Retired for preservation
I heard a story last night which reminded me of some of the difficulties which you face in finding people to fill key positions in defense.

The story goes that the Board of Trustees of Leland Stanford University are seeking a man to fill the presidency of the university upon the retirement of Mr. Wilbur. They have written to quite a sizable list of prominent educators throughout the country giving the qualifications of the man they seek - the perfect university president.

One of Harvard's prominent educators, who is somewhat of a wag, replied to the letter stating that he only knew three people who met all of the qualifications - the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost - and as far as he knew they all had better jobs!
MEMORANDUM FOR

HARRY HOPKINS

Do you want to take this up?

F.D.R.

Re: Confidential memo to the Pres., dated Aug. 28, 1941 from Wayne Coy re his production figures taken from the records of the OPM, Bureau of Research and Statistics.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

November 22, 1941.

MEMORANDUM FOR

HON. WAYNE COY

Here is a real job put into my lap by Morris Ernst. Don't disclose his name or that of Leon Cole, but see Odlum and see what you can accomplish.

As you know, Lowell Mellett is working on this thing too, and I suggest that you and Lowell go together to see Odlum and work at it side by side.

F. D. R.

Letter to Leon Cole from Morris Ernst, dated Oct. 27, 1941, re Odlum's set-up, with suggestions.
July 30, 1942.

MEMORANDUM FOR

WAYNE COY:

Will you speak to me about this?

F.D.R.

(Memo from Ed Flynn - Re: Public Sentiment re Government)
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

From: Wayne Coy

The soldier's and sailor's absentee voting bill (H.R. 7416) passed the House of Representatives last week, and is now pending before the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections. Unless efforts are made to amend the bill so as to abolish the poll tax and permit voting in primaries, a large number of the men and women from the South in our armed forces will be, as a practical matter, disenfranchised.

You may wish to make your views known on this bill, reiterating your publicly stated position on this question.
MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT:

From: Wayne Coy

Since you talked to me the other day about what I shall call an "administrative secretary" to you for civilian war agencies affairs, a few ideas have occurred to me for achieving the general purposes you have in mind.

With ever-increasing problems of broad strategy, war policy and over-all leadership crowding upon your time and attention, it is easy to see how such an "administrative secretary" could be of immeasurable help to you. Briefly, he could (1) assist in reconciling divergent views of civilian war agencies; (2) help in the integration of their efforts to conform with your general plans, and (3) work toward a better balance in the individual portions of the broad program.

It is inevitable that with numerous civilian agencies created for war purposes, frequent divergent policies and disagreements should result. Difficulties arise, however, when each agency seeks to bring its troubles to you for individual treatment, or when issues not so appealed are left to breed uncertainty and confusion throughout such organisations. An "administrative secretary" could be invaluable as arbiter in these disputes and in bringing separate departmental activities into line with your objectives. He could channel questions
so that all agencies concerned could pool opinions and raise questions. He could serve to bring pressing questions to your attention before they develop into outright controversy. He could serve as a buffer from petty departmental bickering. Finally, he could serve as an authoritative "trouble shooter" in problems involving inter-departmental relations.

The thought occurs to me that such an assistant would be particularly effective if he is definitely tied in with your Bureau of the Budget. The Budget Bureau has long-established contacts and relationships with all the agencies. Its impartial approach in inter-departmental matters is recognized, and it has, in recent months, had considerable experience in coordinating the work of war agencies.

Use of the Bureau through an "administrative secretary" would thus utilize all these advantages and obviate many of the difficulties which arose when your administrative assistants attempted to build up their informal contacts to secure information for you.

The foregoing could be done by appointing Harold Smith as Chief-of-Staff for the Executive Offices of the President and relieving him of all operating details of the budget estimates and procedures. Or someone else might be appointed who would function well as a staff officer, and Budget Bureau facilities could likewise be available to him.

The appointment of a chief-of-staff for administrative affairs would fit admirably with the duties of a small group of your associates.
In the military field, Admiral Leahy as Chief-of-Staff to the Commander-in-Chief, fulfills similar functions. Likewise, the work of Mr. Hopkins resembles that of a chief-of-staff for the United Nations. The recent addition of Justice Byrnes as an economic chief-of-staff leaves a chief-of-staff for administrative affairs to complete the picture.
From Desk of
Wayne Coy, Liaison Officer
Office For Emergency Management

4/14/43

Mrs. Bonsteel

I am attaching some correspondence, which you will probably want to forward to Hyde Park to complete file on Grenville Chapman. No handling is necessary.

Mrs. Meehan

This Goes in the Wayne Coy Field (Emergency Management)

Hon. Wayne Coy,
Special Assistant
to the President,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

Only yesterday I learned that the Guayule Emergency Rubber Project has an office in El Paso, so I went in and had a short talk with the manager, Mr. McKay. If I had known of this office earlier I never would have bothered you with the Mandell complaint. Mr. McKay said that they offered Mandell $375. per acre for his land but he asked $400.

I enclose a clipping, and have marked my remarks about Rep. Hoffman, Westbrook Pagler, Mr. Patterson and Col. McCormick, all of whom I said should be arrested and tried for treason. Also, Walter Winchell's column in clipping.

Sometimes, people tell me that I am doing a good job by writing to the papers and criticizing the men above named, and others. But other people tell me that I am a damn fool, and say that I go much too far in my criticisms.

Well, I often wonder myself whether I am doing a good job - or whether I am a damn fool and go too far.

If you don't reply to this letter I will assume that you don't think that I go too far in my criticisms of the (what I call) vicious scoundrels who snipe at the President. If you, too, think that I go too far, or that I serve no good purpose by my very plain language, you can so advise me by merely saying: "I received your letter of March 2nd, and think that you will do no harm by showing a little more restraint."

Respectfully,

[Signature]

[Address]
The radio reported the Supreme Court's decision, freeing Geo. S. Viereck. I had hoped to read about it in this morning's paper, but saw nothing. I wanted to see which Justices voted for Viereck's liberation and which against it, before commenting on the decision. Without knowing how they voted, or why they voted as they did, still it seems to me that they went off half-cooked - as I did on the Handell matter. I admit that I am judging without a full knowledge of the issues involved, or how the Justices voted, but it strikes me that it is a very serious matter to free such a dirty scoundrel as Viereck, in time of war, because it will encourage other scoundrels, like McCormick and Patterson, Coughlin and Gerald K. Smith, to continue their vicious assaults upon the administration. Already, according to the radio, Senator Wheeler has commented gleefully upon that decision - which is right down his alley.

The editor of the local paper censors my effusions, because he is scared to death for fear that Rep. Dies, Senator O'Daniel, or others whom I criticised, will sue his paper for libel. So, even if I do comment unfavorably upon this Viereck decision, the editor will probably censor it, and cut out the worthwhile part.

I wrote this letter to inform you about the local office of the Guayule Project, and having plenty of spare space, and being hot under the collar over this latest Supreme Court decision, I am inflicting my views upon you.
WASHINGTON—Bing, Bing, Bing!

Visiting Reporters: Give me a guy a hand out. I'm getting a line on the town. What's the latest?

Bing: Dixie. First get a place to sleep, which is no cinch. Then learn some of the town. Why don't they all talk like the rest of the American people?

I don't know everything. I've never lived here a lifetime. Too much stuff to do. Not only the office holders, but the lobbyists, the political favor-hunters, the lawyers and, I hate to say it, some of the reporters.

How are the reporters otherwise?

They slim up OK. They work hard. It's a job, they know it. By the time the get to Washington, they've had too much experience. They've rubbed up against the great and they've had to feel. A handful of them, of course, are just errand boys for their public relations people. But in the main, the news men to suit the boss. They are either in the right hand of their men as yes-men in any trade.

I read some that a reporter's in a position to play the role of a month in the capital. The States, I could go on and on, and if we want to take our time, the news men are not a very nice lot. You know better than to believe that. You only have to glance around here to see how wrong that charge is. Right here in Washington there is none of the same telling-offocrat scowling in the business. Ray Clapper's the one, Sallie Stiles. Kenneth Crowlars is another, and Drew Pearson, the others can be watched by the society page. But a sandwich would deliver them no matter what trade they worked.

I'm glad to be put right on that. What's the attitude of the reporters toward the President?

You might as well ask me what's the attitude of a child toward ice cream. Most of them admire him. Some of them would say he's a man's man. But a few of them are just old-fashioned, and they're not going to put their own choice in the matter. Last election the nation's fathers voted for him, too. Against the President. But a private poll showed him favored by some of the correspondents who wallowed him hardest. On their own they were.

How do you account for the bickering and turmoil in Congress?

That's easy. Because it's Congress.

How would you go about making it work better?

Listen, stranger. I live here. You can't understand a thing. You sent the members here—

You the other out-of-towners. Why I worry about your problems?

Do you agree with Packer, who wrote that Congress is a sorry collection of a legislature.

No. Congress as a department of government, is a pretty admirable outfit until you get there. It has the high-minded, unselfish, patriotic and honest in the world. They try to keep their campaign promises before govern for the same time a handful of hands and heads have crept in and

shamed the whole body. As for the bickering and tumult, you should be grateful for that.

The minute you can't get it, you can't get a girl. But even then they carry much weight. Why aren't their nationalist bills voted down?

Not for a lot of reasons. There's a lot of horse-dealing in Congress. A boy with a good bill on the country—will swap favors to get it passed. Pretty soon a lot of these fellows are selling themselves and the public. There's a magic in the name of Congress, and the public is swindled.

No sense in the names. The Washington, the Boston, the Lincoln and the others are all baldly critical, they were. Washington (from the north) I read) refused in a third term principally because he was sick and tired of squabbling

with the Senate. Lincoln went through exactly what FDR is going through; bitter, most unpalatable or unfair, criticism it must be borne; Congress, or the President, must do, both have to see that after Congress, or the President, or both, will have to recede from their positions if the war effort isn't to suffer. I believe that FDR is a well-informed (besides getting Supreme Court's opinion before he acts) that he doesn't over-step his constitutional powers. Of course, Congress has the power to refuse to vote money to Mr. McNutt, Secretary of War, but will take that responsibility when we are at war. I doubt it, but I admit I am at all certain.

When I read about the words of acts of some members of Congress some big business executives (instructed for defrauding the government, unwarranted strikes, "black market" dealings, etc., I just don't know what to think. Then I read about the Russians— I marvel at their courage and patriotism. The Nazis said that the Russians have lost 18 million soldiers, killed, wounded or captured. That's one tenth of Russia's population. Some Americans are saying that we can't afford to pay one tenth of our population in uniform; or up to the Nazi line, but if the Russians have lost 18 million, then we are in a hopeless position, because the States are of so few. When we read, there isn't any lack of courage or patriotism, any want of sacrifice, in Russia.

Walter Winchell's Feb. 28th column's most interesting. He quotes criticism by Rep. Hoffman, Westinghouse's statement, "I have heard the Times."

(Continued On Page 9)

Hon. Wayne Coy,
Special Assistant
to the President,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

You need not return the self-explanatory, enclosed, letter. It appears now that everybody is satisfied: the owners of the land leased to the Government; Mr. Mandell; and the Guayule Project - so "All's well that ends well."

I am wondering whether or not I went off half-cooked; I admit that I don't know. When I first heard Mr. Mandell's tale of woe, on January 7th, he said that he and the other land owners all were dissatisfied with the attempt to make them sell or lease their land, but when I saw him on February 10th he said that everybody was satisfied: the four people who leased their land, and he himself, who refused to sell.

But, I do know that if Mr. Mandell had told me on Jan. 7th what he told me on Feb. 10th, I wouldn't have interfered. But he told me, at first, that he expected, daily, to have his land expropriated. So I wrote to you, hoping that the Manager of the Guayule Project would expropriate the required land from a large landowner, instead of from five owners of small tracts.

I so wrote Mr. Kelley, in reply to the enclosed letter. Another time, I won't be so quick on the trigger, but will make further inquiries before acting.

Respectfully,

GRENVILLE T. CHAPMAN

[Signature]
Mr. Grenville T. Chapman  
501 Park Street, Apt. 507  
El Paso, Texas

Dear Mr. Chapman:

Reference is made to our letter of January 26 and to your reply of  
January 28; we apologize for the delay in getting this reply to you.  

The contents of your last letter reveal the fact that you were not  
fully informed concerning the reasons for the government attempting to  
acquire the Mandell tract. It is hoped this letter will give you a  
clearer picture of the situation.

A few weeks ago we were successful in leasing some 450 acres of land in  
the Mesilla Valley for the establishment of a guayule nursery. The  
land which the government has under lease is owned by Irma C. Allison,  
Gertrude C. Bennett, F. L. Hunt and J. B. Greer.

With your wide experience you can readily see that the operation and  
management of a 450-acre nursery will require a large amount of labor.  
Due to the fact that the nursery tract is far removed from a source of  
labor or housing facilities, it will be necessary to construct a labor  
camp. The nursery land borders the Mandell tract on the east, north and  
west sides. Keeping in mind always the conservation of rubber, we attempted  
to acquire the Mandell tract as a site for the construction of a camp.  
Had this been possible, the laborers would have been able to walk to any  
point of the nursery and also walk home for their noon day meal.

Our local representative made Mrs. Maud C. Mandell a very fair offer  
for her land and improvements. This offer was based on a careful  
appraisal made by a man who has had many years of experience appraising  
land for the Federal Land Bank. As you know, Mrs. Mandell would not  
consider our proposition. We have, therefore, located and purchased  
another tract of land.

There are always two sides to every controversy, Mr. Chapman. I hope  
I have not trespassed too heavily on your time by giving you the story  
of the "other side."

Very sincerely yours,

Evan W. Kelley, Director  
By: Paul H. Roberts, Acting