility for it.

"Congressman Fish has amply demonstrated his patriotism by his service overseas in combat forces during the last war, and by his continual efforts for adequate preparedness since. Can the same be said for Mr. Steeholm and his anonymous backers, whoever they may be?

"I feel that this effort to smear our Representative in Congress is in keeping with the tactics adopted all along the New Deal front in the hope of applying the tags of Communism, Nazism, or some other unpopular group to the Republican candidates. The reaction of every independent voter should be to vote for Mr. Fish on election day so as to stop for all time such unfair, un-American and disgusting tactics."
The following is a statement of the facts of the Nero issue.

The News has been in the possession of the New Deal faction

attacks made on Representative Hamilton and the Ickes to New Deal faction.

in order to bring about the success of Representative Hamilton, I have a duty to do what is necessary to maintain our party and to the best interest of our country.

In common with every other man who has lived to the age of 60, I have seen the dangers and the evil effects of the Depression. I have seen how government machinery can fail to serve the people, how government has failed to serve the people.

I feel that this effort to save the Representative in Congress in an

environce of peace, prosperity, and honest government, as we have never known before.
FERDINAND A. HOYT
BEACON, N.Y.

AGE—61 YEARS.

FAMILY—2 CHILDREN, DIVORCED RECENTLY (no scandal).

RELIGION—EPISCOPALIAN.

POLITICS—DEMOCRAT—VERY PROGRESSIVE.

NON-POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS—AMERICAN LEGION, MASON.

ARMED SERVICE EXPERIENCE—SERVED IN THE NAVY DURING LAST WAR.

FAMILY BACKGROUND—DIRECT DESCENDANT OF MASS. HOYTS ARRIVING AMERICA EARLY 1600
A.D., IMMEDIATE FAMILY COMING FROM PUTMAN COUNTY, N.Y.

OCCUPATIONS—RESIDENCE—1. LAWYER—BEACON.
2. STATE ASSEMBLYMAN 1912—FROM BEACON—LAST DEMOCRAT
ASSEMBLYMAN TO SERVE FROM DUTCHESS.
3. BEACON CITY JUDGE—LAST DEMOCRAT CITY JUDGE FROM
BEACON.
4. JOINED NAVY LAST WAR.
5. RAN BEACON DAILY NEWSPAPER FOR TEN YEARS, SOLD OUT
TO GANNETT.
6. RAN AGAINST GLEASON FOR SURROGATE AT REQUEST OF
ROOSEVELT—WAS DEFEATED.
7. "COMPENSATION REFERREE" FOR PAST 13 YEARS—COVERING
CASES IN ORANGE, DUTCHESS, PUTNAM COUNTIES.
8. CHAIRMAN OF BEACON—DEMOCRATIC CITY COMMITTEE.

POLITICAL FOLLOWING—STRONG LABOR AND LOW INCOME GROUP FOLLOWING THROUGHOUT
ENTIRE 26TH DISTRICT.

GENERAL REPUTATION—EXCELLENT.

APPEARANCE—PLEASANT.

VOICE—FAIR.

FIGHT—PLENTY.

SPEAKER—GOOD

Mr. Hoyt will run if he is assured of the unqualified backing of the Demo-
ocratic party and the Independent Committee. He will be certain to get the ALP
backing which Steeholm failed to get in the last election.

My personal opinion is that if an Independent Republican is listed on the
election ballot for the purpose of weakening Mr. Fish's vote, Mr. Hoyt can win
the election.

A.W.B.
MEMORANDUM FOR
JOHN McCORMACK
FOR YOUR INFORMATION AND
PLEASE RETURN FOR MY FILES.

F. D. R.

Memo from Capt. McCrea re contract let by the Bureau of Docks and Yards known as the South Boston Works with complete memorandum re above from Admiral Ben Moreell 5/9/42
June 16, 1942

Colonel Marvin H. McIntyre
The White House
Washington, D. C.

Dear Marvin:

I am enclosing a letter, which is intended as a memorandum for the President. I will appreciate it if you will call it to his attention at the convenience of the President.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Office of the Majority Leader
House of Representatives U.S.
Washington, D.C.

June 16, 1942

Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President:

Following the meeting of Monday, and having in mind the talk we had in relation to the tax bill, Speaker Rayburn and I had a conference with Congressman Doughton and Congressman Cooper. They both agreed that if there is no effort to insert a sales tax in the bill that the bill ought to be reported out of Committee in time to be brought up in the House around July 7. If there is a fight in the Committee to insert a sales tax this fight will hold the bill in Committee for a period of from two to four weeks longer.

Congressman Cooper said, "This bill is four times as large in volume as the biggest bill ever reported out of Committee before." He also said, "The Committee has worked out about one hundred administrative changes and we feel obligated to consider them because the Committee has been promising for the past two years to consider necessary administrative changes."

They both informed Speaker Rayburn and me that the bill, more or less tentatively agreed on at the present time, will raise about six and a half billion dollars, and if the Administration insists on a bill being reported out of Committee which will raise about eight and a half billion dollars that in their opinion there will be a sales tax附加 in the Committee.

To summarize, if a bill raising about six and a half billion dollars is satisfactory at this time, or is not opposed, or if a bill raising about eight and a half billion dollars is not insisted on, then it is felt that the bill can be reported out of Committee in about three weeks. Otherwise, it will take from two to four weeks longer.

I am making this report to you so you will be advised of the situation.
You will remember I made some observations about the fact that if John Sullivan were handling the tax bill it might have come out of Committee more quickly. I have made inquiry of the Members of the Committee about Mr. Paul and I want to correct the impression that I have heretofore conveyed to you. The Members of the Committee to whom I have spoken about Mr. Paul, and I spoke to others than Congressman Doughton and Congressman Cooper all stated, in substance, that Mr. Paul is a fine man, is a very diplomatic, and a good man to work with.

With kind personal regards, I am, as always,

Very respectfully,

P.S. I asked Congressman Doughton and Congressman Cooper about passing a bill relating only to excise taxes and leaving the rest of the bill until later on, but they both felt they could not very well do that at this time. They both told us that the excise taxes have already been practically passed upon, as well as other important features of the bill, and that if the sales tax were out of the way that the bill would be easy, provided the Administration did not insist on a bill which would raise about eight billion five hundred million dollars.

John.
Dear Grace:

Since April I have been in the South and Southwest Pacific, seeing everything and doing everything.

Before the Navy puts me overboard or I resign from Congress I think it extremely necessary that I have a moment with my Boss, preferably at the House in order not to arouse reporters' curiosity, but a moment anywhere as soon as I can.

In the meantime I will sit at home for word from you, because if I go to the Hill or the Department it means a barrage of questions and I do not know what my Boss thinks I must do.

Sincerely,

Lyndon B. Johnson

Miss Grace Tully
The White House
Washington, D.C.
WASHINGTON
July 15, 1942

MEMO FOR MHM

Congr. John McCormack phoned:

1. "I am anxious to find out the viewpoint on the proposed compromise of the Agricultural Appropriation Bill where Cannon has offered an amendment authorizing the sale of 25,000,000 bushels of wheat at the parity price of corn instead of 85 percent parity price of corn.

"We are going to act on it shortly after twelve and I am holding it up until I get word.

2. "I also would like to have the viewpoint of the Chief on the 100% of parity loan passed by the Senate and now in Committee in the House."
Dear John:

Can't you find a freshman Congressman on our side who will wait his chance until the first time that Clare talks and then quote this poem? I think it is wholly parliamentary -- just as much so as other newspaper clippings which are stuck into your Congressional Record.

Very sincerely yours,

Honorable John W. McCormack,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Enclosure

Clipping of poem as attached.
Au Clare de la Luce

O Lovely Luce -- O Comely Clare!
Do you remember -- way back there --
Holding your lacquered nails aloft,
"The war we fight," you said, "is soft."

And while the vote hung in the balance
You turned the trick with all your talents.
You were the keystone brave and buoyant.
By Lucifer, were you clarevoyant!

Time marches on, events apace --
Are you a hoarder saving face?
What say you now that Eisenhower
Has Africa within his power?

What say you of the bold attack
Where sea is blue and sky is black --
"Vive la Liberté" for all!
"Soft" was the word, do you recall?

"Soft" where the dauntless Callaghan
Gave life itself, where every man
Rode through the fire with flag aloft?
Say it again -- did you say "soft"?

O Lovely Luce -- O Comely Clare!
The brave deserve the less unfair.
You are elected now, that's that --
The ring we'd say is in your hat.

But ere you pack your Vuitton grip
To take the Washingtonian trip,
While still responding to the toasts,
Remember this: those words are ghosts.

And when it's mealtime, never stoop
To see the letters in the soup.
The ghosts may form like homing birds
"My God," you'll cry, "I ate my words!"

Howard Dietz.
The Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D. C.

My dear Friend:

This morning I received your confidential memorandum with the attached note from the Chief of Staff and I heartily concur in your views touching the proposed trip overseas of the Truman Committee.

I shall take my stand for the size of committee suggested by General Marshall.

Faithfully yours,

[Signature]

McN/P
March 76, 1943.

Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt,

The White House,

Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President:

I have received your confidential memorandum in relation to travel abroad by Committees of the House. A group of members and if any such trips are proposed in the future, which I am convinced the recommendations of Admiral Marshall will be followed.

With kind personal regards,

Very respectfully yours,

John W. McCormack
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT:

Secretary Morgenthau called to say that he has just heard from Lyndon Johnson and that he is making very good headway against the Rumel plan. Sam Rayburn gets in tomorrow morning on the B & O train. Lyndon Johnson strongly recommends that the President see him at once and to ask Rayburn to tell Cong. McCormack and Ramspeck to stop talking compromise. Lyndon Johnson also says will you ask Sam Rayburn to see that all the Democratic members attend and vote.

djb
March 30, 1943

Honorable Matthew J. Harritt,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Harritt:

I have had several suggestions recently from Members of Congress to associate the Congress more directly with the purely military phase of the war through the visit of a small Congressional group to the fighting fronts. These suggestions, now under consultation with the Army and Navy, conform generally to your proposal of March 16th.

There appears to be considerable merit in the proposal, but you will doubtless appreciate that the transportation problem is a critical one and will largely govern the disposition of the matter. I discussed this rather fully in a recent letter to the Congressional leaders of both Houses of Congress, and suggest that you consult with them regarding future plans.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT
WAR DEPARTMENT
WASHINGTON, D.C.

March 29, 1943.

MEMORANDUM FOR GENERAL WATSON:

The attached is a proposed reply for the President's signature to Congressman Merritt concerning the visit of a joint Congressional committee to the theaters of operations.

I am also enclosing a copy of General Marshall's memorandum of March 19th to the President and a copy of the President's memorandum of March 23rd to leaders in Congress, both of which concern the subject of Mr. Merritt's letter. The proposed reply conforms with the substance of these memoranda.

Enclosures.

Secretary of War
MEMORANDUM FOR

THE VICE PRESIDENT
THE SPEAKER
SENATOR BARKEY
SENATOR McNARY
CONGRESSMAN MCCORMACK
CONGRESSMAN MARTIN

When I heard of the proposed trip overseas of the Truman Committee of the Senate, I took up with General Marshall the question of visits of Congressional Committees to the various fields of war action and I am sending to each of you, in great confidence, a copy of General Marshall's reply.

In other words, there is no question of the Army's (and the Navy's) complete accord with having a small number of Members from both Houses visit the fronts. But there is involved the serious question of transportation. I might add to what General Marshall says by calling your attention to the fact that every visit to the front by any civilian -- special plane or planes, etc. -- does take the place of officers, men or munitions which would otherwise use the plane or planes.

Therefore, I greatly hope that the last paragraph of the confidential letter to me from the Chief of Staff can be made the guiding spirit of things both in the Senate and the House.

F. D. R.
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT:

With reference to the proposed trip overseas of the Truman Committee, it is understood that the Committee proposes to make these trips into foreign theaters as an extension of the investigation of the defense program which it has been pursuing in the United States. It does not propose to concern itself with military or naval strategy or tactics. Appropriate departments and agencies of the Government will be consulted in preparing plans for these several missions. I am also informed that the delegation on this first mission will be limited to three or possibly four Senators.

So far as this particular Committee is concerned it is believed that the members will keep within bounds and that the visit will tend to satisfy Congressional curiosity or doubts as to conditions in the theaters visited, and I should be in favor of the plan. However, it is probable that a similar Committee from the House will be moved to propose similar visits, and quite possible that Senator Chandler’s Subcommittee may also propose such visits.

If it could be arranged through the leaders on the Hill that not more than one Committee from each House will be accorded the opportunity for such visits and that the size of the visiting Committee be restricted to four members it would greatly simplify the problem for the Army, and presumably for the Navy.

(Sgd) G. C. MARSHALL

Chief of Staff.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

March 19, 1943.

MEMORANDUM FOR
THE SECRETARY OF WAR

FOR PREPARATION OF REPLY
FOR MY SIGNATURE.

F. D. R.

Letter from Cong. Matthew J. Merritt, 3/16/43 to the President, suggesting appointment of a Joint Committee to visit the war fronts.
March 23, 1943.

MEMORANDUM FOR

THE VICE PRESIDENT
THE SPEAKER
SENIOR BARKLEY
SENIOR McNARY
CONGRESSMAN McCORMACK
CONGRESSMAN MARTIN (Joseph)

When I heard of the proposed trip overseas of the Truman Committee of the Senate, I took up with General Marshall the question of visits of Congressional Committees to the various fields of war action and I am sending to each of you, in great confidence, a copy of General Marshall's reply.

In other words, there is no question of the Army's (and the Navy's) complete accord with having a small number of Members from both Houses visit the fronts. But there is involved the serious question of transportation. I might add to what General Marshall says by calling your attention to the fact that every visit to the front by any civilian -- special planes or planes, etc. -- does take the place of officers, men or munitions which would otherwise use the plane or planes.

Therefore, I greatly hope that the last paragraph of the confidential letter to me from the Chief of Staff can be made the guiding spirit of things both in the Senate and the House.

F. D. R.
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT:

With reference to the proposed trip overseas of the Truman Committee, it is understood that the Committee proposes to make these trips into foreign theaters as an extension of the investigation of the defense program which it has been pursuing in the United States. It does not propose to concern itself with military or naval strategy or tactics. Appropriate departments and agencies of the Government will be consulted in preparing plans for these several missions. I am also informed that the delegation on this first mission will be limited to three or possibly four Senators.

So far as this particular Committee is concerned it is believed that the members will keep within bounds and that the visit will tend to satisfy Congressional curiosity or doubts as to conditions in the theaters visited, and I should be in favor of the plan. However, it is probable that a similar Committee from the House will be moved to propose similar visits, and quite possible that Senator Chandler's Subcommittee may also propose such visits.

If it could be arranged through the leaders on the Hill that not more than one Committee from each House will be accorded the opportunity for such visits and that the size of the visiting Committee be restricted to four members it would greatly simplify the problem for the Army, and presumably for the Navy.
PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

January 17, 1944.

MEMORANDUM FOR

HON. SAM RAYBURN

This fellow Garey is still acting as Counsel for that Committee and he is wasting everybody’s time. He is worse than a nuisance because all he is doing is to stir up untrue publicity against the Government. For instance, he is now trying to prove that two Rear Admirals were “railroaded” because they testified against Fy before the Committee. One of these Rear Admirals came to the retirement age, just like everybody else. I do not even know whether the other one is still with the communications’ office in the Navy Department or whether, his turn having come, he has gone to sea.

Also, at Garey’s instigation, the Committee is planning to call J. Edgar Hoover on some national security matter, and I have directed that Hoover shall not go, as I had already told the Secretaries of the Departments concerned.

While Cox was still with the Committee a good many really secret items — matters which in themselves raised no issues — were testified to before the Committee and the papers had them, in spite of their secrecy, within a few hours.

I really think the time has come when Garey, who is clearly working on a political basis, should go. I think Lea, Magnuson and Hart are all ready to move, and I hope much that you will persuade them to do it — damn soon!

F. D. R.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

January 15, 1944.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT:

T. G. C. called me the other day to say that Leo Crowley is sick, but before he got the flu he checked with New Jersey to make sure that Hart was O.K. He tells me that Congressmen Lee, Magnuson, and Hart are all ready to go and he suggests you might like to speak to Sam Rayburn about getting action.

O.O.T.
THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE
WASHINGTON
March 6, 1944

Dear Pa,

I just received a wire from Ambassador Pinant saying he has talked to Congressmen Baldwin and Voorhis and they understand the situation. Apparently there was no difficulty.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Major General Edwin H. Watson
The White House
Washington, D. C.
March 4, 1944.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE:

Dear Ed:

I am returning the attached as I promised on the telephone this morning, to confirm my conversation with you at that time. The President directed that these two gentlemen be permitted to make the North African trip, with the understanding that they are not to take up any politics, particularly with the French. He is not in any way sending them on a personal mission from him.

Yours,

EDWIN M. WATSON
Secretary to the President.

P.S. I have repeated these instructions to the War Department through Major Davenport.

E.M.W.
AMERICAN EMBASSY
LONDON

PERSONAL FOR THE AMBASSADOR FROM THE ACTING SECRETARY

Congressmen Joseph C. Baldwin of New York and John N. Vorys of Ohio are at present in the United Kingdom as the guests of the British Government. They have passports valid for the onward journey to North Africa and have in their passports permit cards to proceed to this military area. I am informed by General Watson that the President does not wish these gentlemen to go to North Africa and you are requested so to inform them and to have their passports amended to exclude North Africa and to have the permit cards attached to the last page of the passport removed and returned to the Department. Please do this as agreeably as possible and render these gentlemen any appropriate courtesies during their sojourn in the United Kingdom.

PD:RBS:HLP 3/3/44
Dear Pa,

I attach herewith draft of a cable to Winant in connection with the Joe Baldwin, John Vorys matter we discussed on the telephone this afternoon. Knowing these gentlemen intimately, I am fearful of a very unpleasant "kick-back".

I also attach Joe Baldwin's letter to Mrs. Shipley. Please note the second and third paragraphs in his letter where he specifically mentions it was the President's suggestion they go to Algiers.

Since talking with you on the phone this afternoon, we have also verified with Ambassador Wilson that Baldwin gave him a handwritten note from the President along these lines: "This is Joe Baldwin, a close personal friend of mine who has an excellent idea".

In view of the above, it occurred to me that you might wish to reconsider and speak to the President once more about the matter to avoid a possible exceedingly embarrassing situation.

Faithfully yours,

Major General Edwin M. Watson
The White House
Washington, D.C.
THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE  
WASHINGTON  

March 4, 1944  

Dear Pa,  

Attached is a copy of the wire I have just sent to Ambassador Winant relative to the trip of Congressmen Baldwin and Worys.  

Sincerely yours,  

Ed  

Major General Edwin M. Watson  
The White House  
Washington, D. C.
NO DISTRIBUTION

U.S. URGENT

AMBASSADOR,

LONDON.

PERSONAL FOR THE AMBASSADOR

The President has requested that you get in touch as soon as possible with Congressman Baldwin and Vorys and say to them that in the light of recent developments in the French situation he hopes that they will refrain from discussing French political problems with anyone while in North Africa.
FDR to Cong. Joseph Mruk

Published in Conferences at Cairo and
Teheran, 1943, page 877

RJ
PRIVATE

March 6, 1944.

Dear Congressman Hruk:

I am afraid I cannot make any further comments except what I have written to you before—there were no secret commitments made by me at Teheran and I am quite sure that other members of my party made none either. This, of course, does not include military plans which, however, had nothing to do with Poland.

Very sincerely yours,

Honorable Joseph Hruk,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.
March 2, 1944

President Franklin D. Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D.C.

My dear Mr. President:

On January 14, 1944, you will probably recall that I submitted certain questions to you with reference to the Russian-Polish situation. Also, I included this paragraph: "I was greatly pleased when you assured the Congress in your annual message this week that there were no secret commitments made in the recent conferences at Cairo and Tehran."

Your reply to me, making reference to Poland's valiant battle against the forces of aggression and outlining in a general way certain attitudes of the United States Government, was no reference to the paragraph of my former letter above quoted regarding "secret commitments made in the recent conferences at Cairo and Tehran."

In view of your assurances to the Congress and our subsequent exchange of correspondence, I was quite shocked to learn last week of the statements made by Mr. Churchill to Parliament regarding the boundary dispute between Russia and Poland. In that statement, after expressing sympathy for the Poles, Mr. Churchill said, "but I also have sympathy for the Russian standpoint," and then went on to indicate that he favors Russia's demand "and we are going all the way with her to see that she gets it." Continuing, he said that this will be done, "not only by the might of her arms, but by the approval and assent of the United Nations." And apparently this was all talked over at Teheran because Mr. Churchill went on to say, "I took occasion to raise personally with Marshal Stalin the question of the future of Poland."

In view of these developments, it occurs to me that the Congress and the country is entitled to know just what part the representatives of the United States played in these conversations and to what extent the United States is bound by any commitments or claims, secret or otherwise, made at Teheran
by any of the powers there represented. And were there any other agreements or commitments made having to do with any of the other occupied countries of Europe? If so, to what extent is the United States a party to them or bound by them?

With kindest regards and deep appreciation of your response to my former communication, I am

Sincerely,

[Signature]

JM: jam
PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

March 7, 1944.

Dear Pat:-

That is a mighty nice letter of yours to which I say "Amen". I can assure you that I am doing everything in my power to reestablish a harmony of action, as well as of purpose, between the Congress and the Executive -- especially among us Democrats.

As you say, there is no unyielding conflict on this matter except among a very small number of people who would rather nail my hide on to the barn door than win the war.

I pay no attention to some of the things that are said about me or my family on the floor of both Houses -- especially by those who insist that I would like to stay in the White House for many unworthy reasons.

You who view things calmly will understand when I say that I would give a great deal personally to return to Hyde Park and Georgia just as soon as the Lord will let me.

And, in the same way, having leaned over backward to be constitutional all my life, I find myself confronted with the provision that when formal legislation is sent to me for approval or disapproval, I have to use my own conscience and, if I veto it, I am required to send it back to the House of origin with my reasons for the disapproval.

I think you know that I have sent more bills back to the Congress without my approval than any other President. That is true not merely for eleven years but it is true year by year. And the percentage of vetoes overridden is extremely low.

Neither you nor I nor the overwhelming majority of Democratic Members of the House are voting because of partisan or political reasons -- even in this year.
That, however, is not true in the Republican Minority or among a small number of the Democrats.

I know you will realize some of the real troubles which are passed on to me. For instance, the Soldiers' Vote Legislation, as it stands today, denies the vote to the overwhelming majority of the ten million men in our armed forces. Frankly, I do not think that that is good in a democracy. It will come to me soon and if I veto it I am not going to be rough or impolite toward anybody. I will not say that the Democratic Party has missed a great chance to pin the blame on the Republican Party. My "advice and counsel" was never asked by the Senate or the House! I think I had a way out -- but I fear it is too late now!

We must never forget that the Republicans are in the midst of a campaign to sow discord among us.

I do hope you will run down and see me some day. I am most anxious to talk with you about the Congressional campaign. I will do all I can to help.

As ever yours,

Honorable P. H. Drewry,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D. C.

February 29th, 1944.

Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt,
President of the United States,
Washington.

My dear Mr. President,

I trust that you will not consider it presumptuous of me to discuss an incident which has been magnified out of all true proportions. Now that it has been closed, I think that an unusual opportunity is presented to you as our party leader, and as our President, to reestablish a harmony of action, as well as purpose, among Democrats in and out of Congress. With your wisdom and with your deep political experience, you will know how to deal with the whole situation.

May I not join with every other loyal American in appreciation of the very fine spirit and sympathetic understanding which you showed in your recent telegram to our mutual friend, Senator Barkley. I am also deeply impressed by the similar spirit shown in the Senator's reply. In these most troubled days it is of supreme importance that we unite our efforts in securing not only a complete military victory, but also in establishing a just and durable peace.

These are the aims of the Democratic Party of which you are the honored leader. Your administration has led the country far along the road which carries us to these ends. Disunity at this time in this great emergency would not only injure the party which has so successfully piloted the ship through the storm but would also endanger the welfare of the country. It is most important to the country in the prosecution of the war effort that those who have served so ably and so faithfully should continue the work, with the experience gained in the years behind us, to a successful conclusion. You, with your true sense of political proportion, can, in my humble opinion, tactfully and magnanimously, take such action as will quiet the emotionalism of those opposed and of those who supported your position and thereby cement the disturbed parts into an harmonious whole. There is no unyielding conflict on this matter but there is a discordant danger which, I believe, you can eliminate.

Perhaps, in moments of stress, thoughtless words and hasty judgments have overemphasized conflicting viewpoints, but, at the present moment, the time is ripe to close up our ranks and to move forward in a united front. If I may make the suggestion, you, as our President and as our party leader, can command the loyalty and
devotion of the Democrats and of the Independents in the House. I do not intend to intimate that you should surrender any fundamental principle, but may I most respectfully and sincerely suggest that the same kindly and understanding spirit evidenced in your telegram to Senator Barkley will produce the same helpful influence among Members of the House.

As you know, I have spent many years in the House, and I believe that I understand its Members and their motives. They are loyal, sincere and deeply devoted to the welfare of our beloved land and to its Government.

As a Member of Congress, as a Democrat, and as Chairman of the Democratic National Congressional Committee, I have worked and I will continue to work with all my power to harmonize any differences in our party. I, and the Members of our Committee, are most anxious to present a united front. We look forward most hopefully to the coming days. We have again and again been inspired by your masterful leadership and by your high courage.

I unqualifiedly pledge you my support in soothing hurt feelings, and in healing our party differences. Our party, and, above all, our country will suffer irreparable injury if the President and the Congress should seriously disagree.

Our war effort under your leadership has been splendid. Our accomplishments of the past eleven years have been epoch making. History will so record the past, but the work is not finished. The country and the world look to you and to the Congress for a solution of these gravest of grave problems. You can once again rally the forces of democracy.

I trust and believe that you can unite our party and our country, and lead us into a glorious victory and a world peace.

Very sincerely your friend,

[Signature]
WAR DEPARTMENT
THE CHIEF OF STAFF
WASHINGTON, D.C.

March 24, 1944.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT:

On March 3rd Congressmen Baldwin of New York and Vorys of Ohio left for the United Kingdom and North Africa at the invitation of the British and by British transportation. Pursuant to your instructions, the War Department has played no part with respect to this trip.

We have now received a message from Devers stating that Congressman Baldwin plans to return to the United States on British transportation by way of the United Kingdom. Congressman Vorys, however, has requested Devers to supply transportation from Africa to the United States by way of Dakar. Vorys wishes to leave tomorrow, and there is no British transportation by this route.

In view of your specific instructions with respect to the trip made by these two Congressmen, and because of our policy not to arrange for the travel of Congressmen overseas, I have withheld replying to Devers' request for advice until I could learn your desires.

Chief of Staff

NOTE: I consulted with Justice Byrnes, who happened to be in my office, and we jointly decided to ask the Secretary of War to just carry out the original instructions, as we didn't want to disturb the President any more or have him faced with another decision.
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT:

On March 3rd Congressman Baldwin of New York and Vorys of Ohio left for the United Kingdom and North Africa at the invitation of the British and by British transportation. Pursuant to your instructions, the War Department has played no part with respect to this trip.

We have now received a message from Devers stating that Congressman Baldwin plans to return to the United States on British transportation by way of the United Kingdom. Congressman Vorys, however, has requested Devers to supply transportation from Africa to the United States by way of Dakar. Vorys wishes to leave tomorrow, and there is no British transportation by this route.

In view of your specific instructions with respect to the trip made by these two Congressmen, and because of our policy not to arrange for the travel of Congressmen overseas, I have withheld suggesting to Devers' request for advice until I could learn your desires.

[Signature]

Chief of Staff.

(Please return to originating office in)
(War Department, showing action.)
The attached came to the President from Congressman McCormack. Will you be good enough to let him know whether the President can see these people on April 28th?

C.G.T.
Dear Miss Tulley,

I am enclosing a letter received from Michael J. Kellehan of Boston, a reputable business man and prominent in Irish circles, with an expression of the hope that the President can see the members of the National Defense Committee of the American Legion, who will meet in Washington.
on April 28, 1944.

I will appreciate it if you will submit the
Fuller's letter to the President, in the hope
that he can act favorably
thereon.

With kind regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Miss Irene Fuller,
Washington, D.C.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

May 10, 1943

CONFIDENTIAL
MEMORANDUM FOR
HON. JOHN McCORMACK

What do you think about Jim Brennan for this place? I have always thought that he was a mighty decent fellow and that we should reward him in some way.

F. D. R.

Enclosure
Let to Mrs. R. from James H. Brennan, 18 Tremont Street, Boston, Mass. 5/27/43, wishes to be appt. Collector of the Port in Boston.
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT.

Majority Leader John McCormack was in Saturday and spoke to me at great length about various things he thought might be done in and for Ireland. He is, of course, interested in the attitude of the Irish in this country. I am summarizing and passing them on:

(1) Selling Ireland two cargo ships, by private sale, to take the place of the two that were lost would be enthusiastically received here and abroad.

(2) If you could find occasion to say in a press conference that, irrespective of what the Irish government has done, there is no intention on the part of the United States to deprive the Irish people of any of the necessities which we have been accustomed to ship to Ireland.

(3) If it is advisable from a military or medical standpoint to construct hospitals in Ireland for the care of our wounded, he is sure that the Irish would be very agreeable.

S. I. R.
Office of the Majority Leader  
House of Representatives U.S.  
Washington, D.C.  

July 11, 1944

Dear Miss Sully,

I will value not if you will call the written letter to the attention of President Roosevelt as soon as you can.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

John W. McCormack

Miss Grace Sally,  
Washington, D.C.
Office of the Majority Leader  
House of Representatives U.S.  
Washington, D.C.

5/11/44.

Dear Mr. President:

If you have not already made up your mind, I am taking the liberty of calling to your attention and Friend "Jack" Casey for appointment as either Under Secretary, or Assistant Secretary of the Navy. I know that "Jack" is again having discussed this matter recently with me in the Senate that you nominated him, instead of the Secretary of the Navy.

With kind personal regards,

I am, as always,

Very respectfully yours,

Eugene V. McNary

Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt

White House
Washington, D.C.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

May 17, 1944.

MEMORANDUM FOR
THE STATE DEPARTMENT:

FOR PREPARATION OF REPLY FOR
MY SIGNATURE.

F.D.R.

Letter from Cong. John W. McCormack, 5/15/44, to the President, submitting information with regard to the sale of two vessels to Eire.
Office of the Majority Leader  
House of Representatives U.S.  
Washington, D.C.  

May 15, 1944.

Miss Grace Tully,  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Miss Tully:—

I will appreciate it, at your convenience, if you will see that the President receives the within letter I am sending to him.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
S D R

If you think this is OK just mail it out?
MEMORANDUM

The American Government in September 1941 chartered to the Irish Government two merchant ships, the West Hematite and the West Neris, both of which were lost some time ago. It is my understanding that the precise manner of the sinking of the West Hematite (renamed Irish Pine) is unknown, the vessel having disappeared at sea. In the case of the West Neris (renamed Irish Oak), however, the torpedoing of this vessel appears to have been definitely established, as well as the fact that a German submarine was observed by the crew of the West Neris some 15 hours before the torpedoing.

These vessels were still owned by the United States and were merely chartered to the Irish Government. This fact, even if definite knowledge were lacking, surely increases the presumption that both ships were undoubtedly sunk by the Germans. Nevertheless, the Irish Government failed to offer any word of protest against the sinking of the vessels.

This Government made a real sacrifice in chartering these two ships to Ireland at a time when every available ship was badly needed by this country or by those countries actively prosecuting the war. These two ships sailed under the Irish flag with distinct neutral markings and traveled fully lighted at night. These circumstances should have made them immune from belligerent attack but, in fact, only helped to make them easy targets for Nazi submarines. If we should transfer any additional ships to the Irish flag they would, of course, be subject to these same hazards of Nazi attack.

On December 4, 1943, the Irish Government requested the State Department to recommend to the War Shipping Administration the approval of the proposed purchase of the S. S. Wolverine. The Maritime Commission on December 7 denied the application for the proposed sale as not being in the interests of the United States. Secretary Hull took the matter up with the President at that time and they agreed that in view of all the circumstances the State Department could not recommend to the War Shipping Administration that the purchase of the S. S. Wolverine be approved.

The Irish Government, in a note of December 18, 1943, notified the State Department of its desire to purchase and have repaired in the United States the S. S. Bur, an ex-Norwegian vessel. The Irish Government requested the State Department to recommend favorable action in this case. The State Department submitted this matter to the War Shipping Administration, which replied that to repair the S. S. Bur would require the extensive use of ship repair facilities which are urgently needed for the maintenance of United Nations vessels.
engaged in war activities. The State Department, accordingly, declined to make favorable recommendation in this case.

There is one further circumstance which cannot be forgotten in connection with the desire of the Irish Government to purchase additional ships in the United States. On February 21, 1944, this Government requested the Irish Government to remove axis consular and diplomatic representatives whose presence in Ireland must be regarded as constituting a danger to the lives of American soldiers and to the success of Allied military operations.

In making this request we did not ask Ireland to participate in the war or even to break diplomatic relations with Germany and Japan. We merely asked, on grounds of military security, that German and Japanese representatives in Ireland be removed from their favorable position to transmit to their governments information regarding American military forces and military operations. In other words, we asked Ireland to take the necessary steps to make sure that its neutrality is not being used by the Germans and the Japanese to our own peril. Nevertheless, the Irish Government replied that it was impossible to comply with our request.

We felt that our request of the Irish Government for the removal of Axis representatives was an eminently reasonable one which we had every right to expect the Irish Government to grant. This request also gave to Ireland an opportunity to show its appreciation for the ships and supplies provided by the United States to Ireland since the outbreak of war.

I believe that public opinion in this country, including opinion among Americans of Irish extraction, would find it difficult to understand our now making available to Ireland two additional ships in the face of Ireland's refusal to remove Axis representatives.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

May 25, 1944

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT.

I think the attached letter prepared in the State Department has too hostile a tone to send to John McCormack -- who is really interested in trying to build up some Irish sentiment. I should like to take a hand at mollifying it if you wish.

Shall I do anything about points (2) and (3) of the attached recommendations of John McCormack contained in my memorandum to you of May 22nd?

S. I. R.
MEMORANDUM FOR THE FILE.

I gave John McCormack a copy of this memorandum yesterday and, therefore, it is not necessary to send the letter.

S. I. R.
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

May 22, 1944

In response to your memorandum of May 17, 1944, enclosing a letter of May 15 from the Honorable John W. McCormack in regard to the desire of the Irish Government to purchase additional ships in this country, I enclose a draft letter which you may wish to send to Mr. McCormack.

I am returning Mr. McCormack's letter for your files.

Enclousures:
1. Draft of letter to Mr. McCormack.
2. From Mr. McCormack
   May 16, 1944.
May 22, 1944

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

In response to your memorandum of May 17, 1944, enclosing a letter of May 15 from the Honorable John W. McCormack in regard to the desire of the Irish Government to purchase additional ships in this country, I enclose a draft letter which you may wish to send to Mr. McCormack.

I am returning Mr. McCormack's letter for your files.

Enclousures:

1. Draft of letter to Mr. McCormack.
2. From Mr. McCormack
   May 15, 1944.
PERSONAL

Dear John:

I have received your letter of May 15, referring to recent efforts of the Irish Government to obtain two additional ships in the United States. You express the opinion that if two ships could be sold to Ireland at the present time, it would not only be justified, but would be productive of favorable results here and abroad.

As you know, the American Government in September 1941 chartered to the Irish Government two merchant ships, the West Hematite and the West Neris, both of which were lost some time ago. You state in your letter that while these ships "were undoubtedly sunk by the Germans", you understand that definite evidence to this effect is lacking and that for that reason no protest could be made to the German Government by the Irish Government. It is my understanding that the precise manner of the sinking of the West Hematite (renamed Irish Pine) is unknown, the vessel having disappeared at sea. In the case of the West Neris (renamed Irish Oak), however, the torpedoing of this vessel appears to have been definitely established, as well as the fact that a German submarine was observed by the crew of the West Neris some 15 hours before the torpedoing.

I should like to emphasize that these vessels were still owned by the United States and were merely chartered to the Irish Government. This fact, even if definite knowledge were lacking, surely increases the presumption that both ships, as you say, "were undoubtedly sunk by the Germans." Nevertheless, the Irish Government failed to offer any word of protest against the sinking of the vessels.

You are, of course, well aware of the real sacrifice which this Government made in chartering these two ships to Ireland at a time when every available ship was badly needed by this country.

The Honorable
John W. McCormack,
House of Representatives.
country or by those countries actively prosecuting the war. These two ships sailed under the Irish flag with distinct neutral markings and traveled fully lighted at night. These circumstances should have made them immune from belligerent attack but, in fact, only helped to make them easy targets for Nazi submarines. If we should transfer any additional ships to the Irish flag they would, of course, be subject to these same hazards of Nazi attack.

On December 4, 1943 the Irish Government requested the State Department to recommend to the War Shipping Administration the approval of the proposed purchase of the S.S. Wolverine. The Maritime Commission on December 7 denied the application for the proposed sale as not being in the interests of the United States. Secretary Hull took the matter up with me at that time and we agreed that in view of all the circumstances the State Department could not recommend to the War Shipping Administration that the purchase of the S.S. Wolverine be approved.

The Irish Government, in a note of December 18, 1943, notified the State Department of its desire to purchase and have repaired in the United States the S.S. Bur, an ex-Norwegian vessel. The Irish Government requested the State Department to recommend favorable action in this case. The State Department submitted this matter to the War Shipping Administration, which replied that to repair the S.S. Bur would require the extensive use of ship repair facilities which are urgently needed for the maintenance of United Nations vessels engaged in war activities. The State Department, accordingly, declined to make favorable recommendation in this case.

There is one further circumstance which cannot be forgotten in connection with the desire of the Irish Government to purchase additional ships in the United States. You will recall that on February 21, 1944 this Government requested the Irish Government to remove axis consular and diplomatic representatives whose presence in Ireland must be regarded as constituting a danger to the lives of American soldiers and to the success of Allied military operations.

In making this request we did not ask Ireland to participate in the war or even to break diplomatic relations with Germany and Japan. We merely asked, on grounds of military security, that German and Japanese representatives in Ireland be removed from their favorable position to transmit to their governments information regarding American military forces and military operations.
operations. In other words, we asked Ireland to take the necessary steps to make sure that its neutrality is not being used by the Germans and the Japanese to our own peril. Nevertheless, the Irish Government replied that it was impossible to comply with our request.

We felt that our request of the Irish Government for the removal of Axis representatives was an eminently reasonable one which we had every right to expect the Irish Government to grant. This request also gave to Ireland an opportunity to show its appreciation for the ships and supplies provided by the United States to Ireland since the outbreak of war.

I believe that public opinion in this country, including opinion among Americans of Irish extraction, has whole-heartedly supported our action in asking the removal of Axis representatives. I believe further that public opinion would find it difficult to understand our now making available to Ireland two additional ships in the face of Ireland's refusal to remove Axis representatives.

Very sincerely yours,
PERSONAL

Dear John:

I have received your letter of May 16, referring to recent efforts of the Irish Government to obtain two additional ships in the United States. You express the opinion that if two ships could be sold to Ireland at the present time, it would not only be justified, but would be productive of favorable results here and abroad.

As you know, the American Government in September 1941 chartered to the Irish Government two merchant ships, the West Hamshite and the West Merrie, both of which were lost some time ago. You state in your letter that while those ships "were undoubtedly sunk by the Germans", you understand that definite evidence to this effect is lacking and that for that reason no protest could be made to the German Government by the Irish Government. It is my understanding that the precise manner of the sinking of the West Hamshite (renamed Irish Pine) is unknown, the vessel having disappeared at sea. In the case of the West Merrie (renamed Irish Oak), however, the torpedoing of this vessel appears to have been definitely established, as well as the fact that a German submarine was observed by the crew of the West Merrie some 18 hours before the torpedoing.

I should like to emphasize that these vessels were still owned by the United States and were merely chartered to the Irish Government. This fact, even if definite knowledge were lacking, surely increases the presumption that both ships, as you say, "were undoubtedly sunk by the Germans." Nevertheless, the Irish Government failed to offer any word of protest against the sinking of the vessels.

You are, of course, well aware of the real sacrifice which this Government made in chartering these two ships to Ireland at a time when every available ship was badly needed by this country.

The Honorable
John W. McCormack,
House of Representatives.
country or by these countries actively prosecuting the war. These two ships sailed under the Irish flag with distinct neutral markings and traveled fully lighted at night. These circumstances should have made them immune from belligerent attack but, in fact, only helped to make them easy targets for Nazi submarines. If we should transfer any additional ships to the Irish flag they would, of course, be subject to these same hazards of Nazi attack.

On December 6, 1943 the Irish Government requested the State Department to recommend to the War Shipping Administration the approval of the proposed purchase of the S.S. Wolverine. The Maritime Commission on December 7 denied the application for the proposed sale as not being in the interests of the United States. Secretary Hull took the matter up with the British Foreign Office at that time and we agreed that in view of all the circumstances the State Department could not recommend to the War Shipping Administration that the purchase of the S.S. Wolverine be approved.

The Irish Government, in a note of December 16, 1943, notified the State Department of its desire to purchase and have repaired in the United States the S.S. Ear, an ex-Soviet vessel. The Irish Government requested the State Department to recommend favorable action in this case. The State Department submitted this matter to the War Shipping Administration, which replied that to repair the S.S. Ear would require the extensive use of ship repair facilities which are urgently needed for the maintenance of United Nations vessels engaged in war activities. The State Department, accordingly, declined to make favorable recommendation in this case.

There is one further circumstance which cannot be forgotten in connection with the desire of the Irish Government to purchase additional ships in the United States. You will recall that on February 22, 1944 this Government requested the Irish Government to remove all consular and diplomatic representatives whose presence in Ireland must be regarded as constituting a danger to the lives of American soldiers and to the success of Allied military operations.

In making this request we did not ask Ireland to participate in the war or even to break diplomatic relations with Germany and Japan. We merely asked, on grounds of military security, that German and Japanese representatives in Ireland be removed from their favorable position to transmit to their governments information regarding American military forces and military operations.
operations. In other words, we asked Ireland to take the necessary steps to make sure that its neutrality is not being used by the Germans and the Japanese to our own peril. Nevertheless, the Irish Government replied that it was impossible to comply with our request.

We felt that our request of the Irish Government for the removal of Axis representatives was an eminently reasonable one which we had every right to expect the Irish Government to grant. This request also gave to Ireland an opportunity to show its appreciation for the ships and supplies provided by the United States to Ireland since the outbreak of war.

I believe that public opinion in this country, including opinion among Americans of Irish extraction, has whole-heartedly supported our action in asking the removal of Axis representatives. I believe further that public opinion would find it difficult to understand our now making available to Ireland two additional ships in the face of Ireland's refusal to remove Axis representatives.

[Very sincerely yours]
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

May 10, 1944

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
WASHINGTON

Yesterdays you spoke to the Under Secretary of State about the possibility of making available two ships to the Irish Government in view of the acute need in Ireland for certain products which have to be transported from this Hemisphere.

You may recall that we chartered two American ships to the Irish Government some months ago and that both of these ships have been lost. One of them disappeared at sea without leaving a trace, presumably the victim of a German submarine. The other one was definitely torpedoed by a submarine. In the latter case Mr. de Valera described the torpedoing of this vessel as "a wanton act" but he did not say that it was done by the Germans nor did he in either case make a protest to the German Government.

Last December the Irish Government applied to the War Shipping Administration for another ship and asked the Secretary of State to support their request. With your approval, I declined to do so and sent a memorandum to the Irish Government explaining why I could not do so. It has since been made public in connection with the exchange of communications with Ireland. A copy of it is attached for ready reference.

In February, you will recall, we asked the Irish Government to expel the Axis representatives. We did not ask Ireland to go to war or even to break diplomatic relations with Germany and Japan. On grounds of military security we asked them to expel a German Minister and his staff and a Japanese Consul General and his staff, pointing out that it would be naive to assume that these officials were not doing everything in their power to send out military information which might seriously affect the success of Allied military plans and cost American and Allied lives. The Irish Government adamantly refused to do this. We know for a fact, although for security grounds we cannot disclose...
disclose this, that the German Minister has continued to try to send out to Germany military information.

We believe that our request of the Irish Government that they expel the Axis representatives was a reasonable one with which they should have complied. We believe that public opinion in this country supported this request and in fact would be disposed to support pressure to cause Ireland to comply. The editorial reaction to this throughout the country was favorable. We believe that public opinion would find it difficult to understand our now making available two ships to get supplies to Ireland in view of the attitude which Ireland has taken toward us and the war.

To make ships available to Ireland in the present circumstances might well retard the progress which we have made in putting pressure on other neutral countries to reduce trade with Germany. Indeed such action might undermine the very foundations on which our program in this regard has been so carefully built up and ironically enough at the very time when we are beginning to get results.

In these circumstances I recommend that you take the position that we cannot now even consider making ships available to Ireland. The Irish Government, of course, knows how to change our attitude and how to get our support in obtaining two fine new Liberty ships.

Enclosure:
Memorandum to Irish Government.
PERSONAL

Office of the Majority Leader
House of Representatives U.S.
Washington, D.C.

May 15, 1944

Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President:

In accordance with your suggestion of last week, I am transmitting to you information in relation to the matter I discussed with you, the sale of two vessels to Eire.

Sometime in December of 1943 I understand the State Department was asked to recommend the War Shipping Administration to facilitate the transfer of the flag of the a/s "Wolverine" to the Irish registry. This was a vessel of 7997 tons and the Irish Shipping Limited had agreed with the owners, State Marine Corporation of New York, to purchase her at a cost of around $1,000,000. This did not materialize.

In December of 1943, I understand the State Department was similarly asked to intervene in the case of a/s "Burl", an ex-Norwegian ship, which had been sunk and brought to the surface again. I understand in this case the Irish Shipping Limited was willing to purchase the vessel if facilities could be had for her repair at an American shipyard. This effort has not materialized.

The two ships formerly sold to Eire were sunk. While they were undoubtedly sunk by the Germans, I understand that definite evidence to this effect is lacking, and for that reason, no protest could be made. In the case of the "Irish Pine", which disappeared on the high seas, no one knew what happened to her. The "Irish Cob" was torpedoed but I understand none of the crew or officers could identify the nationality of the submarine which fired the torpedo. I do not know if these facts are correct, but if so, it or they might explain why a formal protest was not made by Eire.

In any event, it seems to me that if two ships could be sold at this time, that it would not only be justified, but would be productive of favorable results here and abroad.

With kind personal regards, I am, as always,

Very respectfully yours,

[Signature]

JOHN W. MCCORMACK
12th Dist. Massachusetts

EUGENE T. KINNALLY
SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

THE SECRETARY

May 29, 1944

MEMORANDUM FOR GENERAL WATSON

The Secretary asked me to express his appreciation for your kindness and that of the President in letting him see the attached file from Congressman Baldwin.
Dear Mr. President:

Hereewith a brief report on my trip to Algiers only delayed because I had hoped to present it verbally.

In the first place let me say that I stayed at the American Representatives house, actually Bob Murphy's Villa, where I was well taken care of and whom I was able to receive various of the French representing equally varied opinions.

In the second place I was received and for that matter entertained by General Giraud, General de Gaulle, H. Massé, II of the Committee of Liberation, the President of the Consultative Assembly, the President of the Resistance groups, the British Representatives, and our own General Devers. In turn I received several members of the Committee whom I had known before, various French Army and Navy Officers, some of the subordinates of the Committee whom I had previously met in Washington, and last but not least my two youngest French brothers-in-law, now in the French Army, and one of whom was at the French Army Officers School at Cherchel, where are collected young men from every regiment of the French Army. Subsequently I spent several hours with a young French woman just arrived from Paris but whose name I was not permitted to know, and she would shortly be back in Paris. She came to me under impeccable auspices.

As a result of my various talks and conferences I came to the following conclusions, which I believe bear out what apparently is your present attitude to the French Committee of Liberation. I submit them herewith for what they are worth in what I consider the order of their importance.

1. General de Gaulle:

After the dinner he gave in my honor I retired with him, and we spent about an hour in conference, alone. Subsequently I saw him again for an hour alone at his office.
I don't believe I have ever met or talked with a more unattractive or "constipated" man. But I am convinced that to the majority of the French both within France and without he stands as a symbol of resistance. My definite impression is, however, that this French appreciation or support—if you can call it that—is purely military, and only in a very limited sense political—I should very much doubt whether he would receive more than 10 percent of the popular vote either in France or in Algiers should he present himself for purely political office, in a free-election. What he said impressed me, but since then he has so repeatedly acted contrary to his statements to me that I have very little faith in his sincerity. Personally I feel that if treated as a purely military symbol of resistance, and he is now the Commander-In-Chief of the French Army, he could be of some value to us, if we can obtain from him certain signed political guarantees of which more presently.

Certainly he is at present using our much advertised opposition to build himself up as a martyred hero in French minds, and at the same time is, I am convinced, playing both ends against the middle by assuming direct Military Command in the event he feels it wise to drop his own Committee of Liberation. Enclosed the minutes of my first conversation with him which I called the State Department for transmission to you at the time.

2. General Giraud:

The first person I called on in Algiers was General Giraud, not only, as an old friend, but to return the courtesy of his having entertained me at dinner on his last visit to New York. I had assumed that whatever else might be said about him he still had the confidence and backing of the Army. A few days later he gave a luncheon for me. Just prior to that my youngest French brother-in-law, arrived from the French Officers School at Cherchei, and what was my dismay to learn from this entirely unprejudiced source that General Giraud had apparently lost all hold on the Army. A point of view I subsequently confirmed on a visit to the Officers School, where as I have said, young representatives from every French regiment were in training. Later I found this to be the point of view generally in Algiers. Although I did not know it at the time the morning of the day I lunched with General Giraud he received Pucheu's bitter dying message of condemnation for running out on him. Yet the General was hilariously gay under circumstances where I couldn't have laughed at all much less eaten a hearty lunch.

3. The French Committee of Liberation

Wherever I went and whatever source I touched I found the Committee of Liberation unpopular if not despised. While some of the members are undoubtedly brilliant men, and a few of them
sincere patriots, my own impression of the majority and of the Committee as a whole was one of an executive group of party politicians only interested in perpetuating and augmenting their present powers, and patently unaware of their ability to do so under any straight forward democratic process. There is no doubt whatsoever in my mind that neither in Algiers or in France proper have they the slightest following. Personally I am convinced they are aware of this and are hoping to consolidate their position by dictatoral methods. In Algiers and Morocco there is no freedom of the press; books are banned; the black market flourishes flagrantly in everything; the purge trials are unpopular; the Arabs are passively restless and disdainful; the armed services definitely suspicious. The Committee would never dare submit itself for confirmation by popular vote. Should they do so I doubt whether they would get even 5% of the vote.

A. The Consultative Assembly.

Oddly enough the Consultative Assembly impressed me as being far more sure of themselves—at least they represent the various resistance groups in France for whatever they are worth. The President gave a reception for us and we spent at least one afternoon in the gallery while they were in session and heard a very calm and able debate on proposed re-organization of various government powers in France once liberated.

5. The Resistance Group

In Algiers, of course, the representatives of the Resistance Group, are all members of the Consultative Assembly and presumably favorable to the Committee of Liberation— I talked at length with all of them, and with some of them was sincerely impressed. It must not be forgotten however, that these groups as officially represented in Algiers constitute a very small portion of the French population, and cannot in consequence presume to speak on behalf of the French people as a whole. While I am convinced, not only from my general knowledge of France and the French but from the letters I constantly receive from my friends and family through Switzerland, Spain or the Red Cross as well as from my talks and conferences on this recent trip that France is at least 95% anti-German and therefore is itself a resistance group, it must be remembered that there are literally hundreds of centers of resistance in France only a few of which have taken any political or any political form. Every general, every colonel, every mayor, every child even, and most of the members and I should think all of the employees of the so-called Vichy Government practise resistance to the Germans more or less. So far as I can make out the formalized groups of resistance can be divided as follows.

A. Military— Whom I understand the British are arming.
B. Popular— Such as Religious Organizations, petty Civil servants, youth movements, and so forth.

C. Underground— Consisting of ostensible servants of the Vichy Regime, Mayors, prefects, police, etc.

D. Governmental — Who are represented at Algiers in the Consultative Assembly, of which the most active portion are apparently Communists.

I put only one question to the members of the Algiers Resistance Group when I talked with them.

"Given the fact that you have risked your lives, in many instances had your families either killed, imprisoned, or deported, and in most instances most all your property, are you prepared to state that with such a deep bond in common you seek only to liberate France, or do you intend to demand political power?"

The non-communists emphatically denied they wanted power as such after the liberation of France. The Communists refused to answer.

In my subsequent conference in London with the young Frenchwoman already mentioned who had just come out of Paris and was shortly to return, and who was a gallant representative of a non-communist group my conclusions, as given above were confirmed. I might add too, that while she said a majority of the French recognized DeGaulle as a symbol, they had no use for the Committee and assumed that in due time they would be permitted to choose their own government.

6. The Old Regime:

My principle consultant on the attitude of the members of the former French Republican Government, aside from those I had already seen in Washington or New York was Senator Malarme of Algiers. His term as Senator does not expire until 1948, so that he still considers himself "inoffice". The Committee of Liberation invited him to join, but he refused. He claims that the yielding of power to Marshal Petain in the passage of the law of July 10, 1940 was entirely constitutioned, but was subsequently broken by Petain himself in exceeding the powers granted. Therefore he no longer considers the Vichy Government legitimate and looks upon de Gaulle as a temporary
authority but has no use for the Committee, maintaining that the National Assembly still exists and should be recalled as soon as possible with the former deputies terms retroactively extended until a new election as was done in 1918.

While he claims that the Loi Trevigneuc of 1872 which was passed for just such an emergency as the present one, was automatically repealed by adoption of the Constitution of 1875, he is not averse to the principles involved therein as a sound approach to reconstitution of a democratic regime in France. I have his briefs on the subject, together with all of his correspondence with the Committee of Liberation.

In conclusion I can only say, Mr. President, that my own personal feeling about the existing French political picture is that General de Gaulle is too dangerous a man not to have either somehow or other in our pocket or openly, and definitely disavowed and out of the picture. It seems to me that he has given us an opening, for the first course in assuming personally Military Command. If we could get him to London and keep him there as French Military Commander and then obtain signed compliments from him agreeing to the future French political course to be followed until France is free to choose her own government, it is conceivable we might be able to work out of the present difficulties in our regard which he himself has apparently deliberately created. For the Committee, let it continue to function in Algiers as a temporary authority to expire or be dealt with by the future French Government.

On the latter score if General de Gaulle would consent to cooperating with General Eisenhower in calling the Conseils Generaux together as each department is liberated, and letting them in turn summon a National Assembly under the terms of the Loi Trevigneuc, I believe we would be following the wisest course not only for France but for ourselves.

Certainly the present situation is full of dynamite and presently far from favorable to ourselves. Nor are the British failing to make quiet use of this situation.

I realize how much more you know about all this than I do, Mr. President—and if I have spoken my mind frankly, I have spoken it, I promise you in all humility and admiration for the great task you are doing. I feel, however, that as you had yourself asked me to go to Algiers, and report to you my impressions, I ought to give the picture as clearly as I could and not delay longer in presenting it.

There is much more I could add, and I have a great many interesting documents and reports which I will be glad to turn over. I have felt, however, that it was not my place under the circumstances to go anywhere with all this except to you, and only to proceed further, if at all, as you might direct or suggest.
It is good to hear through General Watson that you have returned from your well-earned holiday rested and in fine form. I only hope that this report will not add to your burdens, but on the contrary may be helpful, which I think you know is my most earnest desire.

Always sincerely,

Joseph Clark Baldwin, M.C.

P.S. Forgive the many corrections. I did not have time to have the original copy replyeed.
March 23, 1944.

CONVERSATION WITH GENERAL DE GAULLE FOLLOWING DINNER AT HIS VILLA IN ALGIERS, MARCH 22, 1944.

After about half an hour of general conversation, I turned to the General and with the intention of drawing him out, told of a luncheon at the Elysee Palace in Paris with the President of France when my wife and I stayed nervously on assuming that the same protocol held there as at Buckingham Palace and the White House, to wit, that a guest could not leave before the Chief of State either withdraws or dismisses them. Which one of the President’s Aides explained to me was not the case in France when I appealed to him in desperation. General De Gaulle turned to me and said with a smile: “I am not a Chief of State. The President of the French Republic is still alive.”

The General and I then retired to a distant corner of the drawing room and had about an hour’s conversation in which he did all the talking. “I am afraid, Mr. Baldwin, that your people somehow suspect the sincerity of my purposes. It was inevitable that in the beginning, standing comparatively alone, I had to speak in a somewhat dictatorial manner. It was inevitable also under the circumstances that the initial few who courageously attached themselves to me were not always necessarily important people or those of the highest caliber. As my cause progressed and others joined me, it was equally inevitable that many of the ablest Frenchmen could not be of the group as they either had been killed or were imprisoned in France or in Germany. As soon as possible, I set up as democratic a form of government as I could under the circumstances. If there are those amongst my group who foolishly think this is more than a provisional government, I can assure you that they would carry no weight with me, for it is a temporary government and my only desire is to restore democracy in France and to revive the Republic. I will not deny that what we might call the registered Resistance group in France only represents perhaps 10% of the people. However, as the center of resistance, they have a wide field of sympathy there and whatever may be said about the French Committee of Liberation, I am certain that the French people are anti-German and fundamentally in sympathy with the cause which I represent. Surely, it should not be a matter for astonishment that some of us, including myself, have done some fumbling as we progressed. Many of us had little or no initial experience. In spite of the Puechau trial and my own conviction that there still are a few at the top who have openly betrayed France in the present Vichy Government, I can assure you in all sincerity that it is not my intention to enter France with the idea of hanging, shooting and imprisoning French citizens, whether in the Vichy Government or out of it, who have only done what they considered their duty to the community. Local Mayors and Prefects and Counsellors either had to function under the existing situation or give way to Germans or those who wanted to collaborate with Germany. No one recognizes this fact more completely than I do.”
"The news from your country apparently is not very good so far as we are concerned but I am resigned to the worst in that regard for I am confident that whatever the present decision of your Government, they will eventually recognize my sincerity and the value of my cause to the future freedom and democracy of France and that once they get into France, they will find the French people themselves ready to cooperate with me along the provisional lines which the temporary government here has outlined. I realize that both here and abroad there are adherents to our cause who are, if I can use the term, more DeGaulist than I am, but they are not fundamentally important people. Paradoxically enough, my most difficult problem is to handle my initial supporters and my most recent supporters, each of whom are inclined to regard the other with suspicion."

At this point, I interrupted to say, "In other words, it is somewhat like the parable in the Bible of the estate owner who hired laborers for his harvest and that at the end of the day had to add to the number of his workers, but gave everybody the same salar y, much to the fury of those who had worked at the beginning of the day." General DeGaulle smiled and said, "Yes, it is very much like that," and he went on to say, "I can assure you of one obvious and significant fact, that the French Army is now at least united behind me. There is no longer that division which existed between the so-called army of Giraud and the so-called Free French army of DeGaulle and I can add that General Giraud and myself are on the best of terms, cooperating together and completely united in the task ahead. This, I am sure, General Giraud will affirm."

Shortly afterwards the dinner broke up. In conclusion, I can only add one bit of interesting confirmation of General DeGaulle's statement about the French Army. It so happens that one of my French brothers-in-law is at the French Army Officer's School at Chelmsford. There, naturally, are men drawn from every regiment of the Army, whether originally DeGaulist or originally Giraudist. My brother-in-law is quite emphatic in saying that the so-called DeGaulists and the so-called Giraudists are united behind DeGaulle. They have a certain distrust for the French Committee of Liberation and for what they consider is the personal politics which they are playing, but all of them consider DeGaulle their real leader and not Giraud or the Committee.

I have serenulously observed the President's request, cabled to our Embassy in London, and kept my ears open and my mouth closed, seeking only to obtain information. Personally, I was impressed by my conference with DeGaulle and I confess that in attending sessions of the Consultative Assembly, I was impressed with the attitude of the members and the caliber of their debate. I will, of course, be prepared to give the President a most complete personal report upon my return to Washington the first week in April.
Personal
May 31, 1944

Dear Jack:

Thank you for your letter of May twenty-seventh. I agree quite heartily with you that in a great many sections of our country too many people are wholly unaware of the great crisis through which we have been going and the vast ordeal which lies ahead.

Fortunately through a wise use of lend-lease material pursuant to the Lend-Lease Act of the Congress, the war has been kept from our immediate shores. However, many civilians at home who have been spared from bombing and great deprivation of the necessities of life seem too often to forget that millions of our Allies have been killed and our own casualties have been and, in all probability, will be substantial. As you know, many public spirited citizens and government officials have tried to impress upon our people the seriousness of this war. I am convinced that the great majority of them understand what is going on; but as always it is the minority that give the incorrect impression.

It was good of you to write me.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Honorable John J. Cochran
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

SIR:G
Mr. President:

Due to the information that comes to me I am prompted to write and urge that you consider the advisability of making a speech on the radio that will bring to the attention of the people the necessity of realizing that the war situation by no means warrants any one to feel complacent.

The state of mind of a tremendous number of people in this Country is very discouraging to say the least. For instance I am attaching a copy of a letter I received from the President of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce in which he says, because there has been no war damage, that the premiums paid by the people who applied for war damage insurance should be returned to them.

How a man occupying a position such as this, when we have over ten million men and women in the armed forces and when our casualties amounted to one every minute during the month of April, could come to the conclusion that we are not going to have war damage because we have been able so far to prevent the enemy from attacking our shores is beyond me to understand.

Simply because of the fact that our cities have not been bombed there are some people who do not realize the grave danger that actually confronts us.

Assuring you of my high esteem, I am,

Sincerely yours,

The President

The White House
Honorable John J. Cochran  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Cochran:

At the beginning of the war there was established I believe, under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, a War Damage Corporation which sold insurance against damage resulting from air raids and possibly other causes connected with the war.

There have been no air raids and therefore no damage resulting therefrom. This insurance was sold through the regular insurance agencies, the agent receiving a small commission for handling the sale.

Inasmuch as there have been no claims for damage, it would appear to us that refund should be made to those who bought this insurance, deducting the proportionate share of the cost of handling the program.

I am wondering if this might not be a matter that you would like to look into with the thought in mind of having the Government make proper refund.

Yours very truly,

/s/ GEORGE C. SMITH  
PRESIDENT
FILE MEMO: JUNE 26, 1944

I telephoned Wayne Coy by direction of the President to say that his personal opinion is that there is not a chance of getting a repeal of the two-thirds rule in an election year.

GOT
Two-Thirds Rule

Members of the House are becoming increasingly resentful over their exclusion from the function of policy-making in foreign affairs. There is resentment over the prospect that only a Senate committee will have the authority to consult with the Secretary of State on the question of a postwar peace organization. Leading members of the House feel that, since they have an equal vote for the Senate in declaring war and in supporting the armed forces, they should have an equal vote in making peace. That view is supported by both left, common sense, and democratic theory.

As the Constitution now stands, however, the Senate is left outside looking in so far as the treaty-making process is concerned. And of course, the House is powerless to change that fact. Any move that it may make to initiate constitutional changes will be met with certain to be looked upon askance in the Senate, as it puts the House in the position of reaching out for new powers. For this reason we feel that the Senate should be given the choice in the two-thirds rule by Chairman Sol Bloom of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and many of his colleagues, will not be the most effective way of getting this vital issue before the Senate, which is the only real obstacle to its approval.

It is already apparent that the Senate will have to be provoked into action if this hazard is to be removed. Senator Gillette has been pressing for hearings on his four resolutions to this sub-ject ever since last summer. Yet no hearing date has been set. Chairman McCarran of the Judiciary Committee has indicated several weeks ago that there was no pressure for hearings, and it is unlikely that any of those resolutions will ever reach the floor of the Senate unless pointed and widespread pressure is applied.

In our opinion the situation calls for organization of a national committee of distinguished people to take the fight for the vital constitutional change. In very large measure the future of America will be shaped by the type of peace we make, and the nature of that peace may be determined by the action or inaction of the Senate on the two-thirds rule. Here is a hazard to peace that is scarcely less vital than our entrance into the war to guarantee a democratic victory. Yet it is a hazard that can be removed in the traditional American way—by building up public sentiment and bringing that sentiment to bear upon the body by which the decision must be made.

It goes without saying that the committee should be bipartisan, that one of its first objectives should be the Abolition of the two-thirds rule in both the Democratic and Republican Party platforms. It should be a part of the nation's outstanding achievement in this high and representative spirit of all the numerous groups of citizens that are interested in the maintenance of world peace after the war has been won. Such a committee would give no thought to the aide- proposal that the forthcoming peace treaty be ratified with the advice and consent of a majority in the Senate in agreement. Its whole objective would be to rid the Constitution of an undemocratic and potent impediment to peace—and do it by above-board methods in the best American tradition. We believe that no time should be lost in organizing a National Committee to Abolish the Two-Thirds Rule.
June 21, 1944

Miss Grace Tully
Private Secretary
to the President
The White House
Washington, D. C.

Dear Grace:

I am attaching herewith an editorial from The Washington Post. I would appreciate it very much if you could ask the President if he would look with favor upon the establishment of a national committee to abolish the two-thirds rule. I would like to have his views to guide me personally and not for any public presentation.

I ask for this information because I would not want to do anything that would interfere with a situation with which I am admittedly not completely familiar.

If the President will indicate to you his views on the matter you can reach me on the telephone at National 4200.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

Wayne

Enclosure
Release July 5, 1944—The Nation

A Soldier's Letter to Mrs. Luce

BY WILLIAM J. CALDWELL

THE night of June 27 Clare Luce made a lovely speech. Politics, maddening and deadening, was for a moment a distant reality. She was talking to 'Mrs. Mother America.'

She talked about some friends of mine — a lucky kid from Kentucky who used to be my tail-gunner until a Jap 20 mm. caught him in the stomach. She talked about a Greek from Brooklyn—a cook who brewed coffee for our combat crews before an 0900 Take Off, until Washing-Machine Charlie dropped one sputtering on the mess hall. She talked about a pilot whose name I never knew. This pilot gave our bomber fighter protection one day—until he had to bail out and was machine-gunned to death in his parachute. Mrs. Luce talked about those men—and hundreds of thousands of their comrades, the American War Dead.

I was glad to hear her talk about them. Too few people outside their "next of kin" even think about these dead ones. Too few people take time to plan to preserve the America they died to save.

But Mrs. Luce went one step farther; one step too far, for my money. And in that step there lies a threat that many other speakers may follow her dangerous precedent, for her speech was a powerful, vote-catching speech. And by the gods of many politicians, that's what counts.

The "step too far" was this. Politically, Mrs. Luce seemed to resurrect the man killed in action. And into their silent, cold mouths she stuffed words. For what purpose? For the purpose of supporting her own political party. Mrs. Luce found a new kind of Charlie McCarthy. She went one better than a wooden dummy—she made her mouthpiece a dead soldier.

And a powerful mouthpiece a dead soldier makes—witness the potency of the speech he spoke for Mrs. Luce. A speech powerful enough to stir cheers and tears, a speech maybe even powerful enough to help swing an election—a brave requiem for soldier dust. But, Mrs. Luce, is this right? Is this ventriloquism honorable and decent?

William J. Caldwell was an Army Air Force sergeant at Pearl Harbor when the Japs attacked. At a radio operator and gunner he saw action on sixty-eight bombing missions at the Battle of Midway, throughout the southwest Pacific and spent nine months on Guadalcanal. He was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, Purple Heart, and Presidential Citation. This letter from a twenty-five-year-old veteran of this war is intended neither at the personal attack nor a partisan plea. It is irrelevant, he says, that he is a Republican.

Or is it obscene prostitution of your dead? Presumably your reply is, "Yes, it is honorable. My intentions were high. The end—the instalment of my party (the good of America)—justifies the means."

But upon your slim shoulders weighs a responsibility heavy with the grim burden of "the young bones that bleach on the tropical
rooks of Batzan," that fill the earth beneath white crosses scattered the globe around.

You went on to say, Mrs. Luce, that "this convention is gathered together... to clarify what his [G. I. Joe's] wants are likely to be in the next four years and to plan to meet those needs... before this convention is done, it will clearly interpret his [the fighting man's] long-term wants in keynote and platform, and to the honoring of them our candidate will pledge himself."

Indeed a noble and praiseworthy sentiment. But, Mrs. Clairvoyant Luce, who besides your good self is at Chicago to reveal the fighting man's "long-term" wants? Are you sure that sometimes his long-term wants may not be mixed up with your long-term wants?

A skeptical thought I admit. But what happened last time? Will no one allow the men themselves to decide what they want? Will no one give them time to fight and win and come home? And then grant them the American right of speaking for themselves. Please allow at least the living to talk for themselves, Mrs. Luce—if not the dead.

Do not cease, please do not anyone cease, from planning for the future of the veterans. But before these plans become actions, let the veterans look them over.

Men who fight for their way of life and their country often think about them too.

Mrs. Luce is convinced that George Washington and today's G. I. Joe would prefer a gallery seat at the Republican convention to a gallery seat at the Democratic convention. Surely if heaven grants men peace and wisdom, our soldier dead would spend their days elsewhere than in the Chicago Stadium or the lobby of the Stevens Hotel.

While the blood is still wet on the beaches of Peleliu, upon the steeps of Saipan, politicians in foxholes from Pennsylvania to the Stevens Hotel are already making election propaganda out of their dead. Must the bones of our soldiers and sailors so soon be used as muckshovels to sling mud from party to party?

Our dead belong first to themselves—and then to us, to America, not to this party or that. Let the country pledge faith, then, to the dead, and to the living, who fight to protect it.

For the sake of those men who lie beneath the white crosses of our military graves, let there be an end new to this carving of campaign buttons from the young bones that bleach on the sands and rot in the mud.
July 13, 1944.

My dear Mrs. Bolton:

The President has asked me to tell you that he regrets it will be impossible for him to intervene regarding your proposed trip to Europe on account of a policy set by him pertaining to the visits of Senators and Congressman to the battle area, not approved by the Majority and Minority Leaders. This policy was decided on a year ago and, except for one or two exceptional cases, has not been varied from.

General Marshall agrees that the basic idea of your visit is sound, but he feels that he cannot recommend that the President take any action.

I therefore regretfully have to furnish you this information.

I am,

Very sincerely yours,

EDWIN N. HATTON
Major General, U. S. Army
Secretary to the President

Honorable Frances P. Bolton,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.
MEMORANDUM FOR GENERAL BATSON:

General Marshall is aware of the fact that Congresswoman Bolton desires to go to the European Theater of Operations for the purpose of having a look at hospital facilities and making some report which would eventually reach the women of America and reassure them as to the treatment of their wounded.

I have heard General Marshall say that he feels this would be a worthwhile project. On the other hand, he would not wish to be in a position of advocating an exception to the President's policy with respect to the travel of members of Congress overseas. You will recall that about a year ago General Marshall addressed to the President a memorandum advocating that the Majority and Minority Leaders in each House appoint one committee to make an extensive tour of overseas theaters, and that no members of either House who were not members of these committees be furnished transportation for overseas travel by either the Army or the Navy.

The President endorsed this memorandum to the Leaders of the Houses with the statement that he hoped it would become the guiding policy on such matters.

Recently a number of Congressmen have gone overseas not under the auspices of either the War Department or the Navy Department. Congressmen Baldwin and Vorys made a trip at the invitation of the British Government and were transported both ways by the British. Congressman Fulbright made a trip as a member of a committee working under the State Department. The committee used Army transportation, but
the State Department assured the War Department that this trip was made by personal direction of the President. You have probably noticed in the papers that Congressmen Garfield and Scott have just turned up in the European Theater as ordinary seamen. These men were signed on without the knowledge of the War Department or, we understand, the Navy Department. The State Department tells us that other Congressmen are now attempting to secure passports and British transportation overseas.

These incidents are embarrassing to the War Department for two reasons. Even in very crucial times theater commanders and principal subordinates cannot ignore the presence of Congressmen and must take certain measures to see that they are properly handled. In addition, we are embarrassed to have to turn down Congressmen who make requests for transportation overseas, citing the cases of their colleagues who have made trips. It is most difficult to explain to them all the exceptional circumstances which have arisen or are likely to arise in the future.

In conclusion, although I am sure that General Marshall approves of Congresswoman Bolton's idea and feels she would render a valuable service, he hesitates to recommend approval of Army transportation and thus further complicate our relations with the members of Congress who press us on these matters.

FRANK McCARTHY
Colonel, General Staff Corps
Secretary, General Staff

P.S. General Marshall, who has returned since this writing was written, has now read it. He concurs: CONFIDENTIAL
Dear Mr. President,

The committee was very impressed with the report of the Department of Justice on the recent event of the Mexican crisis. The report presented a comprehensive analysis of the situation, offering valuable insights into the complex political and economic factors involved. It is evident that the U.S. government must take a strong stance to ensure the stability of the region.

I agree with the recommendations put forth in the report. The President's leadership is crucial in guiding the country through these challenging times. It is important to continue striving for peace and prosperity for all.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]
the State Department assured the War Department that this trip was made by personal direction of the President. You have probably noticed in the papers that Congressman Canfield and Scott have just turned up in the European Theater as ordinary seamen. These men were signed on without the knowledge of the War Department or, we understand, the Navy Department. The State Department tells us that other Congressmen are now attempting to secure passports and British transportation overseas.

These incidents are embarrassing to the War Department for two reasons. Even in very crucial times, theater commanders and principal subordinates cannot ignore the presence of Congressmen and must take certain measures to see that they are properly handled. In addition, we are embarrassed to have to turn down Congressmen who make requests for transportation overseas, citing the cases of their colleagues who have made trips. It is most difficult to explain to them all the exceptional circumstances which have arisen or are likely to arise in the future.

In conclusion, although I am sure that General Marshall approves of Congresswoman Bolton's idea and feels she would render a valuable service, he hesitates to recommend approval of Army transportation and thus further complicate our relations with the members of Congress who press us on these matters.

(Signed) Frank McCarthy

Frank McCarthy
Colonel, General Staff Corps
Secretary, General Staff

P.S. General Marshall, who has returned since this memo was written, has now read it. He concurs.

FMcC
2301 WYOMING AVENUE

My dear Simeon Watson,

Would you be good enough to put the enclosed into the Assistant's hands as promptly as possible?

Thank you for your courtesy with appreciation

Sincerely yours

Hannes P. Ballon Jr.

July 12/44
July 12, 1944

2301 Wyoming Avenue

My dear Mr. President,

Some weeks ago Admiral King was good enough to speak to you of my desire to go to Europe in order to experience something of the impact of war, that I might give the reality of it to my people at home and to the people everywhere. He talked with you and brought me the word that you would give me “the green light.”

Then we wanted to talk with you personally, that you might know from me directly that my desire is simply to strengthen the purpose of this great country through a deeper understanding on the part of every citizen.

As how no direct contact with the war and I must certainly that a woman like myself, schooled in hospitals and nursing, in rehabilitation of the injured, etc., can do a very constructive bit of work in child care, etc., can do a very constructive bit of work for the nation at this time through such an experience.

I have been assured by Lord Halifax that the British will welcome my coming forth as a member of Congress and welcome my coming forth as an American woman with a background of wide experience in these important fields. General Marshall, General Ike and Admiral King have told me they would like to see me so. Your
2301 WYOMING AVENUE

I feel it is needless to bring it about. Indeed, I want to go with your sincere desire to have me do so.

I had hoped to have five minutes with you to give you the picture as I see it. However, time is at a premium and it has slipped by. Until now you are immersed in matters that make the intrusion you are making seem impossible. Recognizing this, I was wondering if I would be gracious enough to give me the authority I must have for transportation, etc. So that I could get on with the details involved, as you will understand, unless I can get off promptly, I shall be unable to start. By the time these details are attended to and a date of departure fixed, you would perhaps be free to give me a few moments.

Awaiting this anticipated authority from you,

I am respectfully yours

[Signature]