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CONTINUED
Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt  
The White House  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Governor:

1. Isn't there a possibility that you can clean up the ILO Delegate mess by designating Alex Rose as an additional delegate? Rose would be persona grata to Bill Green and Bob Watt and his appointment would also help straighten out the situation in the New York Labor Party mass.

2. I am quite convinced that the ALP, having been deloused of communists, the non-communist group will form a new party with what I should imagine would be very wide public support from non-communist labor, plus disgruntled democrats and republicans. If the democratic organization of the City or the State made any sense, they would immediately establish working arrangements with this non-communist labor group.

3. Incidentally, the new party will not have the word "labor" in the title which will be to the liking of the laboring men who, after five P.M., do not want to be identified as labor!

4. I have tentatively arranged to go back to England on April 20th on a bunch of miscellaneous items. I am very anxious to see you before then in regard to half a dozen little matters which I don't care to write about.

I do hope you are better.

Yours,

[Signature]
Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear Governor:

1. Rumor has it here that Dewey, being in dutch on racial matters, is likely to come out with a declaration for the temporary admission to the United States of up to 100,000 refugees. I should think that it would be a smart move on his part to make such a pronouncement, and as I know there is considerable thinking around you in favor of temporary refugee admittance, you ought to have your boys beat Tom to the gun.

2. Incidentally, I understand that Bob Nathan has gone over to Palestine to survey the figures which I know you are interested in: how many people for how many million can ultimately live in Palestine.
Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt  
The White House  
Washington, D.C.  

Tidbits  

Dear Governor:  

I am glad you had your rest and are feeling fine.  

I had two swell weeks in England. Britain would not certify my return. Richard Law kidded that he wanted me to stay and the Americans were probably glad to have me get the hell out of England.  

1. Willkie has had long talks with Jerome Frank and others and declares flatly that he will never support Dewey.  

2. All my friends in England -- English and American -- are delighted that Eisenhower has decided (probably unannounced as yet) that on the Continent the Canteens will be run by United Nations for soldiers of all nations, with food and facilities sold at a price that the lowest paid soldier can afford. Mrs. R. will be particularly delighted with this result.  

3. There is a move on to groom Eric Johnson for Will Hays' place to run the movies and in some way this is tied up with the Dewey campaign.  

4. I put through quite a few of my little Trivia such as exchange of pamphlets from Government Printing Offices on both sides of the water, etc. I also talked with your Tax Commission which I think should be able to come back with a swell tax convention between England and the United States. In many ways, disparate and discriminatory taxes between nations are as great a burden as are tariffs.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

May 26, 1944.

MEMORANDUM FOR

MORRIS ERNST:

Thank you for your note. I am glad you had a talk with Sumner. I am sorry I could not see you last Monday. Do let me know the next time you plan to be here.

F.D.R.
May 19, 1944.

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

Tidbits

Dear Governor:

1. I had a long talk with Sumner Welles. When he sees you he may mention my advice to him. He has a plan that may be very helpful because he could head up all of the miscellaneous well-wishing old League of Nations Association people and direct them into channels along your line of functional approach by handling problem by problem: bank, currency, airplanes, etc. He is probably fearful of creating further opposition because of his relations with Hull.

2. Did you notice that Willkie has started to apologize for his position on TVA? I am enclosing a quote. In time he can be increasingly helpful as he gets straightened out.

3. I will be in Washington Monday, May 22, at the Mayflower. If you can possibly spare five minutes any time during the day, or cocktails, I have got a couple of things I really would like to whisper to you.

Yours,

[Signature]

Enc (1)
Excerpt from letter of Wendell L. Willkie to editors of Harper's Magazine, published in May issue:

"But I have no desire to relive the days of the TVA controversy. The TVA is now an accomplished fact and although I have not followed its operation closely, I have a distinct impression that under Mr. Lilienthal’s capable direction it has been well administered."
June 26, 1944.

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

Dear Governor:

1. I am arranging to have the recent radio prayer given by you over the radio, put to music. I picked one of the top musicians to do the job. It will be completed in a few weeks. All of the profits will be donated to Warm Springs or anywhere else you might suggest. I am quite sure I can get all of the recording companies to make records and maybe, if the job is as I think it will be, we can get it on all the networks. I am writing you at this time merely to make sure that it was fully dedicated to the public, as a matter of law. Won’t you be my counsel in the matter?

2. *I am working on a lot of other chores as to which I don’t intend to bother you.

But give me more to do at any time.

Yours,
June 29, 1944.

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

Dear Governor:

Reader's Digest mysteriously asked me if I would outline in a few thousand words the entire foreign policy of our government as I saw it. They don't intend to use my material but they are collecting individual appraisals from those who are opposed to your policy. I have already sent the enclosed to Reader's Digest. I thought maybe if I had really gone off the deep end, or omitted a significant item, that you might want to tip me off because DeWitt Wallace will get in touch with me in about ten days for further elaboration.

With their fifteen million readers I thought this effort on my part was worthwhile. I checked up with Jerome Frank and a few of my buddies and they think that I have incorporated in this document the only comprehensive statement they have seen of your foreign policy without the use of meaningless 310 words.

Yours

[Signature]
INTRODUCTION

The foreign policy of the United States has as obvious and visible objectives the need of keeping peace in the world, the need of reducing burdens on world trade, the right of each freed nation to run its national life according to its own desires short of a fascist regime, the reduction of barriers which prevent the flow of ideas throughout the world and the control of enemy civilizations in order to prevent a recurrence of the present mess.

These fundamentals must be read against the immediate prime necessity of winning the war. There is no conflict between these and the strategy of winning. What appears at times to be a conflict — and on this there seems to be great misunderstanding — is in fact only a matter of timing of moves.

GLOBAL DEMOCRACY AND THE FUNCTIONAL APPROACH

There has been much talk about global democracy. No one can quarrel with the idealism back of that phrase, but an examination of any conceivable practical steps toward the present immediate establishment of a machinery for global democracy makes clear at once the immediate difficulties and the dangers of moving on too broad a front before various necessary preliminary steps have been taken. A realistic approach to global democracy requires an appreciation of the essential facts: democracy requires as necessary tools literacy and the means of communication. Since very few nations in the world can claim 25%
literacy, and since many areas on our planet have no means of communication
whatever, the democratic process in such sectors is little more than a future
dream which our national policy can facilitate. Out of two billion people on
this planet, one billion, two hundred million are totally illiterate and have
no capacity to elect their rulers by what in other terms might be called
"bargaining representatives". Out of all of the nations on this earth probably
two-thirds in number conduct themselves under some form of quasi-dictatorship
as compared to the nations like ourselves which have a sufficient base of literacy
and communication to permit universal suffrage.

Under these circumstances it becomes obvious that a great many
functional steps must be undertaken before real progress can be made in the
direction of a world organization for global democracy. All that one has to do,
is to visualize the first meeting of the 60 odd nations at the time when the
temporary chairman of the meeting is to be elected. Should each nation have one
vote so that we are on a parity with Uruguay, for example? Should the voting
be by population so that China has three times our vote?

The policy of the United States, as is very evident, has in mind as
forerunners to the recent call of the President for a world conference, the need
of a long series of international agreements, subject by subject, function by
function.

It is proper and wise that we should have impatience on the part of
internationally-minded people. Governments, like people, move most wisely
through criticism and pressure. One of the difficulties of officially declaring
a foreign policy always arises from the fact that the impatience and criticism
should not be discouraged but that government, at certain periods of development
of a program, is in no position to state its schedule for timing of steps which
ultimately lead in the direction of these internationally-minded critics. Obvi-
ously it would block the chances of a proper international set-up to announce
to the world that such a set-up prematurely established would fail for specific
reasons. The very list of reasons would deter the attainment of the objective.

Hence, it is apparent that our government has moved, as is well known,
in innumerable directions on a functional basis, which directions taken as a
whole, lay a very substantial foundation for world unity and at the same time
create a springboard for the world organization concept. The functional approach
is evident in many spheres:

1. Airplane conventions.
2. Cable and communication conventions.
3. Relief conventions.
4. Food conventions [to be clearly distinguished from relief since
the raising of the food supply of the world has an important impact on all other
factors of international life].
5. Currency conventions. This is the language of international
trade and should not be confused with the bank concept.
6. International bank with particular relation to the flow of
raw materials.
7. Specific raw material conventions.
8. Convention in regard to shipping services.
9. Oil conventions.

These and others, as is well known, are well under way. On each one of these
subjects each separate nation on our planet has a different stake. Argentina
may well have a more important interest in the flow of food throughout the world
than will have the United States. Various small countries now growing only the
the food which they can consume the next day, can shift their entire food program if they had warehouses in which to store the food. On oil Venezuela has a terrific stake as producers compared to Brazil, although obviously production is not the sole source of "concern", in the Quaker sense of that word, since the purpose of production is consumption. When it comes to currency and bank, for example, the countries supplying the base for the operation of necessity have a larger stake than Costa Rica, for example.

An appreciation of the variance in emphasis and interest of each different country in each different functional problem points to the basic necessity of treating world problems on a business-like functional basis. We realize that there is no hope in referring the myriad of problems of the different countries to a general assembly of all nations on a general leg-rolling basis. Many of the little countries have appreciated this fact and have adopted an exciting well known slogan: "Equality of status even though there be inequality of function and power". This means representation, even though power may not be per capita, per size, per national income — but per those factors implicit in the specific problem under consideration.

Many of the subjects being treated by proposed conventions are of such a high technical nature that the nation realizes that the subjects are matters of expert opinion of highly skilled craftsmen and that the mass of people can have little more than a general feeling of direction rather than reasoned judgments as to specific provisions or solutions. This is not unlike the pattern in relation to the second front, when our society naturally had an expressed desire for an early invasion, but of course, was ignorant and brash in so far as it had the temerity to urge an invasion at a particular time or a particular place.
Criticism of Reader's Digest from the general public -- and I would be less than frank if I did not add that I was a rather violent critic on many occasions -- may have a general value but obviously without knowing the details of the operation, its function is one of pressure rather than an aid in actual determinations.

Departing for a moment from an exposition of the national policy as clearly evidenced, I might add a personal observation to the effect that a poor job has been done somewhere along the line by failing to make clear to the American public the various avenues being approached on the functional basis, the total result flowing from such a wide series of functional conventions and, above all, the relationship between such approach and the ultimate objectives of a world democracy organization.

TRADE AND COMMERCE, AND FINANCING FACTORS UNDERLYING OUR NATIONAL POLICY

The policy of our nation with respect to all of these functional approaches which touch on trade and commerce is naturally affected by the unique position which our land holds in the economic world. Not only have we developed work habits and skills which have increased our production, but we have been endowed by nature with power, raw materials and soil to the extent that we literally do not need more than about $750 million of imports a year in order to maintain a potential national income of $200 billion. As a matter of fact, we need very few commodities -- platinum, magnesium, coffee, etc., in order to maintain our standard of living. This presents a basic difficult situation in international terms. We cannot sell unless we are ready to buy and take in goods in return. Obviously the national policy of this nation, and every
nation, is to sell to high cost countries and to buy from low cost countries. Furthermore, the national policy is to prefer to sell goods with high labor content so as to provide home employment and then to buy goods with low labor content. This basic problem is aggravated by the fact that England, etc., having been virtually depleted of gold and securities, can only buy goods, in general terms, to the extent that they can sell goods and hence, in effect, will be compelled to establish commodity foreign trade budgets. In the policy of our nation there is further implicit the fact that much of our trade with certain countries such as Scandinavia, was balanced out through shipping and other services, and that as to shipping services, as a means of payment, this problem touches on our national policy particularly because of our overwhelming ownership of bottoms. Although I do not find it implicit in governmental statements, I should imagine that it is fairly clear that the position taken by our leading craftsmen in the banking field will be enunciated as a matter of public policy, to wit: governmental guarantees and rediscount facilities in aid of foreign trade. This is peculiarly important because most of the world will be conducting trade through nationally dominated and often operated merchandising units of the governments themselves. I should imagine that it is fairly clear now by action of Congress, etc., that we will not permit, as we did after the last war, the divestiture of our own goods and wealth through placing of loans by private bankers to foreign countries. Nor on the other hand does our national policy go so far as to indicate that our government should finance foreign governments [save for harbors, roads and governmental works] in order even to permit such governments to purchase goods from our factories in order to keep our workers employed. I have not been able to find any clear evidence of government policy as yet but my personal guess is that a combination of
private - government financial machinery will be established. There is ample precedent for this kind of operation and it will have a separate impact on our national policy of stock-piling raw materials.

The entire foreign trade policy of course impinges on tariffs. Here we have no clear national policy since the Republican Party, substantially in toto, plus a sector of the Democratic Party as represented in Congress, have not yet adopted as a premise for a policy the fact that in the after-war world our exports cannot, over a period of time, greatly exceed our imports other than through what in effect would be gifts. The Executive's policy is well enunciated in the following story written by him and released sometime ago even though I doubt if it ever appeared in any magazine or newspaper in this country. The President's statement does not go as far in the direction of 19th Century free trade objectives as do some of the positions taken by Secretary Ball.

"Some years ago the President of the United States was driving through Cartagena, the great seaport of Colombia, with the President of Colombia. The latter said 'It is almost impossible to make our budget balance because we have practically no manufactures. The President said 'Why do you all wear foreign-made shoes and shirts and cotton clothes? You grow plenty of cotton and you have many hides. It is very simple to make low-priced shoes and cotton goods'. The President of Colombia replied 'You must be jesting because that would decrease our purchases from the United States'. President Roosevelt said 'Oh, no, you go ahead and make your own shirts and shoes — raise your standard of living and this will enable you to buy from us more radios and automobiles and things you cannot manufacture down here'. Soon Colombia started making shoes and cotton goods".
FREE CHOICE OF RULERS OF LIBERATED NATIONS

In the field of the re-establishment of state governments in liberated territories our policy consistently has been to use all pro-democracy forces which can aid our military objectives. Obviously it has been difficult to determine, country by country, which particular group in ascendency to power should receive such support. Obviously we had no choice in Italy, for example, unless we wanted to run the risk of having Italians behind our rear at the time of the invasion. Our national policy as I see it, outside of gathering all possible military aid, is to make certain that there be a some provided in each country whereby free and open elections can take place at such time after liberation as the situation permits. Our national policy is in favor of not determining in advance the future rulers of each country but to make sure that there be a democratic election in which we would be taking one supreme risk, namely: that the people of a nation will not elect fascists to office. Each nation presents a different problem with respect to this situation. In France, for example, it is quite important that as against its historical pattern of innumerable parties all claimants for seats in the newly elected Chamber of Deputies shall have equitable access to the minds of the people of France. This access in the main will stem from radio and the printed word. Hence, whoever controls paper rationing and broadcasting time, in effect will control the color of the new government of France. This is the pivotal, delicate issue on which obviously I find no official complete policy comment of our government. It is well known, however, that at a time when escape was possible our national policy was to encourage all pro-democracy French leaders to come out of France. Many, such as Harriot, declined to leave on the ground
that they should stay there and suffer with their people, and further on the
tory that only those who remained at home would be potential leaders for the
revival of that nation. Obviously a judgment as to whether a particular group
in a particular nation will do a decent democratic job in permitting seemingly
minority groups to place candidates before the people is not a matter which

can be gauged by mere words. No group seeking power in a liberated country
could be stupid enough to declare that minorities would not be given fair
treatment. Hence, this is an area of diplomatic judgment on which acute public
tension would get nowhere except in the direction of chaos and confusion.

JAPAN, GERMANY AND CONTROLS

As to Germany I cannot find enough information to freeze the policy
into simple terms. Elimination of war industries, control of essential economy,
control of raw materials, trial of culprits, re-education of youth, present
problems on which the general attitude of our nation seems to be clear and on
which conferences have been under way as is well known. In this connection, it
seems to be our policy not to make commitments as to territorial boundaries at
this time in the middle of the war since all such matters should be left as a
matter of proper timing to common judgment until sometime after the fighting has
ceased.

With Japan I should assume that the policy indicates the liberation
of Korea, Formosa, etc., and the shifting of a substantial portion of the burden
of policing of Japan on to the Chinese.
NEUTRAL GOVERNMENTS

Our policy in regard to so-called neutral countries is clearly an empirical one derived from necessities of winning the war. Here again it becomes difficult for a government to make public the bases for its policy since the benefits of our treatment of Spain and Sweden, for example, have been of such tremendous significance and of such a nature as not to be divulged. It has been obvious, however, to everyone that there could not have been an African invasion if our enemy had taken over Spain; and equally obvious that Hitler could have captured Spain by a telephone call alone. With this in mind, I see nothing in our policy toward Spain, for example, which can decently be construed as an acceptance of fascism at this time or any other time. And our policy after the war will be dictated of course by other considerations. During the war it is most essential that we keep our access to information out of Germany open through the only two possible avenues to wit: Sweden and Spain [and in part Portugal]. This took the most masterful kind of delicate policy treatment. At some later date I should imagine that, without imperiling the lives of our boys and those of our Allies, the full story of the benefits of control of the communication system of Spain, for example, and the techniques used to prevent Hitler from establishing submarine bases in Spain, near Gibraltar, etc., can be fully told. I see no additional or new clear national pattern with respect to attitudes of recognition of countries in South America or Europe other than putting into the act of recognition a connotation of rejection of recognition of a government inimical to our national interest. Our policy has been in aid of the democratic forces but within generous con-
septs of permitting home rule, so to speak, for each independent nation.
We have rejected the screaming of those interests (often liberal and pro-democratic in generalities) which have nevertheless been urging our increasing control through economic sanctions and otherwise of other governments in existence in other nations in order to force conformity to our way of life.

KEEPING PEACE

Keeping peace in the future world is developing realistically and again on a functional basis since the only nations that are capable of maintaining peace by force are those which have capacity through ownership of raw material, plant, equipment, etc., of developing air, sea and land power sufficient to evoke compliance. This policy is developing as I see it as evidenced by the intermingling under single commands of troops of the major nations as they come forward as volunteers from the countries to be liberated. The day by day working together of Russia, England and the United States on military, Land-Lease, civil government controls, etc., support and aid in realistic terms our national policy in this respect.

WORLD ORGANIZATION

As to a world organization and world court, the first step is indicated in the President's recent announcement, but I should imagine that our policy is not unmindful of the fact that after the last war it was some years before war was technically declared ended. I should imagine that our national policy will be to have a much greater period of technical war after fighting ceases this time.

In this connection the success and errors of the League of Nations find their imprint in our present policy. For example, the old rule of the
League of Nations of "unanimity vote" led to ineffective spiritual resolutions. Moreover, the financing of a League and the sanctions to be imposed on nations which do not meet their share of the burden must be obviated in the new venture.

In this connection I find evidence that the Gibraltar Lighthouse Convention, our earliest, and the Ice Patrol Convention, are deemed pertinent. The League's successful efforts where it operated on functional grounds will no doubt be incorporated in our present national policy.

England, Russia and China

In broad general terms, our national policy includes the concept of a cornerstone based on Anglo-American relations but I see no indication that would lead to other than a great hope for enduring peaceful relations with Russia. For 150 years we got along beautifully with Czarist Russia; in diplomatic terms, even though at times our Congress passed resolutions against the pogroms in Russia. One of the most favorable aspects of our national policy in this respect is that we are the sole source of the basic machinery and productive capital necessary for the revival of Russian industry.

As to China, a policy of friendliness and hopefulness is all that I can see since China is possibly a century from complete unification and a semblance of democratic process in terms such as we know. Despite all the reports carried in the newspapers and particularly in utterances by columnists, I see every reason to believe that Russia, England and the United States are in basic agreement on policy objectives, and together with China, which falls in the same category as to quality of mood, there are some indications of a national policy developing toward regional controls with respect to the keeping of the peace.
I pointed out in the Times (Sunday, August 13) to Senator Sargent that Whitman is still being obstructed through legislation for your short ballot. August 20th, 1944, was not the first vote for or against the use of a single ballot in most of our States. What is the issue about this angle? Any suggestions?

August 25, 1944.

Dear Mr. Ernst:

The President has your letter of August eighteenth and he asks me to write to you and suggest that you send Sam Rosenman all the details of the matter mentioned in paragraph one of that letter so that he can look into it.

With kindest regards,

Very sincerely yours,

Grace G. Tully
Private Secretary

Morris Ernst, Esq.,
285 Madison Avenue,
New York 17, N. Y.
I pointed out in the Times (Sunday, August 13) in debate with Charlie Tuttle that Whitman in 1917 put through legislation for your short ballot. Amazed this hadn't come out before. No one thought it unconstitutional. Shouldn't we really use this against Tom -- to show him up as a phoney? What of a radio debate on this angle? Any suggestions?
August 30, 1944,

Dear Mr. Ernst:

The President asks me to send you the following report we have received from the State Department in answer to your inquiry contained in your letter of August 18th.

The State Department telegraphed Ambassador Harriman early in July concerning Mr. Ganfield's suggested trip to Russia on behalf of O.W.I. and the American Book Publishers. The Ambassador replied that such a visit at the right time seemed an excellent idea but that it would be premature at this time in view of Soviet preoccupation with the war. Mr. Ganfield was so advised and the Department has heard nothing further from him.

Very sincerely yours,

Grace C. Tully
Private Secretary

Mr. Morris Ernst,
288 Madison Avenue,
New York 17, N. Y.
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

In response to your memorandum of yesterday, I suggest that you reply to Mr. Ernst along the following lines:

The State Department telegraphed Ambassador Harriman early in July concerning Mr. Canfield's suggested trip to Russia on behalf of O.W.I. and the American Book Publishers. The Ambassador replied that such a visit at the right time seemed an excellent idea but that it would be premature at this time in view of Soviet preoccupation with the war. Mr. Canfield was so advised and the Department has heard nothing further from him.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

August 24, 1944.

MEMORANDUM FOR
HON. E. R. STUTTINIUS, JR.

The enclosed excerpt comes from Morris Ernst. What can I tell him?

F.D.R.
Cass Canfield of Harpers is to go to Russia on interchange of books. As counsel for the publishers and Authors League I'd like to go along. Would you care to jog up Stettinius or Elmer Davis?
Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt  
The White House  
Washington, D.C.  

My dear Governor:  

Welcome home.

1. I pointed out in the Times (Sunday, August 13) in debate with Charlie Tuttle that Whitman in 1917 put through legislation for your short ballot. Amazed this hadn't come out before. No one thought it unconstitutional. Shouldn't we really use this against Tom -- to show him up as a phoney? What of a radio debate on this angle? Any suggestions?

2. Cass Canfield of Harper's is to go to Russia on interchange of books. As counsel for the publishers and Authors League I'd like to go along. Would you care to jog up Stettinus or Elmer Davis?

3. I have great amounts of information as to Willkie's dilemma and moves he is exploring. He would like best of all to be taken out of the campaign and off his spot. What of Doc. O'Connor's job after January 1st with Red Cross? Wendell pictures that as a Hoover Belgian glamour spot, but if you suggest it he will turn it down. He's afraid of being called a bum loser, otherwise he would come out for you. The other consideration is he hesitates to let down Saltonstall et al who helped him. Shall I come down to give you details before you see him?

4. I had Lampell and Murray put your invasion prayer to music. Shall job they did. Mrs. R. has seen it. Decca records, Radio hook-up well arranged. Warner may do a short. What about my bringing the boys down some evening to do the job for you?

Yours,
I pointed out in the Times (Sunday, August 13) in debate with Charlie Tuttle that Whitman in 1917 put through legislation for your short ballot. Amazed this hadn't come out before, No one thought it unconstitutional. Shouldn't we really use this against Tom — to show him up as a phoney? What of a radio debate on this angle? Any suggestions?
August 31, 1944

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

Dear Governor:

1. The editor of the Gallup Poll, a friend of mine, has written me as follows:

"Incidentally, I'd like to get together with you sometime after Labor Day to talk politics. It seems to me the Democrats are making a mistake in strategy. They are letting the Republicans set Hillman up as a bogeyman to frighten people, without finding a bogeyman to pillory on the Republican side."

I think it makes sense. We cannot keep on with "Martin, Barton and Fish" alone.

2. Harry Luce has gone, or is going, to England. The story I hear from the Time boys is that Beaverbrook and the English are so worried about Luce's anti-British feeling that they sent a plane for him and that he was a lone passenger on the plane, telling them you wouldn't let him go over in ordinary ways.

Yours,
Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt  
The White House  
Washington, D.C.

Tidbits

1. Shouldn't George Foster Dulles take the place of "Martin, Barton and Fish"? He was counsel for the German interests in the old Property Custodian cases of the last war; he and his office represented most of the fraudulent stock deals which made the S.E.C. necessary; he was mixed up with the North American indictment and contributed to America First, and his ignorance of foreign dangers is evidenced by his speeches, at least through 1939. I think we need a whipping boy to take the place of Hillman on the other side.

2. When considering names for the Surplus Commodities Commission, what about John Fehlen, whose job on the War Refugees will be ended soon. Also Douglas Fossey, from Carolina, lawyer and economist, now in England, and formerly with Henry Wallace, would be tops.

3. In considering names for the Fair Employment Practices Committee, you might have someone check up I.A. Hirschmann, head of public relations and advertising for Bloomingdale's; he is one of our boys and at present in Turkey on the War Refugee problem. He is one of the eminent Jews who is not working as a professional Jew either with timid Proctor or flamboyant Wise.

4. You might want a copy now, of the statement which William Allen White authorized me to release at any time. In correspondence with you, you had suggested that the most helpful statement would be as follows:

"We were wrong in 1930. We believe in international cooperation and the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms. We propose to back those who show the most diligence and interest in carrying them out."

White refused to sign that statement but worded the following statement:
"We who were violently and actively in favor of the League of Nations in 1919 were wrong in relying upon the mere declarations of public personages in favor of the League."

and he authorized me, on April 6, 1943, to issue that statement. Would any of this help now, and if so, where?

I sent a copy of this to Judge Hughes. I received no reply, but I understand that it is not impossible that he will come out for you for President. Guilt as to his behavior with Harding, plus Will White's courage in the above statement, create a good combination. Incidentally, Felix F. is very close to Judge Hughes at the moment.

Yours,
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

September 26, 1944

MEMORANDUM FOR MISS GRACE TULLY

Dear Grace:

I am handling the Morris Ernst matter and will let you know about it later.

R.L.H.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

September 22, 1944.

MEMORANDUM FOR

HON. HARRY L. HOPKINS:

What shall I reply to Morris Ernst on paragraphs four and five? Please return enclosure.

F.D.R.

Letter to the President, 9-20-44 from Morris L. Ernst, re various things, including suggesting a committee to follow up for the Pres. all of the internat'l moves on radio, press and movies and that the Pres. aid Capt. Burgess Meredith who is being sidetracked because of his picture Welcome to Britain.
THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY
WASHINGTON
October 31, 1944

My dear Mr. President:

I have received your memorandum of October 25th with which you enclosed a letter from Morris Ernst.

John Pehle is an extremely able man, but I do not believe his training would particularly fit him as a successor to Mr. Fly. Furthermore, Mr. Pehle is very desirous of staying with the Treasury.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

The President,
The White House.
October 23, 1944.

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

Dear Governor:

Tidbit

You are going to have a tough time replacing Jim Fly. My guess is that John W. Pehle is the only lawyer I know who would be tough enough to handle Paley, Sarnoff, et al, who are bottlenecking the air of America.

Yours,
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

October 25, 1944.

MEMORANDUM FOR
HON. HENRY MORGENTHAU, JR.

What would you think of this?

F.D.R.

Letter to the President, 10-25-44 from Morris Ernst, re John W. Pehle to replace James Fly.
November 29, 1944.

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

Dear Governor:

I have had long talks with Sumner Welles of late. How about
the improbable suggestion that Sumner go back to his old job? He would
be a terrific asset in South America. He will get along swell with
Stettinius, would gather terrific support from Helen Reid, et al, and he
has enough humility not to worry about titles. You ought not to lose his
great knowledge and popularity. I don't think there is anything to worry
about at all with respect to the story that Krock published about Sumner,
and moreover, I hate to see Krock keep on bragging about putting Sumner
out.

Yours

[Signature]
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

December 17, 1944.

MEMORANDUM FOR
MORRIS ERNST:

I have no objection to
Joe Ball investigating ownership
of publicity sources. It may
come in handy.

F.D.R.

No papers accompanied the original of
this memorandum to Mr. Ernst.
December 11, 1944.

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

Tidbits

Dear Governor:

1. Connie Ernst, Deputy Director of OWI shortwave, is whipping up an idea for a program throughout the world in which you would read Christmas greetings from the Bible. The suggestion has been made that you read for world distribution Matthew, Chapter 2, verses 1 to 11, and Luke, Chapter 2, verses 1 to 14. If you think well of the idea, drop me a note and I will put it into full swing.

2. I am seeing Joseph Ball, Fulbright and others in regard to a possible Senate committee investigation as to who owns the radio, movies and press of America, with the main emphasis on bottlenecks and the evaporation of the small newspaper, starving out a Disney and the freezing out of small radio companies. Green light from you?

Yours,

[Signature]
Miss Kelly —

The last thing Morris Ernst really had to do with Labor Department Act.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

MEMO FOR MISS TULLY:

The President promised to
tell me what he thought about
Mr. Ernst's proposal and what
he thinks proper.

E.R.
December 26, 1944.

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

Dear Governor:

1. I thought I ought to let you know that friends of mine, starting with American Newspaper Guild officers, have been buzzing around with the idea that I might be the guy to sit in the hot spot known as Secretary of Labor. You know how reluctant I have been to go out into the field of political office holding other than the Banking Board to which you originally appointed me and to which Tom will not reappoint me, I hope! I understand that Jim Carey, Secretary of CIO, Clinton Goldsmith, who is Murray's brain trust, Matty Woll, of the AFL, Dubinsky and others, at the moment advise that I would be persona grata to all ends of labor. Should I be suspicious of such unity? I understand that Jerry Frank has been in touch with Harry. Jerry asked me to send him a resume of friends, enemies, and matters on which I have acted in the labor field and also outlines of what the Department should do. I thought I ought to let you know about the situation, in case you do not know about it already, or do you want me to call off the wolves.

2. I saw Joe Ball on Friday in Washington and he is speaking to Barkley, Bert Wheeler and others because he is enthusiastic about a Senate Committee to investigate: "Who owns the radio, movies and press"? If properly conducted it could be of great value and of ultimate aid to a 1,000 small weekly's, 500 small newspapers, 300 small radio stations and dozen independent motion picture producers as well as encouraging more people to enter those fields. I have material to prove the present concentration of power and have prepared an outline of proposed remedies. Ball wants Wheeler with him on the resolution for inquiry. That seemed odd but OK to me.

Yours,

[Signature]
March 5, 1945.

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

Dear Governor:

Tidbits

1. Why not get back 200 miners and miners' sons with their full decorations from the battlefields of the Pacific and Europe. They should be here now while the Lewis strike vote is being taken.

2. Why not undercut the entire Lewis program by a non-inflationary plan in the direction of annual contracts of employment in the minefield.

3. Is there anyone that I can work with on any phase of this program? I went up into the minefields for Governor Earle on Anthracite coal and I know some of John L.'s weak spots.

4. Why not Kilgore for Secretary of Labor right now. If he went up into the minefield with Green and Murray and others, he could undercut John L. Kilgore would like it and is, I am sure, O.K. with Phil.

5. I think I am off to Europe again, this time with Bill O'Dwyer, on the War Refugee job. I think it important that Eisenhower should know that you are back of this job so that some of his military boys don't spike it.

6. Your last speech was swell. Why not ad lib the next one in toto.

Yours,

[Signature]

[Handwritten note: "Morris 7-5"]]
March 9, 1945.

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

Dear Governor:

Here is an impertinent one. It just struck me that Major General Sanderford Jarman, who is now in command at Saipan, looks and acts and resembles so greatly in gists and manner Pa Watson, that you might want to use him in Pa Watson's shoes; that is, if anybody can fill his shoes.

Best,

Yours,
TO SHOW THE PRESIDENT BEFORE MAILING

PSF: Ernst
July 17, 1934
Personal

Dear Mr. Ernst:

The President has your note of March twelfth and would like you to refresh his memory on some of the matters which you want to take up in England. In order to make a request for a passport, we have to explain to Miss Shipley just what is your mission.

In regard to number two, the President says he doubts whether more than half or three-quarters of a Congressman would read Hansard.

Very sincerely yours,

Grace E. Tully
Private Secretary

Mr. Morris Ernst,
228 Madison Avenue,
New York 17, N. Y.

[Handwritten note in pencil: 3-45]
March 12, 1945.

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt;
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear Governor:

1. I am anxious to go over to England around April 10th to continue some of my explorations in regard to Anglo-American tidbits on which you know I have been working. I wonder if you could get word to Mrs. Shipley for her to issue my governmental passport as she did last May.

2. What do you think of the advisability of my getting some rich benefactor to pay the expenses for the exchange of the Congressional Record and Hansard between all Members of Congress and all Members of Parliament. Our Boys at least would get a wholesome education. Or do you think it would be better to have Congress itself, or the State Department, arrange for such free exchange.

Yours,
March 23, 1945.

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

Tidbits

Dear Governor:

1. John L. Lewis is going to urge royalties for miners because the Girard Estate for a century has gotten royalties on practically every ton of coal mined in Pennsylvania. He will urge that these royalties go to colleges, hospitals and charitable institutions and then he will say, "Why not to the miners themselves?" This will be his basic strategy. Who around you is getting ready to handle John L? Phil and his boys are worried sick that John, enemy of yours and of the war, will get something while Phil's boys who are friendly, cannot get anything in the way of increased wages. Whom should I see about the information I have so as to prepare public opinion for this new move of John's?

2. Miss Tully wrote me to send you a note as to some of the matters I want to take up in England. They are:

Completion of arrangements for exchange of pamphlets between His Majesty's Stationary Office and our Government Printing Office as to which I wrote you some time ago.

Establishment of retail book stores in New York and London for marketing of books, especially of a scientific nature not separately printed in either nation.

Further discussions on copyright convention.

Exchange of cultural magazines to libraries of both nations.


Discussions on exchange of films.

Other matters contained in original printed pamphlet of 1942 in regard to Trivia between England and the United States.

Needless to say none are of a personal or professional concern.

Thanks,

Yours, [Signature]