

ROOSEVELT AND HULL!

And a Streamlined Defense Cabinet With
An Admiral as Navy Head and a
General as Secretary of War

(An Editorial)

These are crucial days for the United States.

Defense of America calls for the immediate reorganization of the Cabinet and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Those who believe in the Leader of Leaders, who, as president in 1940-44, must direct this great effort, see a man leading ALL AMERICA--a man operating in spite of, and beyond, all peacetime political party considerations.

This newspaper believes Roosevelt is that Leader.

This newspaper believes Roosevelt will place the best Navy brain in America into the position of Secretary of the Navy. He may be a Democrat, he may be a Republican. But he should be the strongest, most intelligent admiral America has.

The same is true for the position of Secretary of War. Somewhere in the Army machinery is a man who truly knows his business. It may be General George Marshall of Uniontown, in whom we hold implicit trust. It may be some one else. Certainly no political, geographical or party label considerations are now important.

In the legislative field, the House of Representatives--where the money must be found--is now well officered. The House has not blocked the Will of the American People. Chairman May and Chairman Vinson of the Military and Naval committees are strong, patriotic unegotistical leaders.

Senate committees, however, should be carefully scrutinized.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, headed by Senator Pittman and dominated still by eight men who voted against and fought the President and Secretary of State Hull on the neutrality program, is the potential source of weakness in the present supreme effort to make America strong--through a peace offensive to keep the war in Europe and out of the Western Hemisphere.

There is no spiritual unity whatever between Roosevelt and Hull on one side and the controlling group of the committee of the Senate which recommends to all America the way to keep the peace. Yet there must be such unity if we of the United States are to grow strong without waste of time and money.

This newspaper believes that the shifting of Secretary of State Hull into the job of presiding over the Senate of the United States is the answer.

Roosevelt, with a well organized State Department will be--and should be--the deciding voice on Foreign Affairs. He can--and should--give to the Senate the leadership it must have, and the vision it now lacks. That Senate leader should be Hull.

Therefore this newspaper suggests to lead United and Unified America in 1940-44

ROOSEVELT FOR PRESIDENT,

HULL FOR VICE PRESIDENT.

H U L L

In my first editorial in taking charge of this newspaper, I urged you to carry on.

Today, presumptuous and not too old, I say take Hull as Number Two man.

I see the Foreign Relations Committee as the only small vision, out-of-step powerful block to keeping the war over there. I believe Hull above all is your best bet to bring congress into friendly and permanent position. Hull stands before America, beloved next to yourself--next to yourself most respected. His present job may seem irreplaceable, as is yours, but you, the leader of leaders, know better. You know where the bottleneck of traffic toward peace through positiveness will occur.

Little men, twenty of them, seeking authority are dangerous if left in a room alone.

The voice of Hull daily in cloakroom and rostrum is the Senate answer.

Yes, we know--we plain people--that you are tired. We know that you want a young man of your thoughts to lean upon.

But where is the young man who can control these twenty small, aging, jealous Senators? And who in all America, since Garner failed you, can best smooth your path?

Jackson, perhaps; a strong, reasonable, careful man who can't politically function with you because New York can't have both places.

Douglas--fine, virtuous, but with no background, and perhaps too reasonable and already well placed.

And, if not youth, then loyalty, virtue, experience for Senate control.

Rayburn might handle the Senate, but his stature is not that of Hull, any more than is that of Jimmy Byrnes. Both are vital, looking at ^{Barkley} ~~Huck~~; both are pygmies, looking at Hull. With Hull you have a Senate chief in peace or war, knowing you and knowing foreign affairs, speaking with no reservations to you, and speaking with

authority to twenty small men.

Borah is dead, but Johnson is alive. Already, today, the conspiracy of little seantors starts. All Europe waits to see whether you or the Senate has the final word.

A dramatic statement at Chicago that the two most respected Americans in world affairs take post one and post two in American affairs for four years is the simplest answer to the needs ahead. These needs are speed, sureness, accuracy, unity. Even Hitler has these qualities.

The democratic answer is that we Americans also have these qualities, plus virtue, godliness, and a deadly will to defend the peace in love of fellow man.

* * * * *

I believe you see, as leader of leaders, further than any of us. Believing that, I feel you have passed all considerations of youth, health, self to the consideration: Who is the best man to control twenty little men composing the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the Senate floor. Through the Senate halls last week went the name "Jimmy Byrnes". I do not believe in that. For that would merely better Garner, the run-out, better Barkley, the incompetent, but not meet the need. More than a Senator-clerk is needed. A figure, tall, strong, unsmiling when need be, is the need. What do the names Barkley, Byrnes, Garner mean in this world? Why even Borah, Johnson, Pittman mean more. And the Borahs, Johnsons, and Pittmans are what this country must be saved from.

You picked Barkley because this bumbler was a strong fellow and loyal. Failing you by default, the clever, willing, loyal Byrnes comes ahead. But the Senate in the days ahead will not be a log rolling group of ego maniacs. It must be a group of ~~ninety~~ 90 men, controlled by a force of virtue and knowledge sitting there in love of virtue and love of you.

My first editorial in this newspaper asked you to carry on. Today I believe a waiting America knows that you will carry on.

Because you will carry on, you have the right to demand as much from any American at any place, at any time. I believe the best place at this time for Hull is the Senate control. No less figure can control the twenty little egos that you well know may block you—bottleneck the traffic in line for the defense of America.

The events will demand everyone's full reserves every day. You will have no personal time to give to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It is stacked against you in spirit. Only Hull, no other, has the virtue, the knowledge, the respect of fellow senators to whip the little, aging, spleen-charged, self-important brains of members who are certain to oppose you. Only a Hull can over-ride by personal magnetism these who continue in control of the committee.

On a question last week this committee had but two votes for a vigorous peace policy which 90 per cent of the plain people in America had decided for. And we had the spectacle of having a debate going on while you acted—a three week's debate on a simple question of arms to Europe while Europe crumbled.

America declares the continuation of this unthinkable; so, of course, do you. America is declaring that this shall not continue. Please give America and yourself the best you've got to say to Europe that no person other than the President and his brave, intelligent leaders are in power in America. If a lesser name, if a lesser strength goes to the Senate dias, all of us may be irretrievably slowed up while forensic senators babble senilities. Fill Hull's position, because one voice—your voice—is enough. And you really are your own Secretary of Foreign Affairs. Put in Hull's job the man best qualified in your opinion to be President of the United States when you and Hull are through. Party leadership, national safety, rest for both you and Hull demand this.

Certainly not a bumbling Barkley, or a clever Byrnes, or the youngsters of force—a Pepper or a Lee—can take the message to Europe that the Senate is under control. The Senate washroom chooses Byrnes, but I don't believe you are as positive as Byrnes. My belief is that the man who is not going to say yes or no about himself until July 15, is not going to say yes or no about Nel Two place until July 15. There would not be any sense in that. Bumbling Barkley should not be followed by buzzy Byrnes.