

WSM Broadcast  
December 9, 1945

Good Morning, Friends:

We have seen a week of considerable political turbulence in the Nation's Capital. The strain and striving over possible labor legislation, the controversy <sup>picked</sup> up by General Patrick Hurley's resignation as Ambassador to China, adoption of a Republican Congressional platform, the Pearl Harbor investigation, to mention only the larger ones.

On <sup>last</sup> Tuesday, I attended a Committee meeting at which Mr. William Green, President of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. R. J. Thomas, President of CIO's United Automobile Workers Union, Mr. Whitney of the Railroad Brotherhood, and others <sup>labor leaders</sup> denounced all pending labor legislation as anti-labor, unfair, ~~and~~ <sup>as steps</sup> unAmerican, ~~leading~~ <sup>leading</sup> toward serfdom and slavery for workers, ~~and most anything else they could think of saying in derogation of labor~~ <sup>in short, they wanted ~~the~~ exactly nothing done. Let labor solve its own problems, was their plea - and not once did they mention the public interest in industrial strife.</sup> ~~the bills.~~ Meanwhile, a bill embodying President Truman's recommendation was drafted and introduced and hearings will begin on the bill tomorrow by the labor Committee. There is <sup>however,</sup> already reported from the Military Affairs Committee a much more rigid <sup>labor</sup> bill and it seems to be the strategy of those who want to force action by the labor committee to hold this <sup>bill</sup> as a threat.

The chances ~~are~~ <sup>are good</sup> that a labor bill will pass the House of Representatives before the Christmas holidays, but the chances of any bill which labor opposes passing the Senate before Christmas is practically out of the question and in fact, it is doubtful that one will pass before next July 4, ~~if~~ if ever. Only an aroused public opinion will force any <sup>labor</sup> legislation through the Senate.

After General Patrick Hurley had beared his charges before the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, Secretary of State James F. Byrnes came before

the Committee and took the wind out of General Hurley's sails, so to speak,

in a smooth, thorough way. *by citing the records.* So ~~the chances are that~~ after a few more

references to the matter in public print and on the radio, the storm will

subside *and Gen. Hurley can ~~enjoy~~ relax in private life.*

*At least one* outstanding development regarding the Pearl Harbor investigation

should be noted. The proceedings before the Committee are considerably less

partisan now than in the early stages of the investigation. You will recall

that Republican Senators Brewster and Ferguson and Republican Representatives

Gearhart and Keefe were making charges right and left and were asking many

suspicious~~ly~~ arousing questions at the beginning of the hearing. But since

hearing Secretary of State Hull, General Marshall, Admiral Richardson and

all the other witnesses, the partisan flavor of the investigation has been

tempered.

No evidence has yet been shown to prove the thesis of those who were seeking to establish in the American mind that President Roosevelt

had either contrived or acted in such a way ~~to~~ actually <sup>to</sup> invite attack by

the Japanese in order to get us into the war. That thesis has been literally

blasted into nothingness and the Committee is now plodding along in a *more orderly,*

routine investigation of a matter that has <sup>already</sup> been investigated three times

before and I have an idea some people are not only disappointed ~~in~~ in the

findings of this investigation but are actually sorry that we ever had it

because it ~~exploited~~ <sup>has Tarped</sup> some hatemongering ~~suspicious~~ <sup>rumors & whisperings</sup> of the motives and actions

of a great patriot who ~~has now been~~ <sup>awaits</sup> called to his reward <sup>after victory over</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>with</sup> forces

An agreement was signed during the week between the United States and Great Britain by which the United States agreed to a loan of approximately four billion dollars to Great Britain. This agreement, however, must be submitted to Congress and approved by Congress before it can become effective.

Former Secretary of State Cordell Hull issued a statement praising the action, stating that a great need for the further <sup>there</sup> was ~~for~~ world economic cooperation, ~~which~~, <sup>see Hull's</sup> as you know, it has been ~~his~~ <sup>is</sup> these throughout his public life that political action is in the final analysis based upon self interest and that world political cooperation must be based on world economic cooperation.

It was announced night before last that the foreign ministers of Great Britain and Russia and our Secretary of State would meet in Moscow soon for a conference on ~~future~~ control of atomic energy. This bodes for good. The council of foreign ministers in London bogged down in disagreement <sup>the fact</sup> and that the foreign ministers of the three great powers should be meeting so soon is evidence of some <sup>rap</sup> ~~re~~proachment-toward agreement. True, the purpose of this meeting is announced as atomic energy control discussion, but that is not the basic difficulty between Anglo-American and Russian foreign relations. The real difficulty arrises out of unilateral action by the United States in Japan, by Russia in the Balkans, and by Great Britain in the Mediterrean and Pacific areas. The area of disagreement is rather large but it bodes for well that the foreign ministers <sup>are again to</sup> meet even though ostensibly

for the purpose of discussing control of atomic energy.

Incidentally, last Friday another leading American scientist testified before the Senate Committee that the United States could not hope to keep *secret* the ~~possibility~~ <sup>process</sup> of developing atomic energy for more than a few months.

The Republican Party seems determined to wage a relentless campaign to capture control of Congress in 1946. To this end, Republican members of the House and Senate did an unprecedented thing during the week when they adopted, this far in advance of the Congressional elections next fall, a platform or statement of aims. The Republican party like the Democratic party has many differences and shades of political opinion and interest.

50 When they got down to writing a platform to which they could all agree, they found it must be stated only in generalities. And, of course, as is usual in the making of a platform, there ~~was~~ was some dodging of issues, wordy window dressing, and in some cases, a patented effort to get firmly on the fence. When the platform was announced it received a merciless ribbing by many editorials and political commentators. Actually, practically every program which the platform endorsed is something which the Democrats are not only for but ~~some~~ <sup>some</sup> which under democratic leadership has <sup>actually</sup> been put into effect. One of the Washington ~~newspapers~~ newspapers said in an editorial that 80 percent of the Republican platform could be endorsed by President Truman and with better effect. In other words, even friends and supporters of the Republican party branded it as a "me, too" proposition. <sup>The platform rather accurately</sup> ~~Actually, it~~ can be paraphrased as follows: "We oppose sin, standing firmly on the fence we are emphatically against, keeping the Democrats in."