

TOM CONNALLY, TEX., CHAIRMAN
WALTER F. GEORGE, GA.
ROBERT F. WAGNER, N. Y.
ELBERT D. THOMAS, UTAH
FREDERICK VAN NUYS, IND.
JAMES E. MURRAY, MONT.
CLAUDE PEPPER, FLA.
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, R. I.
ALBEN W. BARKLEY, KY.
ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, N. C.
JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, PA.
GUY M. GILLETTE, IOWA
BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, MO.
CARTER GLASS, VA.
JAMES M. TUNNELL, DEL.

HIRAM W. JOHNSON, CALIF.
ARTHUR CAPPER, KANS.
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., WIS.
ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, MICH.
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR., MAINE
HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, MINN.
GERALD P. NYE, N. DAK.
JAMES J. DAVIS, PA.

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

January 24, 1944

ROBERT V. SHIRLEY, CLERK

Hon. C.E. Marsh
Culpeper
Virginia

Dear Charles:

By way of explanation in spite of it not being needed between us, I got into such a jam when I got back to the office after seeing you that I did not have a chance to do anything on the matter we discussed before catching a seven o'clock train.

In Florida I attended and spoke at a luncheon where at least fifteen thousand workers were present, with local radio, a buffet supper for the bigger shots, a dance in the large auditorium for the workers where I made a little talk to them and spent my evening jitterbugging a little with the girls in attendance, attended and addressed a State Townsend convention, attended and addressed the State Democratic Executive Committee meeting in Jacksonville, and then with local radio addressed a large crowd of ladies, with a sprinkling of officials and men guests, constituting the Juvenile Protective Association of Jacksonville.

At the Executive Committee meeting all three of my opponents were introduced and two of them made very short and dignified announcements of their candidacy. This was immediately after my address which related only to what the party had accomplished in the Nation's history and what its principles were. One of my opponents, Mr. Conklin, immediately upon being introduced started a personal attack upon me, that my speech was nothing but pulling the wool over the eyes of the audience, etc. Immediately a point of order was made and sustained by the Chair, with considerable applause from the audience. The candidate resumed his attack, was called to order a second time by a member and ordered to desist by the Chair, with hearty applause from the audience.

At the Committee meeting I kept the Committee from providing for a preferential primary which would have had the effect of Florida approving Byrd without the President's name being on

the ticket in May; got a unit rule adopted so that two-thirds of the Florida delegation at the convention would bind the whole delegation, and got them to cut out half and quarter votes and to provide that each delegate should have one vote.

I have my former secretary, Mr. Johnson, who has run all my campaigns in the past, back here now devoting himself exclusively to the campaign organization. We are just beginning to get set up and prepared to get out a lot of letters. I shall shortly want to confer with you about the campaign.

I enclose herewith a few copies of my New York Times article. The Orlando Morning Sentinel of December twenty-third carried an excellent editorial with my photograph on this New York Times article. I had thought about asking Martin to consider whether considerations of space would allow a reprint of the New York Times article. I do not want to ask that due to the length of it, in view of this splendid editorial which the paper has carried, unless you thought well of the idea. I thought if we could get this carried around in some of our Southern papers, it would do that much good.

I am writing Lyndon Johnson, according to copy of letter enclosed herewith, now so that he will get a chance to see this resolution and article, and we can talk about the matter further when we meet with you shortly.

Let me take this occasion, Charles, since it is still near the beginning of the year, to tell you how grateful I am for your friendship and the immeasurable aid which you have given me since I have known you. I could not have had a more faithful and unselfish friend than you have been, and I am profoundly indebted to you.

I told the Vice President upon my return that I wanted to congratulate him for bringing the South back in the union with his recent speech here before the Southern Governors. In spite of the fact that he only had five minutes and no radio, didn't he make a magnificent impression with his speech to the Jackson Day dinner.

As always

Your friend,



P:C

COPY

January 24, 1944

Hon. Lyndon Johnson
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

Dear Lyndon:

I was having a pleasant luncheon the other day with Charles Marsh and we agreed that you would be the man to introduce in the House a companion resolution to the one I introduced in the Senate changing the rule relative to the ratification of treaties. I enclose a couple of copies of my resolution herewith.

Pat Cannon of Florida has a similar resolution, but mine is distinguishable from his because mine provides against filibuster. Cannon does not like me so I want to advise you of this fact. If you felt that you could do so, I would certainly like to see you introduce this resolution, or another resolution, if you thought some other language preferable, in the House and then lets get together about a campaign, first, to put it through the House, and then to take the fight to the country in an effort to get the legislatures of the several states to propose to the Congress a Constitutional convention which could propose such an amendment to the Constitution.

This is just a preliminary letter so that we may have the ground work for a discussion with Charles about this matter shortly.

It has been too long since I have seen you anyway.

Best wishes for the New Year and

Sincerely yours,

P:C
Enclosures

1 to make treaties, provided a majority of the Members of
2 each house present concur.

3 "Either the Senate or the House, by a majority vote
4 without debate, may fix the time for any vote, including
5 final vote, concerning a treaty."

79TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. J. RES. 102

JOINT RESOLUTION

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution
of the United States relating to the making
of treaties.

By Mr. PEPPER

DECEMBER 13 (legislative day, DECEMBER 7), 1943
Read twice and referred to the Committee on the
Judiciary

(Not printed at Government expense)



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

A Summons Against the "Kiss of Death"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 16 (legislative day
of Wednesday, December 15), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Summons Against the 'Kiss of Death,'" written by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and published in the New York Times Magazine for December 12, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SUMMONS AGAINST THE "KISS OF DEATH"

(By CLAUDE PEPPER, Senator from Florida)

The commanding officer of a big military installation was looking over a long, elaborate report of attempted sabotage in his unit. Glancing down the index, his eye lit on this item:

"Private Quirk, his great mind * * *
page 122."

Now, it was Private Quirk who, while on sentry duty, had allowed the would-be saboteur to slip in. The C. O. was therefore a bit startled by the reference to Private Quirk's "great mind." Curious, he turned to page 122, and there read:

"Private Quirk testified that he had a great mind to stop the intruder but was too sleepy to realize the situation."

There have been obstructionists of our war effort and there will be obstructionists of our struggle to win the peace. Whether these latter succeed will depend on how many of us turn out to be Private Quirks—that is, with a "great mind" to join other peoples of the world in seeing that the peace is kept, yet "too sleepy to realize the situation" when those who would destroy the peace are at work.

These forces which would frustrate peace are preparing their attack now. The recent Moscow agreement dealt them a stiff come-uppance, but while it served to clear the air internationally, it did not fumigate where we need it most.

We who saw the League of Nations emasculated and peace dealt a death blow in 1920 can observe today, even as our country pays with the life of her youth and the heart-break goes on, these same forces at work, this same hand raised and ready to strike. To let ourselves be lulled by the Moscow agreement, or by the endorsement of it by the

United States Senate, would be doing our country a disservice as serious as that of a sleeping sentry.

It is well to remember that when the Senate overwhelmingly approved the resolution embodying the gist of the Moscow agreement, no sooner had the vote been taken than a leader of the isolationist forces was on his feet to block unanimous consent for a proposal that the resolution be conveyed to the President in the nature of advice.

Getting away from the language of Capitol Hill, what does this mean?

In the business of treaty-making, to "advise" the President and to "consent" to his negotiations with foreign powers are constitutional functions of the Senate. They require a two-thirds vote of the Members present and voting. The isolationist leader was quick to remind us that despite the 85-5 approval of this resolution, a two-thirds vote had not been asked, and therefore this was not "advice" in the constitutional sense. It was, he said, merely an "expression of opinion." He wanted that understood. And he refused to give consent to anything more than that.

Now, it would be natural to expect that a Senator who was so careful to prevent this resolution from taking on any legal or constitutional weight would be among those who had voted against it. Why vote for a measure and then insist that it have no real application? Yet you will find the name of this Senator, not among the 5 who voted nay on the resolution, but among the 85 yeas. You will find, also, among those 85 yeas, a number of other names that look out of place in that column, names of men who before the war had opposed our getting into it and after we were in it, did not cease to attack either the administration or our allies.

To those of us who are determined that the American people shall not be caught asleep at the switch in 1943 as they were in 1920, this vote-for-and-act-against strategy in the Senate was worth noting, and, I suspect, worth watching from this time on.

In the light of past word and deed, one cannot assume that the isolationist Senators who voted approval of the Moscow agreement did so of personal conviction. No enlightening angel has fluttered down out of the sky and touched them one and all, giving them to see the light.

It is harsh, perhaps, to point this out. But when the lives of future American boys are in the balance of what we decide now, I can see no reason why we should speak less than the full truth about those who endanger the peace, whether we find them on the soap box or in the Senate. It is only fair and accurate to assume that in this sudden turn-about after the Moscow Conference,

the bloc which had been traditionally and consistently isolationist gave its approval to the Moscow agreement only because it had suddenly become politically unsafe not to do so.

This is important, because if we understand this we shall be on guard against any attempt by these same isolationists to sidestep their answerability to the people when the time comes to make a treaty and build a peace. We shall not accept political strategy for statesmanship. We shall not be beguiled by techniques. If we can look into their parliamentary legerdemain in advance, by exposing it perhaps we can prevent it from coming to pass.

With the way open at last toward the peace that we have so long sought, how can we safeguard it from this minority strategy, these obstructionist techniques?

Our attack on the problem must be both direct—that is by legislative reform—and indirect, through full expression of the popular will.

The direct attack, long needed in our democracy, is to put an end to the two-thirds rule whereby one more than one-third of the Senators present and voting can prevent ratification. As 49 Senators constitute a quorum, a bloc of only 17 have in their hands the power to negate any peace this Nation may negotiate.

In a democracy issues must be decided vote for vote. There can never be democratic rule where one vote of "no" counts for two of "yes." That is rule of the minority over the majority, and by no stretch of reasoning can the meaning of democracy be made to embrace such rule.

Approval or rejection of a treaty, therefore, should be decided by simple majority, and because these agreements with other nations are the supreme law of our land and are of primary importance to our people, the vote deciding them should be as broadly representative of the popular will as the machinery of one government can make it.

Hence both Houses of Congress should share equally in the exercise of this power, with a simple majority of the membership of each House carrying the decisive weight. Surely it is not too much to ask that the House of Representatives, the vote of which is essential to a declaration of war, should have a part in the making of peace.

The two-thirds rule was workable and valid at the time it was included in the law of our land. The treaties which our forefathers were called upon to ratify were bilateral and the purpose in most cases was to effect some temporary agreement—an alliance, trade pact, or the settlement of a border or fishery dispute.

Today, as in 1920, the treaty which will embody the peace of the world will be multilateral—that is, a settlement and agreement

not between two nations but many. When America was asked to sign the Versailles Treaty 26 other nations were already signatory. So all-pervasive was it in the world of international politics, so deep in its application to our own life as a nation, that the older, earlier conception of a treaty, the conception that made a two-thirds rule seem wise, scarcely could encompass it.

The Senate received the Versailles Treaty on July 10, 1919, and held it until March 19, 1920—over 8 months, while 26 other nations waited for peace and our own Army of Occupation waited for orders to come home.

In the United Nations coalition there are now some 35 nations. When victory comes, we shall be dealing with several other world powers on an equal footing with us. In any task of statesmanship so large in import, so broad in the scope of interests involved, so burdened with almost endless ramifications, the odds that one-third of the membership of the United States Senate present and voting will find one reason or another for opposing it are almost overwhelming.

In a peace settlement of this sort, several elements that should not intrude themselves always do so. Party politics tries to make political capital of the situation in any way possible; intolerance and prejudice add their burden of obstruction. All these magnify the task of ratification—to say nothing of the more honest objections which occur to the legal mind, or the habit of some lawyers among whom it is almost traditional to disagree. The sum total of all these sources of opposition will almost always equal one-third.

But if one-third of the Members in the United States Senate are to be the arbiters of American foreign policy, then it becomes practically impossible for America to have a foreign policy. The objecting minority, when foreign negotiations come up for ratification, will shift in identities and interests, but so often will it exceed one-third on the most important issues that the end result is no foreign policy.

In this split-second world we live in, the time required for this Nation to act under its present handicap places not only our own country but all others with whom we would negotiate at an intolerable disadvantage. In the formation of a world agreement, our neighbor nations are unable to take our position into account in forming their own, for too often we can take none.

To make this change in our law a constitutional amendment is required. This means either that two-thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives must vote to propose the change, subject to ratification by three-fourths of the States, or that two-thirds of the States through their legislatures must require the Congress to call a convention for proposing the amendment.

The Senate cannot be expected to give up voluntarily its exclusive power under the law as it now stands; therefore the feasible course is to see if two-thirds of the States, through their legislatures, will require Congress to submit the change to a convention.

Whether through this tedious procedure a change in the law can be brought about in time to meet the needs of the world crisis that is ahead of us, no one can now predict. But certainly that is no cause for resigning ourselves to an undemocratic decision of the greatest issue our democracy will face in our time. The thing to do is to try, and the time to start trying is now.

The indirect attack on isolationism—through the voicing of the popular will and the constant hammering of that will into the consciousness of our public servants—must go on at the same time that we are trying to change the law. We must see to it that those public servants do not, by virtue of an ancient anachronism not yet corrected in our law, attempt to assert them-

selves as our masters. We must see to it that they do not dare.

What can a Senator do, how can he kill something which he knows the majority of the people want and at the same time escape the political consequences of his act?

There are several techniques. Sometimes, for this or that Senator, the sectional interest of his constituency solves the problem. In the case of a peace treaty which embodies the hope and ideal of civilized man, the tried and true method is not to oppose it but to marry it, embrace it, smother it with words, and bury it in counsels of perfection.

Is this how the isolationists intend to deal with an organization of nations and its aim of lasting peace? When the time comes to say yea or nay to the age-old aspiration of mankind, will there be those in the United States Senate who will neither openly approve nor oppose, but in saying they approve, attempt to stifle it with fine protestations? Will they kiss it to death?

This is what happened in 1920. The so-called irreconcilables—those in the Senate who would under no circumstances vote for a treaty embodying the League of Nations and who said so in so many words—were not the men responsible for the final failure. They were not enough in number.

No; the Versailles Treaty was taken up in the loving embraces of men who were not its outspoken enemies and there gently strangled to death. The maled fist strikes no blow so deadly as the caress of friendship demanding perfection.

When, against the will of the American people, this country was maneuvered into the isolationist position in 1920, the one mind that had most to do with directing the strategy in the Senate was that of the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge. Senator Lodge, leader of the Republican majority and chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, more than any other figure of his time killed the chance of American participation in the League. Yet never once, in public utterance, did Senator Lodge place himself openly on record as opposed to either the League of Nations or to ratification of the Versailles Treaty. All that he required was perfection.

An unpublished prize thesis which is now held in the library of Harvard University gives some interesting details on Senator Lodge's role and his attitude. It is entitled "The Treaty of Versailles in the United States Senate," by John McCook Roots, who interviewed many Senators and other leaders on this subject.

After Senator Borah had made his attack on the League Covenant, on February 21, 1919, Senator Lodge, according to this paper, said to him: "My dear fellow, I agree with you absolutely, absolutely, but we can't beat the thing. Eighty-five percent of the Senate are for it. The best we can do is to get changes that will emasculate it as much as possible."

Again, Senator James E. Watson of Indiana, in his book *As I Knew Them*, tells of an occasion when Lodge asked him (Watson) to lead the organization of the Senate against the League. Watson thought the League could not be defeated. He told Lodge so. "Eighty percent of the people are for it," Senator Watson said. "Fully that percentage of the preachers are right now advocating it, churches are very largely favoring it, all the people who have been burdened and oppressed by this awful tragedy of war and who imagine this opens a way to world peace are for it, and I don't see how it is possible to defeat it."

To this Senator Lodge is reported to have answered: "Ah, my dear James, I do not propose to try to beat it by direct frontal attack, but by the indirect method of reservations."

Amendment and reservation. In other words, to kiss it to death. Why, one might

ask, should not those who are opposed to a peace treaty come out and say so? The Members of the United States Senate are honorable men. Why say they are for it when they would act to kill it?

There are three reasons: First, it is difficult if not impossible to justify an act by the elected representatives of the people if that act runs counter to the popular will. If the people say, "Let us try, let us go out to the other peoples of this world and join forces for peace," the Senate cannot well answer, "That is what you want, but we know it will not work. Therefore, we are denying you your will to try." No minority in its senses tries to say this to the majority, for if the minority, through some legislative technicality, really has the power of enforcing its will, it is doing and saying what the ruling cliques in Germany and Japan do and say: "We know better than the people. Our will must prevail over theirs." That is one of the tenets of fascism. Senators are honorable men. They do not resort to the tenets of fascism.

The second reason for kissing the peace to death instead of coming out in battle formation against it is the political price. In an issue as important as this, few Senators, even in the isolationist bloc, are willing to face the music. This was true 24 years ago and it remains true today. In a letter to George Harvey about the Republican platform in 1920, Senator Lodge wrote:

"I want to get the convention to give a full approval of all that the Republican Senators did, drawing no distinctions between their differing opinions as to the final result. That is, I seek to make my speech, and I hope the platform, so broad that those of us who have fought the treaty for a year in the Senate can all stand upon it (the platform) without any difficulty."

The third reason for an isolationist approach to the peace treaty "by way of amendment and reservation" is that by amending and "reserving" the very life and meaning out of any treaty which originally embodied real peace, by hedging and mutilating it so that it must finally be unacceptable to the administration which has initiated it, the responsibility for rejecting the finished product is thus shifted from the wreckers to the wrecked. In 1920 the party opposition wanted the satisfaction of seeing President Wilson kill his own creature. If a treaty is so altered as to subvert the peace rather than insure it, then it is the Executive who must reject the treaty. Thus, today, the minority in the legislative branch which has done the real damage hopes to crawl out from under.

The enlightened electorate of America must not let this happen again. Much depended on its not happening a generation ago—how very much, we are learning in the tragic terms of blood, sweat, and tears today. Too much, a generation hence, depends on its not happening now.

I am confident of our electorate. I do not think our people will allow the isolationist minority to get away with it again. I do not think any of the old tricks are going to work.

But to prevent, we shall have to keep hammering away, to confront that isolationist bloc again and again with the strong, simple mandate of a people whose minds are made up. We shall have to let our Senators know that they will be held accountable, "yea" or "nay"; that none of them can escape that clear-cut issue by dodging into realms of perfectionism; that "amendment and reservation" are not avenues of sabotage, and that any attempt to use them as such will be recognized and punished accordingly.

We, the American people, have "a great mind" to end war. To that, let us now add an unshakable will and a sharp eye.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR CLAUDE PEPPER OVER ALL FLORIDA
RADIO STATIONS COMMENCING WEEKEND OF JANUARY 22, 1944



Friends, this is your senator, Claude Pepper, speaking to you about Washington and Florida.

Everyone who has a loved one abroad in the armed forces is thinking not only of when the soldier, the sailor, the marine, and now the women as nurses, Red Cross workers, WACS and other services, may come home for good in the happy days of peace, but when he or she may come home on a furlough. Some of our men and women have been abroad more than two years. Many others have been in our far-flung battlelines for almost as long. They, as well as those who have not been away quite so long also, are wondering when they can come home again to see the loved ones left behind; to get another look at those old familiar things which mean home; to get a little relief from the things which have borne down upon them. We know what it means to the morale of those fighting men in far parts of the earth to be able to look forward to a time when they can come home even temporarily.

It has been the policy of the Air Corps, at least in certain areas abroad, to let their men come back after they had made a certain number of missions against the enemy, or had had a certain number of hours in air combat. I have met and talked to many of those men and I know what it meant to them to be able to come home even for a time. I have talked to many sailors and soldiers and marines, and I have had letters from many more, and I know what it meant to them to be able to get a furlough.

We have been very much interested in the problem here. I have had it up with the authorities in Washington and with the Military Affairs and Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate. The position of the War Department is embodied in a letter which I have just received from the Chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee. Because it deals with the problem in considerable detail, I am going to read it to you:

"One of the perplexing problems confronting the General Staff of the Army, and which has been given constant study and consideration since the outset of the two wars in which we are engaged, is the return to the United States from overseas theaters of operation of American soldiers who have served overseas for more than one year.

"Kinfolk of these soldiers in their anxiety to have them back in the United States have been urging that something be done to effect their early return.

"As I visualize the situation, after contact with the War Department, the difficulties which preclude immediate solution of this problem are:

- (a) The war is still in its early stages.
- (b) Additional troops are needed in all existing overseas theaters of operation.
- (c) New theaters of operation are anticipated.
- (d) Replacements must be shipped to cover attrition.
- (e) Supplies, equipment and munitions must be given priority in shipment.
- (f) Seasoned troops cannot be withdrawn from the present overseas theaters in the midst of operations when fresh troops are not available to replace them.
- (g) Sufficient shipping is not available at the present time to transport

troops overseas in very large numbers, therefore shipments must be spread over many months.

- (h) The distances from our shores to our overseas theaters of operations are many thousands of miles.

“The magnitude of the problem of prosecuting two wars several thousands of miles distant from the shores of the United States is difficult of conception by the average citizen not familiar with the problems of transportation and supply.

“Army officials have estimated that 7,700,000 officers, enlisted men and women will be required through the year 1944 in the prosecution of the two wars. During the present year (1943) large numbers of troops were dispatched overseas as rapidly as ships became available. In 1944, it is expected that the number of troops which will have been shipped overseas to all theaters will approximate 5,000,000. A number of officers, enlisted men, and women in the Army then remaining in the United States will be required for the primary purpose of training of thousands of replacements which must be transported overseas as fast as possible to keep the units which are overseas filled to the required strength, and also for the purpose of keeping supplies, equipment, and munitions moving overseas. The great majority of the men who will be retained in the United States in training replacements and engaged in the shipment of munitions are, by reason of physical defects and age, not suitable for combat service.

“The General Staff of the Army has realized from the outset that our combat soldiers who might experience combat fatigue and stress should be returned home as soon as possible, and with that in mind have been constantly planning for the relief of such men when it is possible to replace them. The present deterring factors previously mentioned make it undesirable to prescribe a definite tour of service which a soldier should serve overseas before being replaced and returned home. Through efforts now being made it is anticipated that the present difficulties will disappear.

“Some relief in returning men from overseas theaters has already taken place. For instance—

“ALASKA: In this theater a system is operating which should assure that by the middle of the year 1944 all personnel in Alaska with two years' overseas service will be returned to the United States.

“CARIBBEAN: (Same as in Alaska).

“NORTH AFRICA: In this theater there is in operation a system which returns monthly a limited number of men with more than 18 months' overseas service.

“SOUTH and SOUTHWEST PACIFIC: It is anticipated that the present difficulties in returning men from these theaters of operation will be overcome in the Spring of 1944, and that a system will then be put into effect to return a certain number of men to the United States.

“EUROPEAN: Up to the present time men in this theater of operations, other than those in the Air Crews, have not been subject to combat fatigue and stress, and the climatic conditions do not necessitate a change, and therefore no system has been established for this theater for the rotation of troops to the homeland. As the situation changes in the European theater a system will be put into effect.

“AIR CREW PERSONNEL: The rotation of our Air Crew Personnel serving overseas in all theaters has been established and is functioning satisfactorily.

“Where personnel overseas are stationed in isolated posts and where climatic conditions are severe, there has always been a system of local or

theater rotation to provide relief. Also, units have been rotated in combat areas so that relief from combat fatigue and stress has been available."

The Bureau of Naval Personnel has announced the policy of rotating enlisted personnel for rehabilitation leave and reassignment, after a minimum period of service of 18 months in hazardous duty afloat or in outlying stations. However, this is promulgated as a matter of policy and not of directive since the granting of leave or rotation must be consistent with the maintenance of the fighting efficiency of the Service. The method of effectuating this policy is a matter within the cognizance of administrative Commands, and the granting of leave remains the prerogative of the Commanding Officer.

When men are returned under this plan it is usual to grant leave up to 30 days at the rate of two and one-half days for each month served at sea or overseas. Upon return to the Receiving Station at which received, these men are made available for New Construction or assigned to Fleet activities from general detail.

In the case of survivors from sinkings, return to the United States for 30 days' leave and reassignment is recommended, where practicable.

Effectuation of these policies depends materially upon personnel requirements in the particular Theater or Command, and it is not possible to state at this time to what extent they will be found feasible.

Moreover, shocked nerves and worn bodies of men who have been in combat need not only rest, but change of scenery and some of the refreshments and consolations which come from being amid old and fond surroundings. Men in the whole history of war have never had to undergo more trying experiences than many of our men have had to face in this war.

As, therefore, we build more ships to move our men between home and the battlefronts, as more men become available in the armed forces, after adequate training, to be sent on foreign duty or upon the high seas in the dangerous work of the merchant marine; as we get more equipment overseas so that more shipping space may be used for moving men, in short, as we get the whole war operation better organized and moving, the more men who want to come back to move again into the warm embrace of home and loved ones, oftentimes to an aging parent, or to a son or a daughter they have never seen, or to a struggling wife who has faithfully carried on behind, will get a chance to come back.

Everyone, therefore, who helps the Government to get on with the war, to build more ships, to provide more equipment, or to move that equipment to the right places, or who enters afresh into the service, may have the satisfaction of knowing that he or she is not only helping to win the war and the peace, but to reunite those who have long had to look across the dark abyss of separation.

When I last spoke to you I mentioned that the producers of milk and poultry were two agricultural groups in Florida who had not received an adequate return for their products. One of their chief difficulties was the constantly rising cost of feed along with the rising cost of labor. The Department of Agriculture has recently given me some figures to indicate that our dairy industry in Florida, for example, imports a minimum of twice as much dairy feed concentrates as any other State in the union. Our own dairy people tell me that 90 to 95 per cent of the dairy feed consumed in Florida is produced outside of the State. That runs the cost of dairy products abnormally high in Florida. There has been no ceiling on dairy or poultry feeds up until a few days ago, because under the law the agricultural commodities which were the ingredients of dairy and poultry feed had not reached priority to which they were entitled.

We have constantly, however, hammered at the agencies here to

stabilize such feeds at fair ceiling prices. That has at last been done, and with feedstuffs stabilized in price, we have gained one great step in getting relief for the dairy and poultry industries which number tens of thousands of our people.

We have had a feed subsidy for the dairy industry which has given some help; although until we get feed prices stabilized, the increase in the cost of dairy feeds was in a given period twice the amount of the feed subsidy.

We have been in close touch with the officials here recently and have attained an increase in the amount of the feed subsidy. Many representatives of the dairy industry have been here and we have been in contact with representatives of the poultry industry and we have been striving to get the feed subsidy increased to the point where the producer of dairy products would be able to get a fair return for what he sold. Yet one of the advantages of the Government being able to pay such a subsidy is that this increase to the dairyman has not brought an increase to the housewife. Such increase is added to the cost of the war rather than to the cost of milk and butter in every home and restaurant. Of course, if Congress refuses to allow the Government to continue to aid producers while holding down prices, as sure as the sun shines either the producers or the consumers must suffer.

We are hoping to get a program worked out which will enable the Government to help both.

We are hoping, if Congress authorizes the continuation of the limited subsidy program for essential foods, that we can soon get adequate aid for the producers of poultry products.

We are steadily, therefore, moving along toward the correction of many war dislocations. While there is much yet to be done, unmistakable progress in the prosecution of the war, both abroad and at home, gives us some satisfaction.

This is Claude Pepper who has spoken to you about Washington and Florida. I shall speak to you again over this station at this time in two weeks.

The above speech will be broadcast over the following radio stations:

WMFJ, Daytona Beach, Tuesday, January 25, at 8:15 P. M.
WFTL, Ft. Lauderdale—(Inquire at station)
WAAC, Ft. Myers, Sunday, January 23, at 5:45 P. M.
WRUF, Gainesville, Tuesday, January 25, at 8:45 P. M.
WJAX, Jacksonville, Sunday, January 23, at 4:30 P. M.
WJHP, Jacksonville—(Inquire at station)
WMBR, Jacksonville, Sunday, January 23, at 2:30 P. M.
WPDQ, Jacksonville, Saturday, January 22, at 7:30 P. M.
WLAK, Lakeland, Saturday, January 22, at 6:45 P. M.
WWPG, Palm Beach, Sunday, January 23, at 1:00 P. M.
WIOD, Miami, Sunday, January 23, at 4:30 P. M.
WQAM, Miami, Saturday, January 22, at 8:15 P. M.
WKAT, Miami Beach—(Inquire at station)
WTMC, Ocala, Monday, January 24, at 8:30 P. M.
WDBO, Orlando, Thursday, January 27, at 7:45 P. M.
WLOF, Orlando—(Inquire at station)
WDLP, Panama City, Monday, January 24, at 7:30 P. M.
WCOA, Pensacola—(Inquire at station)
WFOY, St. Augustine, Monday, January 24, at 8:15 P. M.
WSUN, St. Petersburg, Sunday, January 23, at 6:30 P. M.
WTSP, St. Petersburg, Sunday, January 23, at 4:15 P. M.
WSPB, Sarasota, Saturday, January 22, at 5:45 P. M.
WTAL, Tallahassee, Monday, January 24, at 6:30 P. M.
WDAE, Tampa, Sunday, January 23, at 5:45 P. M.
WFLA, Tampa, Saturday, January 22, at 6:05 P. M.
WJNO, West Palm Beach, Sunday, January 23, at 2:30 P. M.

2136 R Street, N.W.
Washington 8, D.C.
February 19, 1944

Dear Claude:

I have read your statement and I think
it is a good one.

I will be back in about ten days, during
which time I hope you and Fulbright will
have made some progress.

Sincerely,

Charles E. Marsh

Senator Claude Pepper,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

2136 R Street, N.W.
Washington 8, D.C.
May 4, 1944

Dear Claude:

You are in a position immediately to help the pre-campaign national leadership. Your Forum is the Senate.

You should talk upon the problems of the South under the Democratic process. You should tell the country through the Senate, just what happened in Florida. You should frankly discuss the aristocratic money forces, the "agin the government" gangs, that hang the word "bureaucracy" as a slogan, and the actions of the Republicrat money plunderbunds which use political fronts in both Parties in their secret and underhand efforts to capture Washington while our government is trying to capture Berlin and Tokyo. This takes in the so-called "Christian Fronts", the anti-Roosevelt statesmen so ably financed by Wall Street stemmed corporations, the great groups of Lobbyists of lumber and oil and utilities and railroads which work everywhere through their agents to poison the voter who loves his country, his President, his Commander-in-Chief, and who has a genuine hope for permanent world peace.

Then Hill should follow with his lessons from Alabama. Then you should follow with your picture of post war America being won for post war permanent peace and prosperity and full employment, not by the plunderbund, but through the intelligent leadership and the wisdom of the average American who believes in the Democratic Process.

Sincerely,

Charles E. Marsh

Senator Claude Pepper,
The Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR CLAUDE PEPPER AT A MEETING
IN OBSERVANCE OF THE THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE
SOVIET UNION'S ENTRY INTO THE WAR.

SPONSORED BY
RUSSIAN WAR RELIEF, MADISON SQUARE GARDEN
NEW YORK CITY, JUNE 22, 1944

* * * * *

Three years ago this morning, in the year minus 991 of the thousand years of Fascist rule which Hitler boastfully promised his people, that still legendary "Little Corporal," ever aping Napoleon, entered upon the last act of his Napoleonic drama, Russia and downfall. This great would-be traveler discovered the reverse of what Columbus learned, namely, that if he went East he would soon be going West.

Today with 988 years of his vaunted millenium yet to go, this devil of earth, pressed from every side by those who have come to avenge his heinous deeds can daily and hourly hear the strokes of the "Big Ben" of doom.

For Hitler's mortal wound, for breaking and tearing apart his once great army, all the world, friend and foe alike, pays homage to the terrible glory and grandeur of Russian arms. For all time good men and women, even little children, will speak of the matchless heroism of the Red Army and the Soviet people upon whose unconquerable spirit the storms of Fascism and tyranny broke with all their fury and were relentlessly rolled back.

Upon the old lands of ancient Russia freedom has not only had a new birth but found a new savior.

It is a glorious comradeship which we have today among those who fight the hideous monsters who a little while ago threatened the earth. Never have those who fought common enemies been so much one in concert of action, and in singleness of spirit and purpose. No tribute upon our landing from the West upon the coast of France has been more generous or more worthy than that of Joseph Stalin, the world's greatest general, who speaking of that magnificent assault said: "The history of war does not know of any such undertaking so broad in conception, so ⁿgradi^ose in scale, so masterly in execution." Prime Minister Churchill has ventured the possibility that even this summer, or this year, might see the happy end of the war -- the final choking and throttling of the enemy-- V-Day.

I come here tonight to speak to you and to speak to my fellow Americans not merely about the glory of Russian arms, or about a victory which is assured. These things all the world knows.

Joseph Stalin and the Soviet people are realists. They are grateful for our tributes and our praise, but they want to know what America and Americans are going to do after V-Day. So do all those who now fight with us. What concerns us all, therefore, is whether America and Americans are this time to keep their

(MORE)

rendezvous with destiny, or whether we are again to betray our own dead and our Allies as we did a quarter of a century ago.

There are ominous signs of a second betrayal in the political skies. While the best and strongest of our people die for democracy, there seem to be many determined that their victory shall be in vain. Where are all those who prayed that Hitler might destroy the Soviet Union? Where are all those who decried Lend-Lease to Russia when this juggernaut assailed her? What is the meaning of the willingness of senators to denounce in this day, when we are fighting shoulder to shoulder, Joseph Stalin as a great enemy? Why do great newspapers still disseminate vicious and false propaganda against the Soviet Union and strive to fan the flames of prejudice against such an Ally, such a friend? What is the purpose of those who seize upon the barest threads of rumor to try to drive a wedge between us and the Soviet Union, between Britain and America, between the people and their President and Government, to undermine the people's confidence in their Allies and their own leaders?

We see a Congress in war, a Congress which ordered men to war and many to death, wilfully and purposefully denying to fighting men the chance to vote because some senators and congressmen feared their vote. We see hundreds of thousands of men and women, the fathers of fighting sons, of daughters who are nurses upon the battle fronts, and loyal auxiliaries, disfranchised because they cannot or do not at an appointed time pay a sum of money for the privilege of voting. We see the most diabolical conspiracy in American political history, planned with the masterful strategy of an assault upon the continent of Europe, executed with the boldness, thoroughness and daring with which an Eisenhower assaults Normandy, to deny whole states, millions of Americans, the right to vote for the nominee of one of the nation's dominant parties, even if he be the President of the United States and the Commander-in-Chief of our Army and Navy.

We hear the rumblings of so-called revolts, not revolts against tyranny, but to set up a tyranny upon others. We behold a picayune Judas who once was a pigmy Secretary of War, and an embittered old man, now rich, who is remembered as a senator from Missouri, not for what he built but for his part as one of the demolition squad of the League of Nations, and a man ⁱⁿ whose breast hate of another war President reached its zenith, and others of their kind, gathering in a National Council to assault not their country's enemy, but their enemy, the Nation's President.

We cannot fail to see the scheming care with which some who seek ~~the~~ high office screen their real sentiments and aims from the public eye, or by skillful and guileful blandishments speak words designed at the same time to

encourage and to delude those who believe in world peace and in international working together to make better the good earth.

The crisis now is not upon the battle front but upon the home front, for it is here that the final victory must be won, or all is lost. It is time for Americans to speak up and to speak out if they believe in democracy abroad and at home. If we are not to lose the final battle, the might of American opinion must be mobilized behind principles and programs which will assure beyond any doubt that we not only shall do our part in keeping the peace of the world and promoting its welfare, but as God has set us to do we shall lead the fight and in a manner worthy of our might show the way to others. If we in our hearts covenant that we will honor our debt to our Allied and our own dead and mangled, we will promise the living and the dead that we will let no other little group of wilful men, we will let no Senate, we will allow no sinister forces, whether they be selfish or dangerously shortsighted, this time to dishonor our obligations, deny us our full part in rebuilding the broken world.

You and I know that those three giant leaders who, like a triple Atlas, have held the world of freedom upon their shoulders, have laid the foundations of an accord among nations and peoples upon which may be built the grandest edifice of world security and prosperity man has ever seen. From the Atlantic Charter to Cairo, where the Orient joins the Occident, to Teheran, the ever-broadening path of peace stretches. The world organization to come after the war, through which we shall all work together as we have fought together, is already conceived and aborning.

But you may depend upon it, it will be subjected to every possible assault by those among us who are the isolationists, the imperialists, or the exploiters. They will attack this organization as they will attack any government in America which will fearlessly protect the economic and civil rights of the many against the totalitarians among us.

From however many directions the attack may come, it will be like this global war -- one in strategy. It will generally have a supreme general staff. It will have its daring commandoes, its demolition squads, its sappers, its heavy artillery, its well organized services of supply, and of course its Fifth Column and its minister and organs of propaganda. It will be the more dangerous because the whole army will never be visible and like Fifth Columnists will appear behind a front of patriotism and high purpose.

Let us now, before the eagerly awaiting world, take concrete and positive action to assure that this plot against democracy at home and cooperation abroad shall not succeed. Let us come out unequivocally for a general world organization

with power to keep the peace. Let us not place our reliance in men or parties who subscribe to international collaboration with a big "but", who cautiously spin out webs of verbiage which commit us to nothing, or who maintain a pregnant silence until they are forced to issue a platitude guaranteed neither to offend or enlighten any one.

Such men simply do not have the stature -- do not possess the qualities of leadership -- that will be required in the crucial days ahead.

Let the Congress of the United States now provide for the machinery which will break the stranglehold that, under our present treaty-making procedure, a small but determined minority can exercise over the attempt to set up such an organization.

In order to assure the free play of democratic forces in working out our destiny, let the Congress now specifically renounce the undemocratic two-thirds rule for the ratification of treaties, and agree that our international relations shall be governed by executive agreements ratified by a simple majority of both houses of Congress. In order to remove from the hands of obstructionists the deadly weapon of the filibuster, let Congress now provide that the time for a vote on international agreements may be decided by a simple majority of either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

And let this audience, as well as all other democratically-minded people, serve notice now to the nominating conventions of both parties, that they will support them in a decision not to recognize any delegation, or the authority of any group, that seeks to circumvent or subvert our time-honored electoral procedure and substitute the rule of a small oligarchy for the expressed will of the majority of the people.

Let the Congress now also lay the foundation for a sound and prosperous post-war economy. Let it give assurance that we will utilize the tremendous productive capacity we possess for getting more, and better, and cheaper goods into the hands of the people -- give a pledge of a job and a decent standard of living to every returning soldier, to every discharged war worker, to every white-collar worker, and to every woman who wants to remain employed.

This being an election year, we can expect more than the usual amount of acrimony and vituperation on the home political front. That I can assure you from recent personal experience. But those who think they can gamble with the Nation's destiny in pursuit of their own selfish interests; those who think we can safely return to pre-war unemployment; those who would destroy labor unions and collective bargaining by playing off soldiers against war workers, white-collar against industrial employees, women workers against men, or race against race, had better beware. They will be doing the work of Hitler after Hitler

is dead.

For though we may sentence Hitler, though we may hang him from the highest tree in Russia, though we may bury him and his ideas under the Ural Mountains, the democratic forces of all mankind will have to stand on his grave for a long time to make sure that these ideas do not rise again.

The real secret weapon upon which Hitler most relied was disunity among the people in the countries arrayed against him, and disunity among the Allied countries themselves.

Since I last spoke on this rostrum, on the occasion of the Tenth Anniversary of resumption of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, there have been developments of the greatest importance.

The air has been further cleared of the hobgoblins so industriously conjured up by the anti-Soviet and isolationist press. We have laid many ghosts and legends. We have exorcised the spectre of international superstition with the bell and candle of logic and information. And on June 6, the first pair of boots that splashed into the water off a beach in Normandy broke the last remnant of the power of Hitler's most dangerous ^{secret} weapon.

This meeting is sponsored by Russian War Relief, an organization which has played an outstanding role in fostering good will and understanding between the people of America and those of the Soviet Union. We know from people who have visited Russia how truly appreciative the Russians are of the supplies this organization has sent, and I hope that during the next year our people will give even more unstintingly from the relative bounty they still enjoy.

Before closing, however, I should like to speak for just a moment about the war relief that Russia has given us.

In return for the tremendous quantities of lend-lease materials we have sent to Russia, what has Russia given us in reverse lend-lease? In return for the war relief goods we have shipped to her, what has she given us in terms of war relief?

Russia has given us 7,800,000 dead or captured Germans!

How many American boys could 7,800,000 Germans kill in the course of the war? Allowing one casualty of ours to eight of theirs, which is a fair figure for an American to shoot at, this means that Russia has given us as a gift the lives and futures of 1,000,000 American boys.

Did I hear some one complain about the transfer of a cruiser to the Russian Navy?

American planes are now based on Soviet soil. American blood is running as freely as Russian blood, cementing forever the destinies of our two great nations. With the mutual confidence and respect born of common devotion to a great cause, the peoples of the two nations echo the historic words of their leaders spoken at Teheran:

"Emerging from these friendly conferences we look with confidence to the day when all peoples of the world may live free lives untouched by tyranny and according to their varying desires and their own consciences.

"We came here with hope and determination. We leave here friends in fact, in spirit, and in purpose."

(END)

2136 R Street, N.W.
Washington 8, D.C.
December 21, 1944

Dear Claude:

I gave you a ring a few minutes ago, but there is a possibility that in the get-away rush we won't connect.

Your work this month has given you a very fine finish to the year. Your splendid campaign started off Roosevelt's "campaign trend." You would have lost had you not been a straight forward campaigner, as the cards were all stacked against you and well prepared.

You did not compromise. Hill of Alabama pulled a Munich.

In watching the short exchange between yourself and Lucas, I saw a spiritual and mental difference so much in your favor that '48 flashed in my mind.

The picture between now and '48 will swing largely on economic prosperity or depression. Even if there is a depression, the people will stay liberal PROVIDED they are sure that the fourth term set up has done a better job than the alternative Republican set up.

So full employment--these sixty million jobs that Roosevelt spoke of in Chicago--is major number one objective until the '48 Congressional elections. You and Murray of Montana with some help from Wagner, Mead, Guffey, Kilgore, and possibly Truman, will form a new and maturing Senate leadership of ideas and execution.

You should spend much time in the legislative affairs of the Senate. Watch particularly the new Senators who have votes even if they are at the tail end of the Committees. George, Connally, and Barkley, as well as their old colleagues Hull and Byrnes and their conferees Baruch and Jones, are feeling time.

The year 1945, I trust, will find you emerging as an

honest, progressing, energetic liberal who may justly be acclaimed by the people as a leader in action as well as in thought. I particularly want some Bill in 1945 to be passed which has your name to it and which stands as a permanent monument of the nature of the Wagner Bill. I shall be glad to talk to you in early January. The Bill basically will have to do with health, an extension of Social Security, etc.--in other words, the new humanitarian program in which the government reaches the individual and the family unit.

When I see you in January ask me about an appreciation of your courage and intelligence which has no place in this personal appraisal. It is a tough world when we stand straight but it is an awful lot of fun.

Sincerely,

Senator Claude Pepper,
The Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.