

C19447

Harold:

Here are names of some people who were extremely helpful to me in the East last Spring - they are sincerely interested in you and I would appreciate a letter from you to each of them.

DON MILLAR 537 Blackhawk Ave., Madison, Wis. was extremely helpful during the Wisconsin campaign this spring, he represents the Milwaukee Sentinel here and is the one who put out the "rescued at sea" story about you.

Miss Joyce Gafke, 616 Arlington Place, Chicago, Ill. was a student at the Univer of Wis. who organized a Stassen for President club there which was very effective.

Joseph Ridder, Journal of Commerce, 63 Park Row, New York City was chairman of my committee there and extremely helpful.

Victor Ridder, Duluth Herald, Duluth, was also in N.Y. while I was there and helped me a lot.

Mrs. John ## Cross, The Carlton House, 22 East 47th. St. New York City, was Chairwoman of my committee - She is an extremely capable woman and tremendously interested in you - She was formerly a Hoyt of Cleveland and extremely wealth.

Mrs. Dwight Davis, 4 Sutton Place, New York City who you may also know as Pauline Sabin. She is a very outstanding woman and extremely helpful, a friend of Mrs. Cross and very much interested in you.

Mrs. Virginia Bacon, 1801 F. Street N.W. Washington D.C. -wife of former congressman -daughter in law of former ambassador - very prominent in Washington and smart political - strong for you and great help to me.

Mrs. John Gross, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. - wife of v.p. of Bethlehem Steel and very active in Pa. politics - very strong for you and spend a lot of time in you behalf in Pa.

Harvey Hoshour, 50 Federal St. Boston was my contact in Boston and extremely helpful arranged Cunningham article.

Mrs. C. Reinold Noyes 455 E. 51st. St. New York City - formerly Mrs. Sumner McKnight of Mpls. and mother of Henry - hard worker and very helpful.

Mrs. Winthrop Emmet, 520 East 86th. St. N.Y. City is assistant editor of Vogue - very active in your behalf called a meeting at her home of about 40 people ### at her# home for me to speak to including the mg.ed of her mag.

Robert Coughlan, associate ed. of Life who wrote story about you.

Katharine Scherman, Life, who called at my office and did research on story strong admirer# of yours although she has never seen you.



109-5<sup>th</sup> Ave So.  
So. St Paul, Minn  
Oct 1 - 1944

Dear Brother Stassen,

On Oct. 6<sup>th</sup> 1944, Reserve  
Rebekah Lodge #123 will dedicate  
their Service Flag. Among the  
seven stars will be one for you.  
We feel this is a very grand  
honor for our Lodge and want  
you to know how much we  
appreciate your star.

My husband is out there  
somewhere in the Pacific in the  
Seabees. I would like to give  
you his name although I know  
you are very busy but you  
might accidentally see him.

M. E. Johnson/PO - 59<sup>th</sup> W.C.B. - Co. D5  
of I. P. O. San Francisco, Calif.  
He is now on Green.

May God Bless you all and  
protect you.

Yours in D.L. & I.

Mrs Dorothy F. Johnson  
Noble Grand of  
Reserve Rebekah  
Lodge #123.



UNITED STATES ARMY  
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN  
ANN ARBOR

Od, 2  
[1944]

Dear Harold:

Enclosed find an interesting clipping on a statement made in Minnesota recently.

Julian Baird called me the other day and said it has been very stormy there and I advised as best I could how to combat such weather. Vics memorandum strongly in point there.

Do not suppose you can take much cognizance now of weather conditions in the U.S.

We are working along studying very industriously here at school. We will be through here about Nov. 10<sup>th</sup> and I will no doubt have some leave then (10 days or so) and would like to hear from you then.

Regards Elmer

After writing and before mailing this Sidney called me here and is also concerned with weather effects etc. This showed I think be given careful thought.

October 3, 1944

Dear Harold:

Joe arrived here Friday afternoon. Talked in general terms with Ed. Gave enclosed, (1), to Dispatch. Went to Warren's house and told him about it. Warren made several suggestions and Joe called Mpls paper and gave them story with corrections, which made it look better in the Mpls paper (2).

That night papers called leaders and Ed frantically. Ed at farm and not available, but back home Saturday, saw leaders, George, and Roy, and Earl, and statements were prepared calmly, which appeared in Sunday paper (3). Saturday and Sunday phones rang, tempers flared. Reactions two kinds -- 1, hard feelings; 2, furious. Reasons -- should have consulted friends before making statement, hurt Dewey's chances, slap in face at you and hurt you for future. Then all grievances of past gathered up, such as insults in office, "bet", etc.

Through Sunday afternoon furious and uncontrolled tempers, outside of Warren, Ed and me.

Monday settling down process started in. Editorial in Monday morning paper and Radabaugh's statement were well received, (4). Warren and I called constantly, suggesting to people not to be bitter, but to think how we could repair the damage.

Today, Tuesday, things in general have settled down. Joe had talk at Fairmount cancelled, also at Mpls. He is in Albert Lea today, Tuesday, addressing Chamber of Commerce. Will get report on it tonight. Every precaution to make it go smooth was taken.

Ed talked to Albany, explained situation, they understanding. Rose, Ann S., others very bitter. They will calm down I am sure. Everyone more determined than ever that Tom shall carry the state and will work in that direction. Joe going on air Wednesday evening. Warren and I will do everything possible to get right talk. Joe willing we go over it in detail with him, but doesn't agree to follow all our suggestions.

This whole thing most unfortunate, but will work out of it some way. It is my sincere belief the net damage to you will be negligible, if any.

Pierce Butler going east tonight. Will see them in New York. Had long talk with Pierce this afternoon.

Vic Johnson working Wisconsin. Doing a good job. Spent three hours with Turner Catledge yesterday. Relationship with him and others his group most cordial, etc., etc.



From leading editorial in New York times last week, it would not surprise me to see them declare for Roosevelt. Understand, indirectly, St.Louis Post Dispatch will do the same.

Roy and George both working well with Ed. Ed doing magnificent job. He has grown tremendously the past four months. He makes speech for Dewey middle of month. Will not mention your name directly or indirectly.

Warren here yesterday. Enclosing clippings. He did well. Bricker here Saturday morning, 9 o'clock, St.Paul Auditorium. We are going to try to get a crowd. Goes to St.Cloud for noon meeting. Hope Esther and Glen can ride up with him to St.Cloud. He then goes to Duluth, evening meeting.

A real good job by party being done in this state to carry it for Tom. My contacts are very flimsy, but I would guess 50-50 now. You know "rabbit" is at Ann Arbor for special course. Marge going down Saturday.

Think it appropriate your name not be used in any of Minnesota broadcasts. This policy being followed. Also not guessing at your opinion, or stating a guess at it, as to what you would like to see happen. Feel this to be poor judgment. Keeping Sidney and Julian closely advised so they can keep older group lined up for future. They are both doing a swell job.

We will have "E" up soon. Only home few days and laid up most of it with bad cold.

Editorial in St.Paul paper written by Al Crocker. They want to do anything and everything we want done, and are certainly giving Tom every break, and more so than those across the river.

"pac" doing outstanding job. Stopped by to remind Warren he had two days left to re-register, due to change of address. That is one for the books!

Did you hear about the little boy who went to Sunday School with his father, also to Church. After Church as they were walking home father said, "How did you like it?". Little boy said, "The music was fine, the singing excellent, but the "commercial" was a little long".

Also did you hear about the man who went up to a hotel to get a room. The clerk said he had nothing except the Bridal Suite. The man said he didn't want that, that he had been married 45 years. The clerk said, "So what! If I rent you the Ball Room you don't have to dance, do you?".

Also about the man who went to a Symphony Concert (a business man like myself) He asked an accomplished musician there if Bach was still composing. The musician looked at him for a moment, then said, "No sir, but he is now "de-composing".

The weather is swell. Minnesota has a good foot ball team this year. The Michigan game next Saturday should be excellent. Remember the rainy one we went to together?

The ducks have not started to fly, but I am not going to hunt them without a license and federal stamp, nor without plugs in my gun. None of us ever do.

As for me, my health is excellent. I have lost some weight, taken some exercise, pounding hell out of business, and the results are more than satisfactory. The fund raising which we usually have every four years is going according to schedule in a very satisfactory manner.

Herb Lewis is in London doing a good job and feeling fine. His wife said last night if Norway were to be invaded he would cover it.

I have been lax about writing you, but will try to do better from now on, and I hope all the script is intelligent, along social, family and business lines.

I think I must be getting about ready to run for County Surveyor, for I seem to be able to take awful bumps with a smile and in stride. Modestly, I really believe both Warren and I are going to emerge from this past four or five day period better than most of our acquaintances, for we did keep calm and collected, and tried to be sensible and intelligent in what we did, and due to Ed's excellent handling, George and Roy stayed on the beam.

You have not been heard from since the 18th of September, so I imagine you will be getting back to some sort of a port in the not too distant future, and I hope this reaches you in the course of the next few days.

I can sincerely say, Harold, people, by and large, think more of you today than they ever have before. Turner C. said that even though people kicked you and Joe around the country, Joe's statement would never hurt you, for your stature was well established beyond any question of doubt, and I honestly believe this to be a fact.

When you get a chance, drop me a line, and not over too many scotches, so I can read it.

With sincerest and best regards,

1944

Lawrence L. Dublinowski, Cox.

Motor Torpedo Boat, Base 16  
% Fleet P.O. Navy P.O. 3220  
San Francisco, Calif.



Dear Mr Stassen:

This letter is from one of your campaigners who at the present is stationed in the So. Pacific. It soon will be one year.

Your remembering of me will probably be vague as the work I did for you was in Northeast Minneapolis, (P.N.A. Hall, Ect) distributing literature and serving refreshments.

In order to relate my problem to you it is necessary to go back to my enlistment in the Merchant marine. Upon my completion of boot training I was transferred as a life boat instructor, before shipping out. At that time my wife was pregnant and she was worried about me not being in the states while my son was born. I transferred into the navy so I could stay in the states a little longer. At Great Lakes I was recommended for metal school as that is my trade but before my boot training was completed I got a Cox. rate because of my maritime experience, consequently I lost out in going to metal school. I tried my damndest to drop my Cox. rate so I could go to school but the reply I received was that after I was assigned to a sea-going unit I could with my commanding officers approval to strike for metalsmith in our own outfit which I immediately did.

The problem I am about to confront you with may seem to be quite complicated to you because of censor reasons.

Actually my Cox. duties in the navy have been very limited. When I arrived at this base I immediately went into our metal shop. Several months later I took two examinations, one was my second class P.O. test and the other for metalsmith second. I passed both of those examinations. As you know when the enlisted personnel change from a right arm rate to a left arm rate it must be approved in the bureau at Washington D.C. A few months later my papers were returned with a negative reply because the bureau said the navy is short of the cross anchor rate.

My present situation is that I can stay in the metal shop without any chance to make a metalsmith rate because of compliment reasons or I can carry on with my Cox. rate in that duties. Mr Stassen after about nine years being connected with metal work, No. Pump Co. included then to change my line of work to something I am not interested in is pretty hard to take. I tried to interest myself in Cox work but it isn't in me. The navy says we can choose the type of work we are interested in. My heart is set in metal work, I have a secret ambition to have my own shop after the war. You yourself wouldn't be content away from your law books. You can understand how I feel going into something entirely different from what I have been doing.

Mr Stassen you are the only one I can turn to to get me that rate. With the rate there will also have to be a transfer as that rate is not needed on this base, if possible a transfer to Wold Chamberlain navy base would be more than welcome, next any base in the states, last any repair ship.

In closing I want to stress that I am not of the gregarious type but a fellow who is asking for help to stay in his own line of work. I'll appreciate any action taken in this matter.

Enclosed is self addressed envelope for your reply.

Yours sincerely,

Lawrence L. Dublinowski, Cox. U.S.N.

639-47-35

2/9442

Wednesday Morning, October 4th.

Enclosed are comments from the morning paper on speech at Albert Lea.

Also two releases last night which are most unfortunate.

Have information things went especially well at Albert Lea, no boos, etc.

Radio address tonight will help some, but not as much as I would like to have it. Will send you copy of it.

Radio address fine - for left turn  
all going now things going good -  
I am cheering tomorrow - making contributions  
all working as team - write letter next  
Saw Esther Sunday apt with Mrs May  
Mother she looked grand -



TEXT OF SPEECH BY SENATOR JOSEPH H. BALL  
AT 7:45 P. M. WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 4, 1944.  
OVER STATION KSTP

(Release on delivery)

On Friday night I issued a statement on the national campaign, published Saturday morning. What I actually said seems to have been overlooked in much of the comment it provoked, and I take this opportunity to repeat my statement. I quote:

"It is my deep conviction that the foreign policy of the United States, particularly our firm intention to join with our present Allies in establishing a strong and effective international organization having real authority and power to maintain peace, is by far the greatest issue facing the American people in the November 7th election.

"The lives of future generations and the security of our liberties are at stake.

"That issue is far more important than the political success or failure of any party or person.

"I have read or listened to all of Governor Dewey's speeches and statements to date. He has not as yet convinced me that his own convictions on this issue are so strong that he would fight vigorously for a foreign policy which will offer real hope of preventing World War Three against the inevitable opposition to such a policy.

"That being the case, I would violate my own deepest convictions if I were at this time to try to campaign for Governor Dewey.

"I shall instead devote myself to discussing this issue of foreign policy and stressing its importance to the future of America at every opportunity, trusting in the people's judgment on November 7th to make the right decision for America.

"This is a strictly personal decision by myself alone. I am making this statement because of repeated inquiries as to my plans in this campaign and because I believe the people of Minnesota, who elected me, are entitled to a frank and honest statement of my position and my reasons therefore." End of quote and of statement.

I realize that it is a serious step for a Republican Senator to take such a position regarding his party's nominee for President, and I took it only after long and serious consideration.

For the benefit of those who are interpreting my statement to suit their own partisan political purposes, I wish to make it very plain that I said exactly what I meant, and that I did not mean anything I did not say.

Many persons disagree with my emphasis on the foreign policy issue. I share their concern over administrative bungling and have fought to correct it for four years. My antipathy to a fourth term is as great as anyone's. I have said repeatedly that our postwar domestic prosperity will depend in large measure on the development of clear, sound federal tax and labor relations policies, a responsibility which the present administration has failed to meet and which I hope the Republican party will meet.

I recognize my responsibility both to the people of Minnesota and to the Republican party. But before either of these is my responsibility to eleven million American boys who are fighting and dying to win this war, and to their sons, now alive and yet unborn, who will pay the price of our failure to prevent its recurrence.

I cannot forget that 25 years ago the League of Nations was sabotaged and killed by public officials who claimed to be for its general outline and purposes, but who fought every specific authority needed to make it effective. No one can tell whether this war and the snuffing out of millions of young lives might have been prevented had the United States joined the League and thrown its great strength behind the principle of joint enforcement of international law. No one can tell because we never tried the experiment. We yielded to the multitude of fears dinned into our ears, fears for our sovereignty, for our independence, fear of interference in domestic affairs, fears proven by the subsequent history of the League to have been entirely groundless but which are nevertheless being revived today by the opponents of collective security.

I know that these questions of foreign policy, because of all the prejudices and fears involved, are supposed to be political dynamite, that it is a time-honored political custom to leave them alone as much as possible-- until after election. But I see the heavy casualty lists issued every day-- lists of boys who are facing-- not political dynamite-- but live TNT, flame throwers, tanks, and the hell of massed artillery fire. They cannot take refuge in nice safe generalities.

The very least we at home owe to our heroic youth, dying because of our political failures of the past, is to discuss honestly, specifically, and clearly the grave issues of the future, particularly that of maintaining peace, regardless of the political consequences. That I shall continue to do to the best of my ability.

No one is more strongly in favor than I of a bipartisan or non-partisan approach to the great problem of maintaining peace and of preventing a recurrence of world war. I introduced in the Senate, over a year ago, a bipartisan resolution on the subject and later teamed up with Democratic congressmen to speak for that resolution from coast to coast. I believe that our bipartisan activity helped in some small measure to spur the national administration to action in this all-important field. I am happy that Governor Dewey has joined Secretary Hull in maintaining a bipartisan approach to the problem of forming an international security organization to guard against future wars.

But my deep desire to keep the issue nonpartisan does not blind me to the fact that it is and of necessity must be a political issue. It is a political issue because the convictions and attitudes on it of the President and the congressmen and Senators elected this fall will in the final analysis determine whether or not the United States will join an effective world security organization. Without the United States in it, such an organization cannot hope to succeed.

Already it is apparent that a bitter fight will be waged against our joining the international security organization now being worked out. It will take the strongest kind of leadership from the White House to overcome that opposition.

Let us remember that the people of America never had a fair chance to express their overwhelming support of the League of Nations in the 1918 and 1920 elections because the issue was brushed aside, subordinated to local questions and personalities. General statements for an association of nations gave the impression there was no controversy and the real points of cleavage were never brought out clearly. I believe it would be a betrayal of our fighting men to permit that sort of evasion again, and what I can do to prevent it I shall do.

All of us who read the newspapers and listen to the radio are fairly well informed as to the main outlines of the international security organization being worked out at the conference of American, British and Russian representatives at Dumbarton Oaks. Governor Dewey in his Louisville speech followed those outlines generally when he spoke for a world court to settle judicial disputes, a general assembly in which all nations would be represented, and a smaller executive council to settle political disputes and take action against future aggressors. That is fine as far as it goes.

But, even as Governor Dewey spoke, the two major lines of attack on our joining such an organization were developing, and since then they have become very clear. Both Republican and Democratic Senators have stated them in speeches. There is nothing new or strange about their arguments. In fact they have a very familiar ring, because they are exactly the arguments used to delay, sabotage, and finally kill the League of Nations in the Senate twenty-five years ago.

One of these two arguments is the demand that all the peace settlements, both in Europe and Asia, must be completed and must meet all the varying standards as to what we believe would be just and fair, before the United States should join an international organization to maintain peace.

On the surface, that sounds fairly reasonable; but let's examine it more closely. In the first place, it would mean delaying any establishment of an international security organization for at least three, and possibly five or more, years. Probably it would mean killing it for good simply by delay, because nations are not likely voluntarily to limit their sovereignty in favor of international control of aggression except in a time of crisis when the horrors of war are close at hand.



At Versailles, fear of future aggression was a major force working toward injustice in the settlements. It will be a much more potent force after this war unless we can eliminate its influence by creating beforehand a world security organization in which nations and peoples can and will have confidence.

But I do not expect, and I do not believe anyone who has studied the forces now working expects the peace settlements after this war to satisfy any individual or nation completely. There will be injustices and there will be deviations from principle which the people of America will dislike. To expect anything else out of the seething cauldron of hate stirred up by this most brutal and destructive of all wars is to expect the impossible. The only hope of gradually correcting such injustices without war is to have ready an organization which provides peaceful procedures for change and adjustment. Experience under the old League of Nations justifies that hope.

If we and our Allies are to demand a world Utopia before we do anything effective about preventing future wars, we'll never do it. This argument is now, as it was in 1919, merely a subterfuge for opposition to our joining any international organization.

The second line of attack is the demand that even after the world security council has determined that a clear case of military aggression exists and has called for use of joint military forces to stop it, with our representative on the council agreeing, the United States Congress must still consider the case and give its consent, either through a formal declaration of war or some other resolution, before a single United States cruiser or aircraft carrier can be ordered into action against the aggressor.

Where does that leave the enforcement of our international law against future aggression and war? Obviously, if we reserve the right to decide in each individual case whether or not we will help maintain peace, so will every other nation, and we'll have no more certainty of international law enforcement than we had in the twenties and thirties, and no better chance of preventing a third world war. Instead, we could look forward only to a repetition of the endless delays, the confusion and dodging of responsibility and ultimate inaction that finally resulted in the failure of the League machinery to preserve peace.

I believe these are two of the vital questions at the very heart of the problem of preventing another great war. The American people can decide them only if the two Presidential nominees, as well as all Congressional candidates, state their positions on them clearly and honestly. That has not been done as yet.

Presumably, the present Administration, because it is negotiating the agreements at Dumbarton Oaks, is committed on these questions. Presumption is not enough on this vital issue and I believe the President has a primary responsibility to present these and other issues to the people and state his position on them with complete candor. Unfortunately, we have not had that kind of leadership from the White House. In that situation, it becomes even more incumbent on the opposition to draw the issues clearly and forcefully. Otherwise, we cannot decide these issues intelligently at the polls.

Finally, may I appeal to the people of Minnesota to reject the hate groups and the rabid partisanship which is becoming apparent on both sides in this national campaign. We cannot hope to build either a peaceful world or a sound America on the foundation of hate, fear and prejudice.

Continual raking over the errors of the past generates heat but little light. The problems facing us in the future, both at home and abroad, are vast and complicated. Their adequate and honest discussion should leave little time for mud slinging between now and election.

Statement released by Senator Joseph H. Ball Thursday, October 12, 1944

As a result of my recent statements on the importance of the foreign policy issue in the present national campaign, I have received many hundreds of requests to summarize the real points of controversy already developed over United States participation in a United Nations security organization so that voters can better judge where all candidates for federal office stand on them. In response to that demand, in cooperation with others who feel as I do, I have drafted the following query which voters who regard this issue as paramount might address to candidates for the Presidency and Congress:

It has become clear in this campaign that general statements by candidates favoring an international security organization offer no more assurance to the people than they did in 1918 and 1920. Therefore, we are asking you to answer these specific questions regarding the main lines of attack already developed against United States entry into such an organization:

1. Will you support the earliest possible formation of the United Nations security organization and United States entry therein before any final peace settlements are made either in Europe or Asia?
2. Will you oppose any reservations to United States entry into such United Nations organization, which would weaken the power of the organization to act to maintain peace and stop aggression?
3. Should the vote of the United States representative on the United Nations security council commit an agreed upon quota of our military forces to action ordered by the council to maintain peace without requiring further Congressional approval?

Time is short and I urge all Americans who want our country to do its full share to prevent a recurrence of world war to insist on clear, unequivocal answers to these questions from Presidential and Congressional nominees. Safe, easy generalities on this issue are not enough when eleven million American boys are facing death because of the failure of governments, our own included, to solve this great problem after World War One.

Candidates who have thought this issue through and believe it can be solved only by strong and effective international organization can and will answer all three questions with a straight affirmative, appending their own reasons for such answer. Isolationists, nationalists, American imperialists and others who will give lip service to the principle of world organization but sabotage every effort to make it effective will either answer in the negative or so qualify their answers as to make them meaningless.



STATEMENT OF SENATOR BALL MONDAY OCT. 23, 1944

The record in this national campaign is largely complete.

Here at home, Governor Dewey would not reverse or abandon any major objective or policy of the Roosevelt Administration. He does promise more efficient administration and a friendlier attitude toward business, both needed. However, domestic issues cannot be separated from international issues. This war is convincing proof that in the shrinking world of today what America does at home has terrific repercussions abroad, and that the solutions reached for international problems will shape and limit our choices at home.

The American system has proven by its miraculous record in this war that it is stronger than ever despite changes in federal policy and administrative mistakes the past twelve years. It can and will survive domestic blunders, but neither our enterprise system nor our democratic institutions will survive a third world war. Therefore, the foreign policy which the American people choose for their government in this election becomes all-important.

The Roosevelt Administration, with some mistakes and timidity, has by its action reversed the isolationist foreign policy the United States followed for two decades. It has established American leadership of the United Nations in fighting this war and developing a world security organization to maintain peace in the future.

President Roosevelt in his Saturday night speech capped this record of action by meeting squarely and unequivocally the two vital and controversial issues on which the isolationists kept us out of the League of Nations and will fight our entry into the United Nations Security organization. He insisted that the United Nations organization be formed without delay, before hostilities cease, and that it be granted power to use military force against future aggressors without requiring individual approval of each member nation.

Governor Dewey has opposed delay but has not met squarely the second vital issue. He has spoken for a strong international security organization, but in each speech has so worded his commitment that both isolationists and internationalists could find comfort and support in what he said. A substantial part of his support is talking straight isolationist doctrine to the country.

President Roosevelt is in a position to receive a clear and tremendously forceful mandate on this great issue from the American people.

Governor Dewey's mandate would be confused and weak and his leadership hampered by a serious division among his own supporters.

On that basis, I shall vote for and support President Roosevelt.

SPEECH OF SENATOR JOSEPH H. BALL (R-Minn) on behalf of  
PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT FROM WASHINGTON OVER BLUE NETWORK  
NBC at 10 P.M. THURSDAY, October 26, 1944.

Release for Friday A.M. papers, Oct. 27.

We are in the closing days of a national campaign carried on in the midst of the greatest war in our history. That fact itself is proof of the vitality and strength of the democratic institutions which we are fighting to preserve. Unfortunately, the campaign has not measured up to the needs of the times.

With eleven million American sons in uniform, we had a right to expect in this campaign a courageous, serious and high-principled discussion of the solutions to the great problems facing us. Except in all too rare instances, we have not had this type of campaign. Instead we have had promises without programs to fulfill them, meaningless generalities and concentration on minor issues. We have had name-calling, sarcasm and appeals to hate and prejudice. Neither great party has met adequately its responsibility to the future of America.

Despite this unsatisfactory situation, we must choose a President on November 7. I have made my choice, on the record and the issues. Although I am a Republican Senator, I shall vote for President Roosevelt. Here are my reasons:

On domestic issues, Governor Dewey says he would retain or expand every major program and policy of the Roosevelt Administration. He would expand social security. He would keep the Wagner Act, wage and hour law, securities and exchange act and other major Roosevelt policies. Dewey also accepts the Roosevelt thesis that if private enterprise fails to provide full employment in the postwar period the Federal Government must step in and make up the difference with a public works program.

Dewey does promise a more efficient administration of these programs and a friendlier attitude toward business. I believe both of these are needed.

But on the important domestic issues of taxation and labor relations, Dewey has failed to offer the American people a workable, constructive program. He has properly called attention to weaknesses of the present Administration in these fields. But his only solutions to our labor relations problem is to appoint a labor leader secretary of labor and place all labor functions under that department. That sounds good but it is hardly adequate to solve the difficult labor relations problem ahead. Governor Dewey promises to reduce taxes for nearly everyone, but seems to overlook the huge revenue needs of the Federal Government in the immediate future.

Governor Dewey, and to an even greater degree speakers for him in this campaign, have attempted to scare the American people into believing that re-election of Roosevelt would mean a communist dictatorship in the United States. Because of their reckless and irresponsible handling of this scare attempt, they have seriously weakened the chances of a Dewey administration being able to cooperate with Soviet Russia. Yet any student of foreign affairs recognizes that continued cooperation and harmony between Russia, Britain and the United States is a prime essential to any realistic effort to prevent future wars.

But what are the facts about American communists? In four years in Washington I have yet to meet a federal office holder who is a communist, and I may add that I have absolutely no use for the American variety. There may be a handful of communists on the outer fringe of the New Deal, but to try to paint them as a serious menace is ridiculous.

As a matter of fact, it is a little inconsistent to try to picture President Roosevelt as a would-be dictator in one speech, and in the next blast him because his subordinates quarrel in public. Dictators do not permit their subordinates to quarrel in public.

The rights and liberties of the American people are in far less danger from the little handful of communists on the outer fringe of the New Deal than they are from the rabid isolationists and labor haters who unfortunately occupy positions of much greater influence in Mr. Dewey's campaign.

But domestic issues cannot be separated from international issues. This war is convincing proof that in the shrinking world of today what America does at home has terrific repercussions abroad, and that the solutions reached for international problems will shape and limit our choices here at home.



Furthermore, the American system has proven by its miraculous record in this war that it is stronger than ever despite changes in federal policy and administrative mistakes over the past twelve years. It can and will survive domestic blunders over the next few years, but neither our enterprise system nor our democratic institutions and individual liberties will survive a third world war. Therefore, the foreign policy which the American people choose for their government in the November 7 election becomes all-important.

The one positive, constructive proposal made to prevent future wars is an organization of the United Nations having authority to settle disputes by peaceful procedures, and endowed with power to stop future attempts at aggression by the use of joint military force. Its major purpose will be to stop future aggressions when they start, before they have grown so great that only a world war can stop them. The major principles of such an organization were agreed upon at Dumbarton Oaks and published.

For a time, general statements in favor of such an organization, coming from even such confirmed isolationists as Ham Fish, created an impression that there was no controversy on this issue among political leaders. However, it has now become clear that our joining such an organization will be opposed bitterly. Two main lines of attack have become apparent. They are not new or unexplored, because they are the same major arguments used to kill the League of Nations 25 years ago. And they were used then by men who professed to favor the general principles of the League.

These two lines of attack can be summarized briefly in two of three questions which I suggested that voters ask all candidates for federal office:

1. Will you support the earliest possible formation of the United Nations security organization and United States entry therein before any final peace settlements are made either in Europe or Asia?

2. Should the vote of the United States representative on the United Nations security council commit an agreed upon quota of our military forces to action ordered by the council to maintain peace without requiring further Congressional approval?

Candidates who have thought this issue through and are convinced it can be solved <sup>only</sup> by strong and effective international organization can and will answer both questions with a clearcut affirmative, opposing either delay or hamstringing of the organization's power to use force against future aggressors.

These two vital questions are at the very heart of the problem of preventing future wars. The American people can decide them only if candidates state their positions on them clearly and honestly, not privately to interested individuals, but publicly to the people.

President Roosevelt has met both issues squarely. He wants the United Nations security organization established without delay, before hostilities cease. He wants our representative on it legally endowed with authority to commit an agreed upon quota of our forces to action against an aggressor at the call of the council.

In addition, the Roosevelt Administration, by a long series of actions, has reversed the isolationist foreign policy of the United States. It has established American leadership of the United Nations in fighting this war and in developing a world security organization. It has done this through reciprocal trade agreements, the good neighbor policy, the destroyers-bases trade, lend-lease, selective service, repeal of the arms embargo, the United Nations conferences on food, currency stabilization, relief and rehabilitation, and finally the Dumbarton Oaks conference.

Governor Dewey has said that establishment of the organization should proceed without delay. He has not answered the second vital question. He has spoken for a strong international security organization, but has so worded his commitments that both internationalists and isolationists could find comfort and support in what he said.

Two facts make Dewey's weak commitments on this issue even weaker. One is the record of the majority of Republicans in Congress in opposing these foreign policy and preparedness measures before Pearl Harbor. The other is the fact that a substantial number of Dewey's supporters, including most of those Democrats who oppose Roosevelt, are talking straight isolationist doctrine to the American people. The present leaders of the Republican party are trying to stand on both sides of the foreign policy issue.

While Governor Dewey makes speeches aimed to please the internationalists, his running mate, Governor Bricker, is talking the isolationist-nationalist doctrines of the McCormick-Patterson press. In a press conference recently in St. Paul, Governor Bricker made statements which in effect answered both of the questions quoted a moment ago in the negative. And it is significant that Bricker is the Republican Vice Presidential nominee as a result of a deal made by Dewey at Chicago in order to avoid a contest for the nomination. That deal was hardly the act of a man with strong convictions on this issue. Bricker is a man of integrity and his foreign policy views were isolationist then as they are now.

On the record, President Roosevelt is in a position to receive a clear and tremendously forceful mandate from the American people on this great issue. Dewey's mandate would be confused and weak and his leadership hampered by a serious division among his own supporters.

Nevertheless, there are those who argue that Dewey should be elected because there are many members of Congress, in the Senate particularly, who hate Roosevelt so much they will be against any international proposal he makes, regardless of its merits. That argument is the most serious indictment of American politics yet made. It is not a valid argument for defeat of Roosevelt, but it is a very powerful argument for the defeat of all members of Congress whose decisions are made on the basis of blind partisanship and hate, rather than the merits of the issue and the future welfare of America.

A word about the Democratic nominee for Vice President, Senator Harry Truman of Missouri. I do not like the way he was nominated any better than you do. But I am even more disgusted by the present vicious smear campaign directed against him, largely by the very same groups who a few months ago could not praise highly enough his achievements as chairman of the special Senate Committee to investigate the national defense program, known as the Truman Committee. Truman admits he was supported by a political machine of unsavory reputation, but like the late Alfred E. Smith of New York, Truman has risen above it. I served with him on the Truman Committee for over three years and saw him time and again demonstrate his absolute integrity, his political courage, his ability and finally, his devotion to America before any political or partisan loyalties.

Harry Truman's voting record on foreign policy is 100 percent right. In addition, he participated in the inception of the B2H2 bipartisan foreign policy resolution in February, 1943, and joined bipartisan teams which stumped the country for a strong international organization a year ago.

Let us reject the hate groups and rabid partisanship which is becoming apparent on both sides in this national campaign. We cannot hope to build either a peaceful world or a sound America on the foundation of hate, fear and prejudice.

Our primary responsibility in this election is to eleven million American boys who are fighting and dying to win this war, and to their sons, now alive and yet unborn, who will pay the price of our failure to prevent its recurrence.

President Roosevelt, because of his convictions, his record and the clear mandate he can receive on this great issue from the people, is best qualified to discharge that responsibility.





implementation of other countries  
participation in the peace. I have  
felt that it was essential to America's  
successful participation in world peace that  
the Republican party join in those measures  
and I had <sup>taken pride in</sup> depended much on your leadership  
in the party to bring that about. As I  
have written you before, I have taken great  
pride in observing your rise as a  
pillar in our democracy. Can you now  
exercise that leadership? What is the attitude  
of Senators White, Burton, Ferguson,  
and Congressmen Judd, La Follette, the tall  
Congressmen from Massachusetts, <sup>others who endorse B2 H2,</sup> and new electees  
like Saltonstall & Morse (if they win)?  
If not, who will take over? Will the President <sup>now</sup> implement  
Have you made a basic decision  
of following a different role as your  
part in contributing toward world peace?

I am also concerned as to the  
effect of your actions on your personally,  
particularly with regard to your relationship  
to those <sup>friends</sup> who worked for your election and  
who believed in our view of world policy.  
I will look forward to hearing your

Can we avoid policy differences? If so, what can be done to prevent that? Considerable reputation

analysis of the situation when you took  
your action and your analysis of the  
situation now. If you wish I will then  
write you my view of the steps you should  
now take, for your consideration with due  
regard for ~~the~~ <sup>and delayed</sup> limited ~~of~~ information on  
domestic affairs.

As you know from the press we  
have been extremely busy and the Third  
Fleet has been unusually successful. The Japs  
will never recover from the blow struck <sup>there</sup>  
last 60 days. <sup>Our fleet is re-equipped and</sup> The Pacific outlook is  
bright.



October 5, 1944

Dear Harold,

About a month ago I had the pleasure of attending a meeting of Minn. Insurance Agents. At the banquet the principal speaker was Senator Ball. I had not heard Joe speak in a long time and was quite surprised and pleased over his development as a speaker. He gave a very fine talk which kept the audience of at least a thousand people, spellbound for an hour. I could visualize a great future for him even with all the mistakes he has already made. But his last two errors in speaking out of turn have hurt him severely, together with making it tough, and I mean tough, for any program that might be taken in the future.

I will try and give you a summary of developments in the state since you were here. This I'm doing at the suggestion of the little fellow and with the idea that what I pass on to you is at least my own feeling in this matter.

This campaign is different in many respects than former ones. Party leaders are indifferent, they will not work, they are more interested in making money, the war and other entertainment, rather than politics. Before Saturday, the campaign was moving along smoothly and in accordance with plans. Roy Dunn had taken the reins and was running the show. Still is (which was all right), there was very little effective campaign work accomplished in the state. I would say that if the election were held then the results would be the same as when you were here. The work done so far has been by radio. Roosevelt & Dewey have given a few radio speeches. I don't think they changed many votes. The republicans appointed a finance committee which you have seen in your clippings. You can recognize all the "old guards". Your people were giving the necessary support to convince the people of our cooperation. All in all I would say that everything looked encouraging. It would be a close race in Minnesota with Dewey losing the state. If that came about I know the people in the East would feel that we gave them everything we had and Roy Dunn could be singled out as the leader who lost the state. Up to this point we were in a good position.

About two weeks ago Senator Ball issued a story calling for the defeat of eleven senators who were up for election because they were isolationists. He further stated that they were 8 rep. and 3 Dem. This was a mistake. I don't think he could change the course of any election or defeat of senators in other states. From Roosevelt's purge he should have learned that was the impossible. The Dems played this up a little, but it soon died down. This action of Joe's could have a bad effect in the future.

His statement of Saturday, which you have heard, was a prize. I fear it never will be forgotten. It came out of a clear sky, with repercussions that went all over the nation. Telegrams, letters, resolutions, mail bag letters, editorials and conversation condemning him for his deed. Gov. Thye, Doc. Rad. Roy Dunn and George Jones statements helped to clarify our position. Of course, one hears how this is another of Stassen's fast political



moves to further his own future aims. You would be surprised the number of people who believe this. On the whole they feel you had nothing to do with it. Your supporters who were never sold on Joe are welcoming the opportunity to condemn him. Your supporters who were favorable to him have also turned on him. The effect on the National picture you can well analyze.

I found that two people knew that Joe was going to give out the release. Warren Burger and Les Malkerson. They were in agreement with him. After the heat started Burger had a change of heart and joined in with those who were displeased.

I called on the Gov. and suggested that he write East, reaffirming his stand and that due to Ball's statement we were making a survey of the situation to ascertain the possible harm brought about by Ball's action. The survey would take about 10 or 12 days at which time a complete report would be submitted. He felt this was unnecessary at this time, also the report in the middle of October. He explained the situation was different now as he called Dewey Saturday night and had a long talk with him. He told of your visit back home, how you sat down with Gov. and Mrs. Thye, Senator and Mrs. Ball and asked that every possible effort be made to carry the state for Dewey. He was satisfied and told Ed. he had the highest regard for him and appreciated the work he was doing. Ed. then suggested that perhaps a meeting with Ball might help matters, to this Dewey replied he wanted nothing to do with Ball, that he was just a snake in the grass. I don't know if this last request nullified the first part of the conversation. When I left him I had no assurance that the instruction contained in the Vic Johnston memo would be carried out. I feel it is more necessary that this be done now than before.

Joe talked on the radio last evening reaffirming his position. I'm afraid this issue is about all you will hear and read from now until election. What effect it will have is uncertain. Now it looks like it will make a Dewey a martyr here in Minnesota. Then my prediction is that it will help him. There are so many who hate Roosevelt and they feel Joe's action is helping him. This has aroused them from apathy to a fighting group. You can't realize the effect of Joe's action on individuals who never could be stirred up. I can't relate incidents in detail, but have tried to give you the picture as I see it.

Before Ball's statement the betting in Mpls. was 2½ to 1 on Roosevelt to win the National with \$200,000 up. Dewey was favored in the state to win 6 to 5. Since Ball's statement the odds have changed to even money that Dewey would carry the state. On the national it is still 2½ to 1.

My health is slowly improving and hope that you are well. My best of luck to you and my only wish is that you'll be home soon. Katx sends her best.





# MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



[www.mnhs.org](http://www.mnhs.org)