

~~SECRET~~
POLITICS

~~SECRET~~

April

Barry decided in 1941, before the United States officially declared war on the Axis nations, to join He was sent first for three months to Great Lakes Training Station for the United States Naval Reserves. He was stationed for ~~a good many~~ ^{six} months in Washington, ~~then~~ ^{but} when we entered the war, he became Public Relations Officer to Admiral Stark in the European Theater; ~~then~~ when the European phase of the war was about over, he was transferred to the Pacific on the staff of Admiral Nimitz. He was discharged with the rank of Commander after four and a half years.

an officers' course
Then

Mark was left in charge of the papers, WHAS, and the ~~Rotogravure~~ ^{which did not change} operations, His duties weren't appreciably ~~changed~~ ^{changed}, except that the Courier's editorial staff was augmented by Mary Bingham, ~~she~~ ^{who} became a regular editorial writer, and Mark thought she was the best editor ^{of writer} the Courier had, ~~he~~ ^{and} depended on her a lot. Only once did they disagree on the editorial policy the paper should take. They argued over it for some time, she forcefully ~~setting out~~ ^{outlining} her viewpoint and he just as forcefully ~~setting out~~ ^{defending} his. Still they couldn't agree. Finally Mark said, "Mary, let's call up Barry and ask what he thinks."

OK
This statement seems to be a new security clearance mail OK

me also p. 33

She immediately bridled and answered, "No, Mark, that isn't necessary. Barry left you in charge of the papers and, if you don't exercise that authority, I won't have any respect for you."

Repetition
of only one
intentional?

And Only once did Mark have to correct her copy.

corrected
how?
see below

For some years the Courier had had a feud with
~~Colonel McCormick, publisher of the Chicago~~
Tribune, ^{the two papers being} They were at opposite poles of the
political spectrum. The Tribune was ultra
conservative and the Courier and Louisville Times,
ultraliberal. Naturally, this caused heated
differences, ^{which, nevertheless} However, the differences were minor
compared to the acute, divisiveness that developed
because of the Courier's advocacy of the United
States intervention in the war and the Tribune's
devious isolationist stand. Everyone on the Louisville

they?
i.e.
a paper
and
a man?
see below

papers, ~~so far as Mark knew,~~ was bitter with
Colonel McCormick, ^{publisher of the Tribune} but no one was so bitter as

Mary. Day after day, the Tribune's news columns
were blatantly slanted and the editorials out

rageous. One day, as ~~Mary~~ ^{she} worked on an editorial,
her feelings ~~about the Colonel~~ prompted the

most intemperate outburst. She knew, of course,

it couldn't be printed; she just had to get her
disgust ^{with} of the man out of her system, ^{so} she wrote:

"He's a goddamned son-of-a-bitch, the nephew of a
syphiletic bastard."

was this
rewritten
or simply
deleted?
see above

Mark, too, once expressed his personal
opinion of the Colonel. Editor and Publisher

and?
see
p. 56
+ 2 06

see p. 234
of paper?
indirectly
of the Colonel?
of the colonel!

asked him what he thought of the Chicago Tribune and the burden of his criticism was that it was "the product of animal vitality and vigor, published in a stockyard town."

see?
p. 233

^{Mark's criticism appeared in}
The day after Editor and Publisher appeared,

was this printed?
yes
i.e. the particular issue in which Mark's criticism appeared?

Colonel McCormick came out with a two-column editorial in the Tribune, proclaiming in the headline, "HE SAYS WE'VE GOT HAIR ON OUR CHEST." He quoted what little good Mark had to say about him, ^{and} ~~then~~ used the rest of the two columns to give Mark hell.

Feuding with Colonel McCormick, though, was an insignificant part of Mark's activities in those strenuous days. Getting out two papers and overseeing the operation of a radio station and the roto publishing plant, ^{plus} ~~with~~ all the war shortages, ~~and the~~ regulations pertaining to the movement of troops and ships, and innumerable other headaches, kept him exceedingly busy; but his role was dull compared to what others ^{or} including ~~his~~ ^{our} first son, Mark Jr. ¹ were doing so heroically over seas.

How was Mark involved in this?

When the war finally ended and Barry returned home September 1945, he said he had given a lot of thought to what he wanted to do on the papers.

see
p. 235

Thinking about it through long wakeful

~~Awake~~ at nights in the Pacific, he said, thinking about it, he had decided he wanted to be the editor

of the Courier-Journal, not the publisher. So,

on September, ^{19th 5,} Barry made Mark the publisher of the Courier and Louisville Times and he ^{himself} became the editor of the Courier and president of both papers.

Barry devoted himself to the editorial page, writing ~~a great~~ many of the editorials himself, though the Courier had a full stable of writers. He continued the custom the paper had followed for a good many years of holding a meeting at ^{ten thirty} 10:30 every morning, except Saturday and Sunday^s, with all the editorial writers of both papers, ^{They} to discuss ^{ed the} ~~that~~ subjects they wanted to editorialize about and the stand they should take on each ~~subject~~. If there were disagree^{ment}ments, they tried to talk them out. ^{Usually} ~~Almost every~~ ~~time~~ they arrived at the same line, but if they didn't, Barry and Mark took the final responsibility. If an editorial writer ^{did} disagreed with ^{them} Barry and Mark, he was excused from writing ^{that particular} ~~the~~ editorial.

They never wanted a man to write anything he didn't believe. ⁹¹ Fortunately Barry and Mark thought alike on ^c practically every issue. In the rare cases ^{when} ~~that~~ they didn't agree, Barry bowed graciously to Mark's judgment. Mark ^{ot} ~~sweeps~~ they

235
228
X
10/24

who was the Times editor?

with both?
with either of them?

never had a real fight or cross word in the twenty-seven and a half years he was with the papers.

The liveliest and most heated conversations they had in those editorial meetings were over what candidates for public office to support. Kentucky had an almost manic preoccupation with politics, and it was a dull day on the papers when somebody didn't announce for some public office. Kentucky politics didn't even have the Churchill Downs 45-minute intervals between races. A new political race had ^{began} already ~~began~~ before the ^{contestants} horses of the last race had crossed the line.

Three weeks before ^{an} the election the papers ^{announced} published their choices and the reasons for ^{them} those choices. They considered it their duty to the public to take a stand one way or the other.

Sometimes, of course, they picked the wrong man. Even after ~~these~~ long, intensive investigations and arguments among themselves, they could still make a bad choice.

Jimmie Pope wrote ^{we} about one of those wrong candidates:)

"Take the celebrated race for governor of

forty =
five =
no horses?
contestants or participants

x
e
e
s
+
times

Is this from printed material or a letter to WSE? See suggested changes on p. 237

Kentucky in 1941. Liter Donaldson, the highway
 commissioner, ran in the primary against Ben
 Kilgore. ^{when} The Courier chose Donaldson, ~~the~~
 editorial conference crew split up immediately.
 Lisle Baker and Mary Elizabeth [Lisle's strongly
 opionated ~~and outspoken~~ wife who really didn't have
 anything to do with the policies of the Courier
 other than wield her influence over Lisle] were
 for Kilgore, and Lisle said so on the Op Ed page.
 Some carefully concealed tension arose. Any~~way~~,
 Donaldson won [in the primary] and faced Judge
 Simeon Willis, whom the Republicans for some occult
 reason had selected. A month or so before the
 election Allan Trout [head of the Courier's
 Frankfort bureau] called me. He had uncovered
 (or more likely been given) evidence that Donaldson
 had accepted substantial campaign money from the
 oil companies.

"Jimmie, do I write it?" Trout asked.
 This was a gag. Nobody on earth could have
 prevented his writing it, certainly not I. I
 said, 'Go right ahead, shoot the works, but just
 to have everything clear, since this means a
 different governor from the one predestined, I'll
 check with Mark.' It was, as a matter of fact,

even on a high^{er} minded newspaper, a pretty caustic sort of confrontation. The Courier had built Donaldson up far beyond his merits, as editorial writers always do, and the paper would get some discredit no matter how things came out.

"Mark was in New York. I called him and read him the story. He paused just long enough, in my untutored estimation, to take a swallow of Scotch, and said, 'Hell, yeh. Run all of it.' I was unsurprised, but there was not a managing editor on another paper in the country who in the same circumstances would not have had to wait until, at least, everything was weighed and balanced. Willis won and the Courier picked up a lot of respect."

"There were many such conflicts," Jimmie continued, "but I don't recall any being decided against the reader. The weekly magazines played ~~the story~~ ^{its} Such events play a big part in the reputation of a paper, especially being ^{ranked} fourth in the nation when Edward L. Bernays began his ^{newspaper} polls. We weren't all that good, but neither were the three ^{papers} ahead of us. The Times (New York) was big, rather than good.... We might have been first if they had computed the size of ~~our~~ staff and

I'd like this before Peter
antecedent of "it"?
The Courier printing and on news again the candidate
this ref not clear?

ES
This whole # seems unclear to me in connection with what precedes. Can it be deleted?
ES

I hate to leave this out. It is important and ok or clear []? to Mark for David (you?) and me

~~your budget~~ ^{and then they} ~~into the process.~~ ~~The Courier~~
~~spends more in a month now than we did in a year."~~

9?
Exp. 238

During political races, the editorial employees of the papers were encouraged not to get personally involved; judgments must remain detached. When someone felt he must work in a candidate's campaign, he was given a leave of absence.

Once, in 1944, however, while the war was still on, Mark felt so passionately about the necessity of President Roosevelt being elected for a fourth time, he accepted an invitation to address the Oklahoma Democratic convention. It was his first and last out-and-out political speech. ^{and} The Democratic National Committee published 300,000 copies. ^{It} The speech was entitled, "FOR WHAT THE HELL SHOULD WE APOLOGIZE?" Here are parts of it:

"The real choice the American people must make this year is between philosophies, between ideas that lie deep in their conflict. This year is the year of referendum upon the attitude toward the function of government and the work of the New Deal for the past twelve years. Domestically, the choice is between the destruction

~~1/1~~
~~1/1~~
 of the New Deal and the eradication of its emphasis¹ which is all the Republican party has so far to offer¹ and the preservation and implementation of the central idea of the New Deal¹ which is that the person is more important in a civilization than property; that government itself must and should be used to make freedom the ex¹panding force it can be when the individual has the opportunity to develop his own soul.

"In the international field, I believe the choice is between a good peace and a bad one.

~~1/1~~
 "I have no shame in confessing that I am and have been a New Dealer for years. Yes, I'd like to see the budget balanced and always have felt that in normal times we should tax for what we spend. Yes, I get irritated by a good many things about the administration....But I can say in all honesty that I'd infinitely rather have had Franklin D. Roosevelt for the past twelve years than Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover and their twelve years. In theory I didn't like third and fourth terms, but I'll take a fourth term of Roosevelt with thanks to God for the chance in preference to a first term for Dewey^w with all the forces that are behind him.

"I sense every now and then a note of apology in Democratic voices. I'd like somebody to tell me what the hell we should apologize for....

U...Anything short of taking our full place in world affairs is an invitation to another war. Anything short of recognition that what we are going through is in fact a counter^r revolution against the tyrannies of authoritarianism and that the trend of the world when this war is over will be toward the greater emphasis upon the dignity of the individual^l the trend to the left, if you care to call it that^l will put us out of step with the peoples we fought to save. Anything short of the recognition that there is no turning back in our domestic affairs^r ~~that we cannot go back to 1914 or even to 1940~~ is the sheerest stupidity.

"Anything short of recognition that we cannot go back to this will-of-the-wisp thing businessmen call 'free enterpr^rise,' which never existed since the first regulatory law was passed by the Continental Congress, will lead us into trouble. We must know in our hearts that there must be full employ^{ment} for employables and that, if private-business doesn't provide for it,

X

the ok here?
neg

ok?

men pl?

4

government must. We must know in our hearts that we will never go back on the standards of fair working conditions or wages that we have set. We must know in our hearts that we will never relax regulations made in the public good, regulations born of the necessity of protecting the individual from the brute power of pooled money or influence.

"We must know that the demand for an earned security, particularly for greater medical security in the rural areas, will not die out, but will swell in chorus until the government does what the medical profession cannot do. We must know that the standards of health, housing, nutrition, and all other things that make for a good life are not matters to be left lightly to free enterprise, but are matters of concern to all of us as a people who make a government; as a people determined to use their government as an agency to secure the welfare and enhance the happiness of all of us."

MARK AX/VAE

That year, at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, Mary Bingham, Mark, and I, Barry was still in the Pacific, wanted so terribly for Henry Wallace to be nominated for a second term as

vice-president that we did everything we possibly could ^H without involving the Courier and Louisville Times other than in the editorial columns ^H to bring it about. We believed that Wallace had done a fine job as vice-president for Roosevelt during his third term and that he was the most idealistic, one-world enthusiast, and people-oriented candidate in the race.

X Mr. Roosevelt, ~~of course, had been~~ nominated for a fourth term, and naturally ^H he could say whom he wanted for vice-president. It was understood by a great many people, including Mr. Wallace himself, that Mr. Roosevelt had said if he were a delegate he would support Wallace; indeed, ✓ Senator Robert Jackson of New Hampshire had a letter that said as much. Others, however, claimed the President had given his nod to Harry Truman. ✓ ✓ Robert E. Hannegan, chairman of the National Democratic Party, said he had some written words to that effect. ✓ ✓ others claimed Justice William O. Douglas had the nod; still ✓ others, James Byrnes. Our own almost legendary ✓ figure, Senator Alban Barkley, had been endorsed for the spot by the Kentucky State Democratic Convention; (however, he wasn't) a serious candidate

in Chicago.

During the convention a ^{news magazine} poll came out in ~~a news magazine~~ ^{ed} showing how the candidates rated with the general public, and to our great delight Mr. Wallace was the favorite by a wide margin. Mary, Mark, and I believed ^{that, if} ~~if~~ the poll was known to the delegates to the convention, they would certainly cast their votes for Wallace. Surely they would want to nominate the candidate the people wanted. But how were we to get the poll in every delegate's hand?

That day the three of us were having lunch with Drew Pearson, the noted syndicated Washington columnist. He, too, was for Wallace. And he, ~~too~~ agreed with us that, if the poll ^{results} were known, Wallace would be nominated. After much feverish discussion, we hit on the brilliant idea of reproducing the poll in a full-page ad in the next morning's ^{Chicago} Tribune. And this we did at a cost of \$1,000.

Is this the Chicago Tribune?

The next day, in spite of our ad, Mr. Truman got the nomination. Mary and Mark were so enraged at the devious manner in which Mr. Roosevelt had not only permitted, but evidently ^{had} encouraged, the selection of Mr. Truman for his running mate that Mary wrote a letter of protest

See ?
p. 251
re
FDR's
presence
at
the
convention

to Mrs. Roosevelt and Mark wrote ^{the following} one to the President:

"Dear Mr. President:" ~~Mark wrote~~

"Surely one who has followed you so devotedly as I have for so long does not need to apologize for saying to you that I think you have made the greatest moral and political mistake of your career in the way in which you brought about the nomination of Senator Truman.

"We on the Courier-Journal had supported the renomination of Mr. Wallace, in spite of the candidacy of Senator Barkley, for whom we have great admiration, because we felt he ^[Wallace] had been made the symbol of the fight on you and all the works of liberalism....Senator Pepper told the literal truth when he said at Chicago that Wallace bore the scars of many a dagger aimed at you.

"....I have alienated kin and kith to fight the fight with you....I have taken two nasty jobs because you asked me to take them. I feel, therefore, that I have got the absolute right, and, moreover, the duty to tell you that I am sick and bewildered by your attitude toward Wallace. But beyond that, by your own position in all the maneuverings at Chicago.

"If you had said frankly that you did not want Wallace as a running mate again, that would

Truman clear in this fight how OK did that? It wasn't clear - I was maneuvering behind down. (?) I.e. Wallace

ok? (?)

got?

(?) FDR hit at the Convention thru out? see pp 244 and 251?

Have you did it for him - It would take pages to explain it all.

The next page explains a lot.

cap in?

have no doubt been understood and no doubt accepted ^{ly} with disappointment, of course; if you had said publicly that you wanted Truman, that would have been understood and regretted by Wallace supporters. But you were left in the position at Chicago of having said that if you were a delegate you would support Wallace and at the same time directing the fight against him. If that is not your true position, you owe it to yourself and to the loyalty of your followers to make it clear.... ^{!!}

Mark ~~then~~ reviewed briefly the Machiavellian moves that went on in the smoke-filled rooms; then returned to the attack:

"I confess I cannot understand how the Democratic Party can have any moral force or expect to appeal to people who value moral force as a factor in the success of any liberal movement when it plays the shell game. Truman may have improved the ticket had he not become, unfairly I believe, the symbol of duplicity and the fair-haired child of Southern racists and Northern city bosses...."

After much more in this vein Mark concluded with the statement that he would vote Democratic

in the fall "because there is no place else to go"; and added:)

709
"You have been, as Mr. Wallace says, 'the voice of liberalism in the Western World' and I can take a lot of punishment to hear that voice. As a newspaper publisher I shall go on supporting you, but I am much less happy about it than I have been and I think you ought to know it. I think you ought to know, too, that, in spite of what Mr. Hannegan and others may tell you, there are a great many of us who feel the same way. I wish it could come about that you could again get your information from the people, as you did in your days as governor and in your pre-war days at the White House. I'm sure you'd find them ready to follow you in every defiance to intolerance and to the revolt of bigots, in spurning every gesture of appeasement and in proving that this country does not have to sink into reaction by retreating step by step."

Mary wrote:

"Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

"I am moved to write to you out of a deep sense of bewilderment and sadness.... I think many women in America feel that one of your greatest contributions to advancing good government in this democracy has been the direct and sympathetic

liaison you have established between our government and women in general who, often inarticulate and lacking in effective means of political approach to people in office, have so often relied upon writing to you about developments in public affairs that puzzle or distress them. The kindly consideration you have given in the past to all sorts of queries and appeals is my own excuse[#] for writing to you now.

"I have just come back from the Democratic Convention in Chicago, As an editorial writer on the Courier-Journal, which supported Henry Wallace for the vice[^]-presidential nomination, I was particularly interested in his candidacy. Our support of him was based upon a long familiarity with his accomplishments in the public service, a deep admiration for his personal qualities, and the strong conviction that, next to the President himself, he best exemplifies all the vision and the liberal and progressive ideals of the New Deal. Like many, many other devoted friends of the President's and of Henry Wallace's, I came away[^] from Chicago sick at heart[^] over the method which was employed there to assure the nomination of Senator Truman and to defeat the Vice[^] President....

9
= /
1

at
in
11?

"I cannot believe that the President could, or would, willingly have contrived or countenanced a maneuver that can hardly be interpreted except as a betrayal of Henry Wallace. I know how Southern reactionaries feel about the Vice President. I know this feeling divided the Convention. On that very account his speech seconding the President's nomination electrified even the press box because of its superb honesty, its great-hearted courage. Could he not have been given a fair chance in a free convention? How can those of us who have loved and admired and trusted the President for so many years bear to believe the plausible and circumstantial story through which Mr. Hannegan explains how a coalition of city bosses and Southern reactionaries defeated Henry Wallace with the President's active assistance? I really cannot bear to believe such a story. And yet no other explanation has been offered. I know that many, many people who are loyal to the President came away from Chicago unwillingly persuaded that Mr. Hannegan's story was the truth and on that account saddened and disillusioned. At a time when the President and the party need the devotion and the

energies of all of us do you think there is any way at all to explain the maneuvering at Chicago, to put all that went on behind the scenes there in such a light that our faith and confidence would be restored?...

"I hope you will not be affronted or annoyed because I have spoken with frankness and candor. Above all, I hope you can help me.

"Sincerely yours,

✓ Mary Bingham

✓ (Mrs. Barry Bingham.)" ✓

Almost immediately, Mary received a letter from Mrs. Roosevelt, ¹ a rather shocking, outspoken letter, considering she was the wife of the President. It said:

"Dear Mrs. Bingham,

"I do not wonder at your sense of bewilder¹ment and sadness. I deeply regret that Henry Wallace did not win.

"Since you undoubtedly have watched the political scene within the Democratic Party in the past few years, I cannot understand why you should have been surprised. However, I do not feel that I can authoritatively and adequately answer you and therefore as soon as the President returns, I shall give him your letter and let him[#] answer it or

usually
le?
still
in it

give it to someone who can give you the explanation that you feel is needed.

"Very cordially yours,
Eleanor Roosevelt."

→]

(The President was on the Wst Coast.

Just before the convention opened, his train had stopped for a few hours in Chicago.)

A few days after Mary and Mark posted their letters, they had a telephone call from the White House, inviting them to come to see the President. Dr. James H. Richmond of Louisville was also invited to come with them.

Mary wrote ^{an} ~~an~~ account of the meeting in a letter to Barry:

"Our off-the-record appointment was for noon on Wednesday August 30th, 1944. The schedule was behind, and so we were put to cool in the Cabinet room until 12:15, and then Mark and I and your old teacher, Dr. Richmond (who had also written a protesting letter about H.W.'s traummaning) were ushered in. He [Mr. Roosevelt] looks very much better than his pictures might lead you to expect. His color is better, too, but his face looks thin, and his hand trembles a little when he lights a cigarette. H.W. told us later

he was
then,
not
at the
convention
throughout?
see p1
2/4/44

✓
~~Mr. R.
in the
white
house~~

~~at the
in~~

~~Dr. R.
about~~

?

H.W. =
Waller
of course.
OK?

that this has been the case for some time....

"We then sat down in chairs ranged in front of his ^[Mr. Roosevelt] desk, and, giving one of those head-thrown-back glances all around, he said, 'I didn't get you up here to hold a post-mortem; that is, unless you want one.'

"There was an uncomfortable silence which he took to mean [†] that we did not want one, and then he went on to say that, until he read the Eastern papers, he had known nothing about the activities at Chicago attributed to him. We said nothing to this, so there was a rather miserable pause, and I suppose my grief at hearing him utter such a fib was plain to be seen on my unsubtle face.

^[the President] "Dr. Richmond then rushed in with a question as to how he [†] thought the election was going. He replied that it depended altogether upon how the vote was got out. There was an extraordinary apathy, he thought, about the election.

"This gave Mark an opportunity to say that we believed that that apathy could be dispelled by a resurgence of liberal leadership on his part. It might make some people fighting mad, Mark added, but, he said, we believed that with the war so nearly won and the Republicans playing the game in public of cooperating for organization for peace, the

~~See earlier part of record at the source~~

issue of war and peace was not the one on which the administration would be reelected....

"Mark then touched on several points in the GJ ~~Carrier Journal~~ memorandum as subjects our host might well talk about in the Campaign: conservation of natural and human resources; especially social security; an enlargement of medical services (in view of the 32 percent of the draftees found unfit for military service); federal aid to education; the inauguration of new TVAs on the Missouri and Columbia Rivers, conservation of timber (reforestation) and mineral resources....

"Our host said that he had planned to talk to the Teamsters next month about conservation, and at that point got loose on the subject of the relation of poor worn-out land to wars. He talked about Persia and what a terrible naked hopeless land it was to fly over, and what wretched, dirty specimens the Persians are....Mark drew him back from Persia by suggesting that not only conservation of timber and other natural resources ought to be talked about, but conservation of human resources too, and the whole philosophy of government as exemplified in the early New Deal, of the government's responsibility for taking positive action in

this ok?
memoranda
not
previously
mentioned

points

Working
OK here?

the interest of the welfare of the people.
 Mark said then that the war had, necessarily,
 interrupted the carrying out of many of those
 early plans, but that he believed the people
 were ready now for a rebirth of the New Deal under
 the kind of dynamic liberal leadership the President
 had exercised at that time. Our host nodded, but
 did not seem enthusiastic....~~I did feel, however,~~
~~that Mark had caught his attention sufficiently~~
~~to interest him in the CJ memorandum that he then~~
~~put on his desk.~~

that time?
 in his
 period time
 1940-
 ? 1944
 ?
 1

"At this point our host went back to the subject
 of H.W. and said that his position at the Convention
 was very much ^{u-} that his own had been in 1932. On
 the second ballot on that occasion he had been 30
 votes short of a two-thirds majority. Farley and
 Louis Howe had called him to say they were dickering
 with Texas and California. He had asked what
 strings were attached, and they said Hearst and
 Jack Garner. He had replied that Hearst was a
 pretty bad string, as he considered he had been
 the worst influence in the country for the last
 half century. But in the end the compromise had had
 to be made. Mr. Roosevelt had accepted Mr. Garner
 for his vice-president to get the Texas delegation
 vote.

his
 his

✓
 ✓
 ✓
 ✓
 ✓

by
 1/1/40

He asked if we thought that compromise had been worth it. We said it had indeed. The parallel with the Truman expedient was, by indirection, at least strongly suggested. Henry, he said, simply did not have the reserves to throw into the fight.

"At about this point the door was cracked, but our host motioned to us to sit down again. 'I'll cut it short.' He went on to say that he had told Henry that he could have any job in the cabinet he wanted except that he would not fire Cordell Hull, Secretary of State. He went on to say that he had a plan in mind which appealed to him very much and suggested that it had about it a quality of poetic justice which he himself found highly satisfactory. With a huge twinkle he then said that Jesse Jones was, he felt, getting old, and moreover, his machinations with the Texas electors smelled bad, very bad indeed. He thought it would be a splendid thing for Henry to succeed Jones as Secretary of Commerce, and laughed heartily and said, 'Wouldn't that give business fits!'"...

"...Then Dr. Richmond said he hoped our host would be able to make some good fighting speeches during the campaign and was answered rather

Is this a new # in Mary's letter?

no

set down again? no mention of their rising apparently signaled in the "cracked" door?

Mary didn't mention that the record to say that was reflected in 44 above to understand that -

the?

he?

pronoun not grammatically clear here but

impatiently; 'Do you realize that I have a war on my hands, and that when I make a speech it takes five days out of my ordinary routine of work? 'Besides,' he added, ^vI want to go back to Hyde Park. I want to go home'

("We all agreed this remark was made in a childish spirit, or perhaps in the spirit of one who has been badgered to the point of exasperation.)

"At this point we got up to leave. When I shook hands with him ^[the President] he said, 'When you write Barry give him my love. There have been many times when I have wished he were here, but I put myself in his place and I did not think it would be fair to him to pull him out under the circumstances. He has done a great job. Perhaps he can come home soon....' I was so affected at this point that I could hardly respond with anything but a ^{e w}hugh ^vdry grin. However, I did manage to stammer out that you were particularly glad to have been on the Tuscaloosa in the Cherbourg engagement. He looked very grave the ⁿ and nodded his ^{head} vigorously and said that that ship was one of his old favorites. I said I knew that and that you had felt particularly happy to think that that ship was the one on which he had so often been himself, and with this somewhat inane remark we all left the room."

?

See [the President]

v - ~~v?~~

Barry?
or
Barry?

#

Mary and Mark and I were terribly wrong about Mr. Wallace. It took some time for ^{us} Mary and Mark to realize it, but finally ^{Mary's and Mark's} their own eyes and ears convinced them, ^{and Mark convinced me} Mr. Wallace came to Louisville to speak and Mary, ~~Edie Callahan~~ ^{and} ~~close friend of Mary's, Mark's, and mine and a strong Wallace supporter~~ and Mark went to hear him. I was out of town ^{for a} speaking ^{engagement} myself and afterward they went to a reception for him and there they heard a man who was traveling with Mr. Wallace repeat, so Mark reported to me later, "the most blatant Communist line. If he had been quoting from Pravda, he couldn't have spouted the Communist doctrine more enthusiastically. And goddamn, there stood Mr. Wallace, drinking it all in and not uttering one word of dissent. It was one of the most disillusioning experiences of my whole life."

Mark's woefully wrong assessment of Wallace's along with his failure to grasp the lasting power of Hitler character ~~was~~ rankled in his mind ~~ever since~~ all his remaining ~~days~~ ^{days}

Mary later summed up her feelings in this letter ^F

head and me:

"What strikes me about the whole affair is how very obtuse we all were about Henry Wallace's essential weakness, his soft-headed pro-Communism, his blindness at being used by Communists, in general, wooly-mindedness. I shiver to think

days
whom?
Is this the whole letter or a quote from a longer one?

When did WSE realize it?

2
82

X

what would have been the consequences if the terrible mantle had fallen upon him instead of upon the then-despised Harry Truman, one of the great presidents, I now feel."

Another national figure who stirred the emotions of the overwhelming majority of the Courier, and Louisville Times, and WHAS people was Adlai Stevenson. He was much ^{of} beloved and admired. ✓
 ✓ Vic Sholis, the manager of WHAS, took a leave of absence to work in ^{Stevenson's} ~~his~~ first campaign for the presidency and Barry took ^a leave to work in his second campaign. The night of ^{Stevenson's} ~~his~~ second defeat I don't believe there was a dry eye ^{among} ~~in~~ the large group of supporters who gathered at the papers to watch the returns come in. f

The local elections, however, usually caused the greatest excitement, ^{and} Mark ranks "Happy" ✓
 ✓ Chandler, as Kentucky's most colorful politician. ✓
 He was a loud, jolly, outgoing, ambitious man, ✓
 Like Jim Farley, he remembered everybody's name and he had a knack with the English language. For instance, he referred sneeringly to his political adversary, Wilson Wyatt, who was one-time mayor of Louisville and national chairman of Adlai Stevenson's first presidential campaign, and who sometimes wore spats, as "Old Ankle Blankets."

251 *x*

Though the Courier and Times were Democratic in ^{their} ~~its~~ leanings, ^{they} ~~it~~ sometimes supported Republican candidates.

It continuously supported Kentucky's Republican senator, John Sherman Cooper, though in 1960 ~~it took it~~ ^{it} took considerable agonizing and time ^{for them} to make up ^{their} ~~the~~ editorial minds.

Finally, the Courier, explaining ^{it had} ~~it~~ a "a choice between two men of dignity, integrity and solid accomplishment."

"In such a case it seemed to this paper that the scales should come on the incumbent in office. Keen Johnson, the Democrat, might be expected on his record to become a distinguished senator. Republican John Sherman Cooper is already one."

The local elections, however, usually caused the greatest excitement. Mark rated "Happy" Chandler as Kentucky's most colorful politician. ~~He was~~ a loud, jolly, out-going, ambitious man. Like Jim Farley he remembered everybody's name, and he had a knack with the English language. For instance, he referred ~~to~~ sneeringly to his political adversary, Wilson Wyatt, who was one-time mayor of Louisville and national chairman of ~~the~~ Adlai Stevenson's first presidential campaign, and who sometimes wore spats, as "Old ankle blankets."

on previous page already

When Senator Malcolm Logan died in October 1939,
 First, "Happy" ^{resigned as} was governor of Kentucky, ~~then~~ because
~~in October 1939, resigned when Senator Malcolm~~
~~Logan died, for he wanted to be appointed senator~~
 to serve out ^{Logan's} ~~his~~ term. The people of Frankfort
 claim you could hear him over several blocks
 yelling joyously to his wife, Mildred: "Mama,
 Logan is dead! Pack your bags. We're going to
 Washington." ^{That} ~~his~~, no doubt, is a slight exaggeration;
 still, Keen Johnson, who succeeded ^{Chandler} ~~him~~ as governor,
 came through with the appointment.

Mark had the honor, according to reliable
 sources, of being Number One on Chandler's list
 of S.O.B.'s. This ~~place of~~ distinction came about
 because the Courier-Journal and Louisville Times
 turned against ^{"Happy"} ~~him~~ in his race ~~in~~ 1942 for a full
 six-year senate term. ^{During} ~~In~~ that race, his opponent,
 John Young Brown, the father of the present
 governor of Kentucky, turned up evidence that
 Chandler, while serving out Senator Logan's term,
 had allowed a contractor friend, Ben Collins of
 Louisville, to build him as a gift a \$10,000
 swimming pool at his home in Versailles, Kentucky,
 using four tons of steel, brass, rubber, and other ^{priority}
 war materials ^d ~~priorities~~. Though a senate committee
 cleared Chan^dler of an "indictable offense," the

OK as
of
rule
date?

Courier-Journal and Times opposed him vigorously.
But, in spite of their opposition, he won.

In 1944, "Happy" had even more exalted ideas.
He wanted to be the Democratic vice-presidential
nominee and he tried, ~~as his first step,~~ to get
the Kentucky state convention to endorse him.
The papers editorially fought the endorsement and
The convention ended up endorsing Barkley.

Chandler claimed his failure to get the
state's support eventually prevented his being
president of the United States. His Byzantine
reasoning went like this: if he had ~~got~~^{won} the Kentucky
conventions' endorsement, he would have been
nominated for vice-president at the national
convention instead of Mr. Truman because he wouldn't
have fallen by the wayside as Senator Barkley had
done. And if he had received the nomination, he,
of course, would have been elected as Roosevelt's
running mate and, at Roosevelt's death, he would
have stepped into the White House.

x Though the Courier was definitely Democratic
in its leanings, it sometimes supported Republican
candidates. It continuously supported Kentucky's
Republican senator, John Sherman Cooper, though
in 1960 it took considerable agonizing and time to

Mark was pleased and proud that Chandler "Happy" credited
him with keeping him out of the Oval Office. He felt this achieve-
ment went a long way to make up for his worst political mistakes.

XXX