

and an impassioned crusader for labor-employer unity and amity in face of the common enemy.

The regenerate Mr. Bridges, probably somewhat to his own astonishment, as well as that of the membership, recently found himself addressing a section meeting of the famous Commonwealth Club of California. And what he said there was even more astonishing than the fact that he said it there.

This was Harry Bridges in a new role—a Harry Bridges who pledged his powerful unions to an unqualified policy of no strikes or work stoppages for "the duration"; a Harry Bridges who promised all-out production and full-cooperation to whip the Axis; a Harry Bridges who declared that "unionism as usual," "business as usual" and "politics as usual" are all equally reprehensible; a Harry Bridges who startled his hearers out of their chairs by praising employers and employer associations for the part they are playing in the battle for democracy.

There will doubtless be considerable skepticism and cynicism in many quarters regarding the sincerity of Harry Bridges' reformation. Mr. Bridges' motives, too, will undoubtedly be called in question, and some will probably come out with the charge that he is more interested in saving the Soviet Union than America. Among some union men, too, there may even be a suspicion that Harry Bridges has "gone over" to the employers. The sudden change over from the role of militant business-baiter and strike boss extraordinary to that of a patriotic crusader for labor-business unity (even if it's just "for the duration") is a shock to the nervous system and as incredible as Bridges himself. But this writer is just a reporter; not a diagnostician of human behavior.

Declares the new Harry Bridges: "Labor's enemy is not management. Its enemy is Hitler and Japan. Only that employer or that representative of management, or union representative for that matter, who is not first of all concerned with the full war effort and victory is the contemporary enemy of us all."

Says this new, regenerate Mr. Bridges: "It has been my experience in dealings with management in recent months that employers who put profits and special privileges first are in the minority and are not truly representative of American industry." And again: "After this war is over, we'll still have our differences, we may still have our fights. But isn't it just this opportunity that we are really fighting for?" More startling still, if you remember the Bridges of other days, is this unqualified pronouncement: "Now, at this time, more than ever before, employer associations are of extreme value and a real need to help win the war."

Believe it or not, that's the new Harry Bridges—the most interesting political phenomenon of this changing world. Motives? We wouldn't know about that. But Harry Bridges answers: "We ask but one question: 'Are you willing to work with us in every possible way to defeat Hitler and the Axis?'"

### In Memoriam—Patrick J. Boland

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1942

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have lost a real friend and the country has

lost a loyal, patriotic, intelligent, and industrious Representative.

Through the years I knew him he increased in my personal esteem and admiration. I shall ever remember his amiability and good will. His kindness shone like a glowing star in the firmament.

His loss is a severe blow to all of us. My sympathy and condolences go forth to his dear wife and loved ones.

I am reminded of the words that Washington sent to the Portuguese synagogues at Newport. Washington said that he rejoiced that now in this fair land of ours all could "sit under his own vine and fig tree and there shall be none to make him afraid."

PAT BOLAND always fought for that Washington principle. He wanted "none to be afraid," afraid of intolerance, racial, and religious discrimination, oppression, economic and military cruelty. He stood four square for the great freedoms of our Nation—freedom of speech, press, religions, and opportunity. He ever fought for the greatest good for the greatest number. He sought always to help those who could not fend for themselves.

We bid him hail and farewell.

### Quit Shoving

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1942

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the New Republic, which published, for the organization which assumes the name of Union for Democratic Action, a demand for the defeat at the polls—the political execution—of 3 Senators, 26 Representatives, whose records it purported to give, and 16 other Senators and 43 other Representatives, is not only looking for trouble—and plenty of it—but follows the Hitler line of seeking to divide and conquer.

The scurrilous, lying attack, as published in the May 18 issue of New Republic, follows the method of personal abuse, vilification and charges of disloyalty pursued by a certain class of publication and organization which has adopted a "rule or ruin" policy.

The heirs of some of those who accumulated millions because the principles of free enterprise were established and maintained here in America are now spending a portion of those millions to subsidize publications here in the United States, which, because of their attacks on loyal Americans, may well give Hitler, Hirohito, and Mussolini the impression that our people are not united in the effort to defeat them.

These publications advocate, in modified form, the domestic political procedure of Joe Stalin and Adolf Hitler. Those two former friends—now enemies—caused their political opponents to be

executed; that is, shot, beheaded, or hung, although sometimes Stalin, according to reliable reports, sent them to Siberia to starve.

The eminent gentlemen who are behind this attack upon the people's representatives forget the Boston Tea Party, Valley Forge, and the 8 long years of strife which established our Republic. They ignore the War of 1812 and the purpose for which it was fought. They have no recollection of the War Between the States, of Bull Run, of Shiloh, of Vicksburg, and of Gettysburg, of Cold Harbor, of Appomattox.

They seem to think that the spirit of Americanism is dead. They seem to feel and they act as though Americans of the present day could be pushed around by a lot of trade-mad, title-loving worshippers of foreign philosophies and titled leaders. To them, we must have world trade, even though we pay in blood, in suffering, and sacrifice the lives of millions of Americans, to fill with gold the coffers of those who seem to care naught what be the cost, so long as our merchant princes may sell abroad.

Some of those who prior to Pearl Harbor, who before December 7, were yelling and were shouting for the sending of American expeditionary forces throughout the world, even though they knew, or should have known—had they possessed the slightest atom of intelligence—that we were unprepared for such a venture, forget, or have the effrontery to ignore the fact—and it is a fact—that, following their course, our men—thousands of them—died at Bataan and in the Philippines; other thousands were taken prisoner and are now in the prison camps of the Japs.

They ignore the fact that they are the ones who followed a course of aggression and that, because of their political philosophy, our men are now suffering imprisonment; others died lacking food, medicinal supplies, and the support of their comrades who could not reach them.

Do we hear them reply that we, termed "isolationists," are at fault? The answer to that charge is found in the words of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, printed under date of March 18, 1942, on page A1175 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Speaker then said:

Congress is being criticized, but Congress has given the President every law and every dollar he has asked for defense purposes.

The isolationists advocated walking softly and carrying a big stick. Isolationists opposed a policy of irritating and aggravating other nations while unprepared to meet the consequences. Isolationists believed and contended that our Nation should be first armed here at home, prepared to defend itself against any enemy or combination of enemies.

I believe that America should first be prepared to defend itself. The soundness of that policy has since been demonstrated by the losses which we have suffered in the Philippines; in the Southwest Pacific. Proof of the advisability of an adequate defense here at home is brought home to us day after day when ships are sunk in the mouth of the Mississippi, all along the Atlantic coast-



line, from the Mississippi to and in the St. Lawrence River.

No one finds fault with, or questions, the valor, the courage, the determination, the skill of our fighting men, our armed forces.

Isolationists are willing to forget the mistakes, the conceit, the self-assurance—yes, the motives—of those who, before Pearl Harbor, who before December 7, were propagandists for war, provided those gentlemen will quit shoving around challenging the loyalty and the patriotism of the people's representatives and of the people themselves who sent us here.

If those arrogant, egotistical mouth-pieces of the money-changers, who spread falsehoods, vilification, from their swivel chairs; who challenge the patriotism of the millions of voters who sent 69 Representatives to Congress, think they can shove, think they can gag, intimidate, cause the political execution of, 91 Members of Congress, then indeed will their ignorance and their arrogance destroy them. Then indeed, if they follow that course, will Hitler, Hirohito, and Mussolini have cause to rejoice because of the disunity which they create.

Let them beware. Let them remember that the spirit of the Revolutionary fathers is not dead; that the sacrifices which have maintained this a Nation were not made in vain and that we, sons of the soil, children of the founding fathers, do not propose to be either intimidated or have our patriotic efforts thwarted by title-worshiping, nobility-minded, self-anointed Delilah hairclippers, who, consciously or otherwise, furnish propaganda for Hitler.

What the Department of State thinks of the Union for Democratic Action is shown by a newspaper article printed herewith and marked "Exhibit A," which appeared in a Washington paper on May 16.

Two articles from yesterday's press, one by Arthur Sears Henning, marked "Exhibit B"; the other by John O'Donnell, marked "Exhibit C," show the depth to which some propagandists have sunk in their attacks on the patriotism, not only of the people's representatives, but of the people themselves, who sent those individuals to Congress; who have renominated some of them for public office and who will undoubtedly reelect the overwhelming majority to the next Congress.

#### EXHIBIT A

COMMUNIST FRONT UNION SEEKS CONGRESSIONAL PURGE—OUSTER OF 29 MEMBERS IN NOVEMBER OBJECT OF DEMOCRATIC ACTION GROUP

(By Chesly Manly)

A special supplement of the left wing magazine New Republic, just published, announced the undertaking of the so-called Union for Democratic Action to purge 3 Senators and 26 Representatives in the congressional elections this year.

Inquiry disclosed yesterday the State Department has a dossier on the Union for Democratic Action which it keeps in its officially denominated "Communist activities file."

#### COMMUNIST FRONT MEMBERS

The Dies Committee on un-American Activities also has extensive records concerning the organizers and members of the Union for Democratic Action, as well as their member-

ships in hundreds of other Communist front organizations.

Senators on the Union for Democratic Action purge list are WAYLAND BROOKS, Republican, of Illinois; ARTHUR CAPPER, Republican, of Kansas; and W. LEE O'DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas.

The Representatives are HAMILTON FISH, Republican, of New York; STEPHEN A. DAY, Republican, of Illinois; CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Republican, of Michigan; PAUL SHAFER, Republican, of Michigan; HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia; MARTIN DIES, Democrat, of Texas; WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON, Republican, of Kansas; HAROLD KNUTSON, Republican, of Minnesota; EUGENE E. COX, Democrat, of Georgia; WILLIAM B. BARRY, Democrat, of New York; FRANK KEEFE, Republican, of Wisconsin; LELAND FORD, Republican, of California; CHARLES FADDIS, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois; DEWEY SHORT, Republican, of Missouri; JOSHUA L. JOHNS, Republican, of Wisconsin; MARTIN SWEENEY, Democrat, of Ohio; JOHN RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi; KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota; JAMES VAN ZANDT, Republican, of Pennsylvania; JOSEPH STARNES, Democrat, of Alabama; THOMAS WINTER, Republican, of Massachusetts; HARRY COFFEY, Democrat, of Nebraska; J. PARNELL THOMAS, Republican, of New Jersey; JAMES F. O'CONNOR, Democrat, of Montana, and FREDERICK SMITH, Republican, of Ohio.

#### BUT NOT MARCANTONIO

Most of these Members were leading non-interventionists before Pearl Harbor, but not all of them. Representatives DIES, STARNES, SMITH of Virginia, and COX, for example, consistently supported the administration's war policies before Pearl Harbor. But they are outstanding foes of communism.

Representative VITO MARCANTONIO (American-Labor), of New York, who has been characterized by former Postmaster General James A. Farley as the only Communist Member of Congress, is not on the Union for Democratic Action purge list. During the period of the Hitler-Stalin alliance from August 1939 to June 1941, MARCANTONIO consistently opposed the administration's war policy measures and even voted against some of the most important authorizations and appropriations for our own Army and Navy. But he is a patriot for the Union for Democratic Action.

The New Republic purge issue violently attacks the Chicago Tribune, accusing it of treachery. The Senators and Representatives on the purge list are termed "obstructionists." The magazine disclaims any intention of implying that they alone were obstructionists or that others should be forgiven. "In the House, perhaps the most dangerous man of all, since he is one of the most powerful, is JOSEPH MARTIN, Republican leader," the article states.

#### BROOKS UNDER ATTACK

The magazine makes the flat charge that Senator Brooks "has found real buddies among the Ku Klux Klanners. On August 27, 1940, at Rockford, Ill., Senator BROOKS spoke to 60,000 Klansmen and stamped this hate-renascence party with the prestige of his high office."

"Of course, this is a contemptible smear," said Senator BROOKS. "I spoke on that day to approximately 100,000 persons attending the annual Trask Ridge picnic, which is the oldest and largest farmers' picnic in the Middle West. The speech was broadcast nationally and recorded for the newsreels."

Kenneth G. Crawford, Washington correspondent of Marshall Field's PM in New York, is a member of the executive committee of the Union for Democratic Action. PM has been described on the floor of the House as the uptown edition of the Daily Worker.

#### AMLIE CAPITAL AGENT

Former Representative Thomas R. Amlie, of Wisconsin, is the director of Union for

Democratic Action's Washington bureau. After Amlie had been repudiated by the Progressive Party in 1938, President Roosevelt nominated him for the Interstate Commerce Commission but was forced to withdraw the nomination to prevent certain rejection by the Senate. Members of the Interstate Commerce Committee said they could not stomach his program of revolution.

Officers of the Union for Democratic Action, all well-known fellow travelers of the Communists, are: Frank Kingdon, president; Reinhold Niebuhr, chairman; Robert Bendiner, John L. Childs, and Franz Daniel, vice chairmen; Freda Kirchwey, treasurer; Murray Cross, secretary, and James Loeb, Jr., executive secretary.

Miss Kirchwey, or Mrs. Evans Clark, is editor of The Nation, another proletarian organ which closely follows the Communist Party line. As long ago as 1927 she was listed as a member of the executive board and one of the owners of the New Masses, an official organ of the Communist Party, in its own statement.

#### STATE DEPARTMENT'S VIEW

The following account of the Union for Democratic Action is contained in the files of the State Department:

"The Union for Democratic Action, despite its name, is an aggregation of persons whose chief claim to public attention is their long record of affiliation with the front organizations of the Communist Party.

"Even more sinister than the past records of the union's members is the objective of the group. That objective may be summarized briefly as the utilization of America's war crisis for the purpose of effecting what the union believes to be a program of social gains. Translated into stark realism, the union's idea of social gains is in the entrenchment of the proponents of class struggle even more deeply into American life.

"The case against the Union for Democratic Action may be stated in brief by calling attention to the fact that its outstanding leaders have long records of affiliation with the numerous front organizations of the Communist Party.

#### EIGHT TYPICAL "TRAVELERS"

"To cite only a few of these individuals, the following may be named: Reinhold Niebuhr, Freda Kirchwey, John L. Childs, Frank Kingdon, A. Philip Randolph, Herman F. Reissig, Margaret Forsyth, and Morris Schappner. These eight individuals, who are typical of the entire membership of the Union for Democratic Action, have had at least 192 affiliations with Communist front organizations. The affiliations with Communist fronts of all the members of the union would represent a grand total of several thousand.

"Glancing at the list of Communist fronts in which the foregoing eight individuals have been active as leaders, we find the following: American League Against War and Fascism, American League for Peace and Democracy, American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, American Student Union, American Youth Congress, National Negro Congress, the New Masses, the Communist Party, and the League of American Writers.

#### EXHIBIT B

POLITICAL PURGE TEST DUE IN PENNSYLVANIA TOMORROW—ADMINISTRATION SEEKS DEFEAT OF MEN IN CONGRESS WHO FOUGHT ITS PRE-WAR POLICY

(By Arthur Sears Henning)

The outstanding current political development is the activity of the alliance between the Roosevelt administration and the Communists and other left-wing groups to purge



Congress of pre-war noninterventionists and right-wingers.

The first move came from the President's political mouthpiece, Charles Michelson, who called for the defeat in the congressional election this year of all noninterventionist Senators and Representatives, to whose opposition to Roosevelt foreign policy he attributed the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

#### 29 ARE TARGETS

Then came the pronouncement of the Union for Democratic Action, affiliated with Communist front organizations and with the left-wing New Republic and the Henry Luce Time-Life-Fortune and Marshall Field publications. This combination called for the political liquidation of 3 Senators and 26 Representatives seeking reelection, either because they opposed the Roosevelt intervention policy or incurred the displeasure of the Communists and other left-wingers on social and economic legislation. Sixteen other Senators and 43 other Representatives were also denounced for noninterventionist votes and speeches.

Although the Communists, up to June 1941, when Hitler declared war on Soviet Russia, bitterly opposed intervention in what they termed an "imperialist war" they have now enlisted in the administration undertaking to purge the pre-war opponents of Mr. Roosevelt's intervention policy.

#### BROWDER'S RELEASE

While working up this political alliance with the administration, the Communists and other left-wingers asked Mr. Roosevelt to release from prison Earl Browder, head of the Communist Party, who was serving a 4-year sentence for passport falsification. They were finally rewarded Saturday when Mr. Roosevelt commuted Browder's sentence to the 14 months he has served.

The purge of noninterventionists is one of the most extraordinary movements in our political history. What it aims to accomplish is the repudiation of pre-war noninterventionist Senators and Representatives by their constituents who at the time gave ample evidence of overwhelming support of the attitude of their public servants in Congress. To compass their repudiation now by their constituents who supported them at that time would constitute an unparalleled achievement in swaying public opinion.

#### PREVIOUS PURGE THWARTED

The President's previous experience in attempting to purge Congress of his opponents was disastrous. In the 1938 congressional primary elections Mr. Roosevelt sought the defeat of nearly a score of Democratic Senators and Representatives who had refused to follow his leadership of various measures. Every Senator blacklisted was renominated and every Representative save one—John J. O'Connor, of New York.

Announcement of the purge already has caused the President to be accused of creating the disunity he professes to abhor. The blacklisted pre-war noninterventionist Senators and Representatives to a man yield naught to the pre-war interventionists in support of all measures to win this war, however long it may last, however much it may cost. There is every evidence that with the exception of a negligible lunatic fringe of disloyalists and crackpots, the people are united as never before in the determination to fight to victory.

Why the President should seek to stir up the old controversy between interventionists and noninterventionists that was buried at Pearl Harbor is a question on which there is no end of speculation in political circles. One theory is that he is still seeking an alibi for Pearl Harbor, the greatest military disaster in our history. If he could influence the people to repudiate the noninterventionists in line with the Michelson imputa-

tion to them of blame for Pearl Harbor he would have reason to feel vindicated and absolved from blame himself.

#### PENNSYLVANIA TEST TOMORROW

"In this critical hour," said Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, Republican, of Minnesota, one of the blacklisted noninterventionists, "there should be no politics, as the need for unity is paramount. If the New Dealers and left-wingers embark on this campaign, as is reported, to purge those who were against intervention before Pearl Harbor it will be regarded as a confession that the New Dealers view the fall elections with the gravest apprehension."

The first test of the purge will occur in the Pennsylvania primary tomorrow. The 15 Republican Representatives from that State were strongly noninterventionist and also ran afoul of the left-wingers on legislation on domestic issues. Defeat of all of them either in the primary or the general election is sought by the administration while the left-wing group singles out Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT as particularly deserving liquidation.

Also dishonorably mentioned are Representatives J. W. DITTER and R. F. RICH. The latter, however, is not a candidate for reelection. Representative C. I. FADDIS, Democrat, was marked for the purge for opposition to the left-wingers on domestic issues.

#### NEW DEAL DEFEATS SO FAR

In the Oregon primary last Friday J. W. MOTT, Republican, listed by the left-wing group for liquidation, was overwhelmingly renominated. So were Senator CHARLES L. McNARY, Republican, who was dishonorably mentioned, and HOMER D. ANGELL, Republican, a noninterventionist not mentioned by the left wingers. On the other hand, Representative WALTER M. PIERCE, Democrat, with an interventionist record and one acceptable to the left wingers on domestic issues, may have been beaten.

KARL MUNDR, Republican, of South Dakota, for whose defeat the purgers call most emphatically because of his noninterventionist record, was overwhelmingly renominated in the recent primary in his State. Representative FRANCIS CASE, Republican, of South Dakota, with a similar record, who was not mentioned by the left-wing combine, also was renominated.

Representatives LOUIS LUDLOW, Democrat, and F. A. HARNES, Republican, dishonorably mentioned as noninterventionists by the purgers were renominated in the Indiana primary. The only Member beaten was WILLIAM T. SCHULTE, a Democratic interventionist.

One of the three Senators on the purge list is WAYLAND BROOKS, Republican, of Illinois, who was renominated by a landslide. The purgers also called for the liquidation of Representatives STEPHEN DAY, EVERETT DIRKSEN, CHARLES S. DEWEY, and JESSIE SUMNER, other Illinois Republicans condemned by the left-wing group for opposing the President's foreign policy before Pearl Harbor. All were overwhelmingly renominated.

#### EXHIBIT C

#### CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

The Senate of the United States goes into action this week to meet the filthiest attack made in the history of the Republic against a fellow Member.

For a fortnight, this Capital has seethed with whispered gossip of sex perversion—ugly gossip which thrust directly at a veteran Senator who offended the Roosevelt administration because of his noninterventionist stand before Pearl Harbor.

An afternoon newspaper in New York City flatly accused the Senator of frequenting a house of degradation in Brooklyn. Last night the Capital received word that the Fed-

eral Bureau of Investigation has proved the falsity of the charges. The individuals who signed affidavits accusing the Senator—affidavits later published by political opponents—have recanted and admitted the falsity of their charges.

Last night the Senator was speeding back to the Capital from his home State. Today or Tuesday the Senate will receive from its assailed Member a resolution which will call for a Senate investigation of all the circumstances surrounding the charges.

Specifically, the resolution will demand the production of all Department of Justice reports—reports which Washington has been told will destroy the published charges that the assailed Senator frequented a Brooklyn gathering place of degenerates, described as a hang-out of suspected Axis agents.

Also to be demanded in the investigation will be the identity and motives of individuals who put pressure on the makers of the false affidavits, the names of those who reported the story to the White House, and those who printed and broadcast the scandal in New York. A telephone check last night indicated that the Senate resolution will pass unanimously.

Within the last week it has dawned on those Members of Congress who do not bask in the sunshine of a Roosevelt benediction, that some very expensive publicity, bankrolled by the Treasury, is going to be turned against them in this fall's elections. Hence, the care with which they are pondering that \$600,000 pay roll of Archibald (sock 'em with a sonnet) MacLeish and his Office of Facts and Figures.

Warily they are scrutinizing the 20 "generals" of the MacLeish fusiliers who are now pulling down \$8,000 a year, and the same number of "brigadier generals" who struggle along on a mere \$6,500 as they sweat and bleed to win what Poet MacLeish grimly terms the "battle of American opinion."

The one-third of the Senate and the entire membership of the House whose political lives are at stake next November have learned that MacLeish's Office of Facts and Figures is to be the propaganda arsenal for Roosevelt administration candidates in the forthcoming campaign. And they also know that the MacLeish experts in psychological warfare on the domestic front already have planned their publicity strategy on the fundamental assumption that between now and election day the phrase "Roosevelt administration" must become identical in the minds of voters with the words "Government of the United States of America."

The Department of Justice has not yet gone along with the battle orders issued by the MacLeish fusiliers. At a recent press conference, Attorney General Biddle said that he agreed with the Civil War dictum of Abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison that a citizen of the Republic, even in wartime, could "be 100 percent loyal to the Government of the United States and 100 percent opposed to the individuals who happened to be administering that Government."

Congress, through Senator HARRY BYRD'S (Democrat), of Virginia, Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures and MILLARD TYDINGS' (Democrat), of Maryland, Committee on Economy, is now going over the pay roll of the weirdly assorted group of ex-foreign correspondents, New Deal press agents, fiction writers, playwrights, Rhodes scholars, and "war before Pearl Harbor" propagandists.

Hitherto, the MacLeish outfit has been coy and demure when the hard-boiled question of its pay roll was brought up. The general idea delicately insinuated by Office of Facts and Figures but treated with much irreverent scoffing by the common or garden variety of Washington reporters, has been that these literary patriots, at great personal sacrifice and with heart-wrung regrets,



had reached a decision that they would be of more value behind a typewriter in the capital than in uniform on a battle front and come what may to their bankroll they were determined to give all. When reporters tried to talk cold turkey about the pay check they found that the Office of Facts and Figures gave out few facts and less figures. But now the boys are being forced to loosen up, thanks to pressure from the Hill.

To the congressional investigators, it appears that the boys who were willing to give all for the war effort were not particularly shy when it came to getting both feet into the Treasury trough and gulping down a monthly pay check. In fact, the boys are doing much better in Office of Facts and Figures than if they were in the Army.

MacLeish drags down his \$10,000 a year as Librarian of Congress and is not on the Office of Facts and Figures pay roll—a pay roll which is financed by Roosevelt's blank-check appropriations without accountability to the Congress. Of the 267 individuals who make up the MacLeish Fusiliers, 1 out of every 15 hits the jackpot for \$8,000 and 1 out of every 5 gets \$4,600 or more. No other Federal outfit pays on this scale.

The congressional investigators also turned up the interesting fact that with the national elections coming along Office of Facts and Figures has transferred a cool \$97,864 to finance "polls of public opinion" by the Surveys Division of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. This outfit—salaries to its workers are in addition to the \$600,000 Office of Facts and Figures pay roll—will be, according to Office of Facts and Figures, "able to probe deeper into people's attitudes and the reasons for them." In setting up this machinery, MacLeish has ignored the early war experience of the British. Under Alfred Duff Cooper, the British Ministry of Information embarked on a similar program which was promptly dropped when its poll takers were labeled "Cooper's Snooper" and faced public derision and hostility.

This bureau, headed by \$8,000-a-year "Gen." R. Keith Kane, Oxford graduate and Wall Street lawyer, is seeking, according to Office of Facts and Figures, the answer to these questions:

"What does the public know? What has it been told? In what context has the information reached the public?"

In view of the fact that Office of Facts and Figures was created last October by the President with the direct orders "to facilitate a widespread and accurate understanding of the national war effort and the national war policies and activities of the Government," it would seem that all "General" Kane had to do was to reread the Office of Facts and Figures hand-outs.

The "generals" of the MacLeish Fusiliers—those who get the \$8,000 base pay of a general officer in the Army—are an interesting and colorful group. They include:

Ulric Bell, ex-Washington correspondent for the Louisville Courier-Journal when it was under the control of the late United States Ambassador to England, Bingham. Bell later functioned as the spark plug of the William Allen White Committee and Fight for Freedom, Inc.

Allen Grover, former vice president of Time, Inc.

Edgar Ansel Mowrer, ex-foreign correspondent for Secretary of the Navy Knox's Chicago Daily News.

Cornelius Du Bois, former advertising research director for the Henry Luce publications—Time, Life, and Fortune.

William Bennett Lewis, ex of Columbia Broadcasting.

John Herrick, ex-Washington correspondent of the Chicago Tribune.

Raymond Thomas Rich, press agent and fund raiser.

Charles G. Poore, ex-newspaperman.

Henry F. Pringle, ex-newspaperman.

Leo C. Rosten, University of Chicago prodigy, whose Ph.D. thesis on salaries of Washington correspondents persuaded its author that Office of Facts and Figures' \$8,000 was more than he could get from a newspaper.

Among the boys who are struggling along on what the Nation pays an Army colonel or a Navy captain are ex-columnist Alan Barth; Oxford graduate S. Shepard Jones, director of the World Peace Foundation; Clyde A. Beals, ex-editor of the Guild Reporter; Philip Henry Cohen, ex-director of New York radio activities for the Federal Office of Education; Thomas D. Mabry, ex-executive director of New York City's museum of modern art; express agent Clyde W. Vandenburg and George A. Barnes; and ex-speech writer for Department of Agriculture big-wigs John R. Fleming.

In all honesty it must be reported that the MacLeish Fusiliers and other Government press agents of military age have been very brave when it came to facing the publication of their salaries. Even more, when a hard-hearted selective service board back home rejected a formal plea that a Government press agent be exempted because his work was "essential to the war effort," the boys just gulped and took it without a too public whimper.

But best of all, we like the way the boys have taken the ribbing from ex-colleagues. That rowdy, bawdy, quick-step of World War I has been cleaned up—just a bit—in honor of the MacLeish Fusiliers. And so you hear, o' nights when the boys are gathered in song:

"Oh, we'd rather write than fight,

"For we'll win this war in type!

"Boost the pay-checks for the MacLeish Fusiliers."

Mr. Speaker, asking for my political execution the New Republic, a publication communistic in its views and tendencies, writes:

For the past few weeks HOFFMAN has been busily occupied before a grand jury trying to explain away the 145,000 copies of his inflammatory speech, Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes, which were distributed by William Kullgren, editor of the pro-Nazi Beacon Light, under HOFFMAN's frank.

In the foregoing sentence, there are three charges. The first is that, for the past few weeks, I have been busily occupied before a grand jury. That is a falsehood, for 10 minutes would have given the grand jury all the information I had it either needed or wanted about the speech Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes, a copy of which, by the way, you can get by dropping me a postal.

Second, no attempt whatever was made to explain away the 145,000 copies of this speech, which either have been, or will be, sent out. It needs no explanation.

The charge that those speeches were distributed by William Kullgren, "under HOFFMAN's frank," is not true. I do not know Kullgren. He had no authority to use, he did not use, HOFFMAN's frank to distribute either that speech or anything else.

When the New Republic and Union for Democratic Action question the loyalty of 91 Members of Congress, they but brand themselves as enemies of our Republic, join the ranks of those whose sayings and doings give comfort to Hitler.

War propagandists on the public pay roll, or who are now spending a portion of the money accumulated by rugged individualists through free enterprise,

whose sayings and whose doings tend to create disunity, should remember that there are hundreds—yes, millions—of Americans, who do not as yet take either orders or opinions from those who believe not in the government of the forefathers; who prefer the doctrine of the Communists; who deny the existence of a Deity, the efficacy of Christianity.

## Why Ration Gasoline in Middle West?

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1942

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I have previously pointed out that there is no need for gasoline rationing in the Middle West and that any effort to do so will not only be injurious to the morale and the fine spirit of cooperation shown by the people of that part of the country, but will be definitely harmful to our war effort and defense production.

The following editorial from a recent issue of the Kansas City Times summarizes in a very effective way some of the reasons why there should be no imposition of gasoline rationing in the Middle West at this time:

#### WHY RATION GAS HERE?

Now comes the threat to extend the gasoline rationing order beyond the Atlantic seaboard to the Middle West.

Obviously the release of information that the War Production Board has such a proposal under consideration is a "feeler" to find what the reactions of the Midwest will be. If so, the reactions should be prompt and outspoken, for if ever a government scheme was without logic or valid reason, this is it.

The occasion for gasoline rationing on the Atlantic seaboard is understood by the Nation, although there may still be some doubt that the conditions are as serious as have been implied. For example, the last issue of the Oil and Gas Journal states that even if all tanker deliveries to the east coast are stopped, the supply of gasoline for motorists will average 5.5 gallons per car per week for the next 5 months.

Remember that tanker deliveries have not ceased—at present tankers are delivering an average of more than 500,000 barrels of petroleum products a day. Even so there is a conceivable emergency. Ultimate contingencies should be provided for. Since essential users should get more than nonessential users, the present proposal of limiting gasoline to less than 3 gallons a week per user is probably in the line of safety and judgment.

But the shortage in the East, as understood by the entire Nation, is due to a local condition of transportation. There is no national shortage of gasoline supply. There is no shortage of national gasoline manufacturing facilities. There is no shortage of petroleum production.

Why, then, extend rationing to the Middle West, where not only there is no need for it but where such rationing actually would seem to be contrary to the national policy?

Arguments in favor of such a drastic rationing are flimsy. One is that rubber should be conserved in the Middle West. It already has been conserved up to the limit by tire rationing. Another is a minor Government