

This speech is the "answer" of Dies to earlier criticisms by Congressman Tom Eliot. The basis of the speech is a quotation of Eliot in the newspapers as having used the word "lie" in referring to an earlier statement by Dies that he had been prevented from averting the tragedy of Pearl Harbor by the Administration. Dies arose on a question of personal privilege and upon recognition had an hour of time.

Generally, it can be said that the speech constitutes no answer to Eliot's charges or for that matter to any other charges against the Committee. If Dies couldn't qualify as a liar within the dictionary meaning he gives on p. 1979, "uttering of a falsehood, ^{knowing it to be a falsehood,} /for the intention of deceiving" he certainly could at the end of this speech.

It should be noted that the speech consists of clever evasions and subtle misrepresentations in addition to complete and outright and deliberate lies.

1980 Dies didn't take long to show that his speech was going to be one of his rare and extremely competent demagogic performances after a statement of the statement by Eliot by saying: "My purpose in raising the point of personal privilege is more in defense of the dignity of the House of Representatives than in my personal defense, because I have an abiding faith that if the confidence of the American people in the legislative body is undermined by slander and misrepresentation, by untruthful statements that appear in the press from time to time, it will be a great blow to the cause of democracy and the preservation of our form of government."

This theme carries throughout.

- 1) Col. 2: On this page Dies says beginning July 1941 "I issued a number of press releases warning the people about the Japanese situation." It should be noted that in these "press releases" reproduced in the Yellow Book as they appeared in the press, it is clear that if Dies was "warning the people" he was also attacking the Department of Justice and the FBI, because almost every story contains the statement that he is "waiting for them (the FBI) to act", to "clean up the situation" and other similar things. These statements are dated beginning July 5. (It should be noted that while Dies stated on July 5 he was ready to act, much if not most of the material in the Yellow Book not plagiarized from other sources is dated subsequent to July 5.)
- 2) In col. 3 Dies reproduces the letter to him from the then Acting Attorney General, Francis Biddle, described by Dies as "the Attorney General." This letter is dated August 13, 1941.

Biddle says that "according to the press reports "the Dies Committee had "turned over to the Department of Justice" the information described in the press. Commenting on this Biddle says "The records of this Department fail to disclose the receipt of any such evidence as described by you."

This letter and the other correspondence with the Department of Justice is omitted from the Yellow Book except for the letter from Mathew McGuire, exhibit 1, in the Yellow Book.

In this letter Biddle refers to the Dies Statement, "much of the evidence on which his charges were based has come from a

former attache of the Japanese Consulate in Hawaii."

None of the evidence obtained from a person of this description is included in the Yellow Book.

3. In this same letter Biddle states he received a letter from Stripling dated July 29, 1941, "transmitting a telegram which had been received from Messrs. Dunstan, Steedman, of your Los Angeles office" stating "Japanese ships off the California Coast were to be the object of sabotage carried out by Italian agents, the purpose being to precipitate hostilities between the United States and Japan."

There is nothing about this matter in the Yellow Book.

With further reference to the information turned over to the Department of Justice by the Dies Committee, Biddle says of the above that it is "the only information which has been received by this Department on any Bureau thereof."

- 1981 4. Dies includes at this point his reply to Biddle dated August 27, 1941, two weeks after Biddle's letter. Dies said "I did not say that I had turned the information over to your Department, or that I intended to do so." In view of the fact that Dies, almost 6 months later, included these same newspaper accounts in his Yellow Book, there is particular point to his omission of this letter or any other denial of the statements reported in the press.

Also compare this with Dies' speech on the floor of the House on January 28, 1942 (the Pearl Harbor speech).

This very revealing sentence appears in Dies' letter "I assume that with the hundreds of agents which you ~~would~~ have, you would have no difficulties in getting the facts." In effect Dies says

"This is our pie; keep your fingers out of it. To hell with the consequences."

Note ~~that~~ the discussion of this point in Congress 03742, pp. 2118-2129, Congressional Record Vol. 88, No. 48.

- 5) At the bottom of col. 2 Dies again refers to the former attache of the Japanese consulate in Honolulu who was to have/called as a witness.

It seems pertinent to note that while testimony was taken from other witnesses who were to have been called in Washington at hearings on the West Coast and this testimony is reproduced in the Yellow Book, either no such testimony was taken from this person or the Committee left such testimony out of the Yellow Book. In the event it is the latter, the nature of the "testimony" needs no description.

- 6) In col. 3 on this page Dies says "I have also a letter from Secretary Knox, who acted very promptly on the suggestion of our Committee and I shall read that for the sake of the Record. "This is with relation to the Detherage matter and is dated 2-21-42, from Dies to the Secretary saying "It has come to my attention that an individual by the name of George Detherage is now employed on a construction project at the Norfolk, Va. Naval Base." and then Dies says Detherage testified before the Committee and "the Committee has in its possession a large file on Detherage and his activities."

In his reply the Secretary thanks Dies for his offer and says that immediately after receiving information that Detherage was thus employed he took action.

The unquestionable design of Dies here, in view of the language quoted above, is to make it appear that he "exposed"

this Detherage matter. Whereas the truth is that 6 days before his letter to Knox (2-15-42) FM exposed this.

1982 (7) Here Dies says that in speaking to Secretary Hull about the Japanese situation in September 1941 "I told him that the situation was indeed grave."

Just imagine!

Unfortunately Congressmen did not point out the fact that as of the time Dies told Hull what Hull knew from his own experience, if not from newspapers, the United States and Japan were engaged in negotiations, the seriousness of which was known to everyone.

However, note the information about this conference with Secretary Hull given by Congressman Mark Antonio in a radio speech (2-19-42) after conferences with Sumner Wells who consulted State Department files, Hull, and F.D.R.

(8) Dies says "I am not here to criticize the Department of Justice or the Secretary of State." This is a meaningless self serving declaration because that is exactly what Dies does here, in the Yellow Book, and on every opportunity elsewhere.

(9) Here Dies is asked by Eliot "Why has he (Dies) on at least 2 occasions . . . given us and the American people to understand that but for the interference of those Departments with his Committee, Pearl Harbor need not have happened."

Dies says: "Let me answer that directly." He then proceeds to neither answer nor be direct. He evades his direct and unequivocal statements on the previous occasion (1-28-42) by saying "I now regret that I called off the hearings."

1983 Eliot asks "Why and How" the Committee "was prevented from making the facts known last September." Dies says "I think the answer is very

obvious" and then proceeds not to answer the question and to launch into a red baiting attack upon the CIO.

1984 (10) Here Dies says "I must say that if it had not been for our investigation Mr. William Dudley Pelley would not now be in the penitentiary." If anything is a complete lie it is this.

(11) Dies says "Mr. Barker had spent many months making an audit of all of the financial affairs of William Dudley Pelley."

While there is some information in the Record about a few sums of money Pelley obtained, it is a complete lie when Dies says they either audited or obtained all the financial information of Pelley and his organization unless it is true that the Committee deliberately suppressed this information.

(12) With reference to Detherage Dies says: "He and his knights of the White Camelia. . . were exposed by our Committee. We did such a thorough job in that expose that his organization was compelled to go out of existence."

Compare this with the obvious truth as revealed by the Dies Committee record itself, that Detherage had a field day, that he loaded the Record and through it the press with his evil propoganda, that the Committee suppressed its exhibits about Detherage - as indeed it has consistently with exhibits relating to all fascists - and that rather than exposing Detherage it was intimidated and insulted by him. The Record shows that Detherage was in contempt, told the Committee that he was in contempt and then dared the Committee to do anything about it.

What an expose!

Compare this with Dies subsequent statements in this speech.

1985 (13) Col. 1: ¹⁵ Congressman Coffee of Washington asks Dies "Why it was that Father Coughlin's organization had not been investigated."

Dies answers as follows:

Re letters urging such a hearing, "I always suspected that those . . . urging . . . wanted to advertise Father Coughlin." He says also this is true of Winrod, dignified by Dies by calling him a "preacher."

"I took the position that . . . whenever this Committee brought to Washington any preachers or priests ~~ixix~~ and undertook to examine them publicly and permit them to be held in contempt, which would have been the inevitable result, for Father Coughlin had appeared before our Committee, as shrewd a publicist as he is, and had done what others did, and had said 'I refuse to answer any questions'. . . we would have been compelled to . . . cite in contempt."

(1) the truth is Coughlin publicly demanded a hearing; 2) the Record of the Committee as can be seen especially in the cases of Detherage and Smyth, is that fascists are never cited for contempt by Dies regardless of how contemptuous they were; 3) the newspapers of Feb. 20, 1940 reporting Committee discussion and action ~~xxxxxi~~ re Coughlin contain the following:
Noah Mason - Father Coughlin has not been connected with subversive activity;

Dies to hear Coughlin would require a redefinition of the word unAmerican; Dempsey: The Committee didn't want to give Coughlin a sounding board;

4) with reference to Winrod, note that investigator Metcalf was called off of an investigation of Winrod, known as "the Jay hawk nazi", Back in 1938, as revealed by a story in the Nation quoting affidavits in the possession of Birkhead of the Friends of Democracy, showing that a "preacher" named

Hodge in Dies district had arranged for this suppression.

(16) Dies says: "As you will observe in our report (presumably to be made) a great deal of this evidence is an attempt to smear personally the President of the United States. . . This is a time of evidence, consisting of axis propoganda directed at the person of the President, propoganda that has been distributed, millions of pieces all over the country, designed to undermine the confidence of the people and the personal integrity of the Chief Executive. . ."

With reference to this: 1) if this is the genuine feeling of the Committee, why then did it during the hearing at which Pelley testified refuse to allow Congressman Casey and Voorhees to question Pelley about his propoganda of this description, as foul and debased as any such propoganda could be; 2) it is obvious that if and when the Committee prints this data it will be distributing nazi propoganda at government expense and making it available to all native and foreign fascisti under privilege.

True, throughout this speech many dishonest things are done and certainly not by accident. For instance, on pp. 1982-1983, Rankin asked Dies if he did not expose the Tenoka Memorial. Dies replied "That is right." Rankin then says "and it maps out the very program that Japan has followed up to date. Is that correct?" Dies replied "That is correct". Then Rankin: "If the Dies Committee had been permitted to go ahead and make this investigation prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor, is it not entirely probable that it would have uncovered these facts and prevented the Pearl Harbor disaster?" Dies replied "May I answer that by quoting from the speech I made in the House: 'I now regret that I called off the hearings'".

It is obvious that Dies did not expose the T~~an~~ka Memorial.

It is obvious that whether or not he continued to make an "investigation" the T~~an~~ka Memorial in any value or information it might have are not connected and there is nothing in the T~~an~~ka Memorial relating to Pearl Harbor specifically or otherwise.

Note that Dies immediately after the last statements quoted above, changes the subject and takes credit for the ~~presentin~~ freezing of ~~axis~~ funds of axis powers by the President.

With reference to Father Coughlin these are a few immediately available statements:

New York Sun: 2-16-40 - Mason: "I don't think he has been mixed up with these subversive elements."

Washington News: 2-16-40: "They (the Committee) emphasized that the Committee has no evidence that would link Father Coughlin with the subject matter of the inquiry". Also Dies said hearing Coughlin would involve a definition of unAmericanism, whether the Committee should investigate only those "organizations with foreign tie-up" or should inquire into persons preaching 'race hatred.'"