

● PSF

State Dept. Deferments

Jan. - Feb. 1944

1944

PSF
State

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

821 altogether Foreign Service
303 Foreign Service under 38
54 Already disapproved

70 Department turned
down

Want it intact

PSF
Stats

24

423

70

198

94

February 9, 1944

My dear Mr. President:

With reference to our correspondence regarding the Selective Service status of Foreign Service personnel, I am pleased that the importance this Department places on the retention of its numerically small group of permanent Foreign Service Officers has been quite generally recognized. I note with concern, however, that the Review Committee has recently disapproved a number of junior Foreign Service Officers who are essential to this Department's war activities and who are irreplaceable under war conditions.

The Department has made a study of all male Foreign Service personnel of military age with a view to releasing all who could be spared. Out of the 494 cases reviewed, this Department's Agency Committee approved 281 requests for deferment (57%), and disapproved 213 (43%), of which 68 were deferrable on physical or other non-occupational grounds and 145 have been or are to be released when called for induction. Since December 7, 1941, 227 Foreign Service personnel of military age were released up to January 31, 1944, and in addition 125, who have been disapproved for occupational deferment, will be released when called, making a total of 352. Of the 423 Foreign Service personnel of all categories who are now deferred on occupational grounds, 191 are Foreign Service officers.

Thus the Department has made a sincere endeavor to cooperate with the Selective Service authorities by anticipating the standards of the Review Committee, and has made considerable sacrifices to this end. The release of so many men from our Foreign Service, which was already understaffed, has occasioned considerable inconvenience, but it was hoped that, by retaining the permanent officers, the necessary adjustments could be made without impairing functions essential to the war

The President,

effort.

The White House.

effort. I am convinced, however, that this cannot be done without the assistance of all available permanent officers, who form the backbone of the Foreign Service. Their training, experience and general competence make them indispensable. As stated in my letter of October 5, 1943, the ability of the Department to fulfill its responsibilities in the war depends on retaining the limited supply of specially selected professional officers.

There is a particularly acute shortage of junior officers. Although the period of their service may be relatively short, they make a valuable and essential contribution because of the qualifications on the basis of which they were selected; and, as their experience grows, their value is increasing. All are now doing responsible and necessary work. In fact, there is a greater demand for competent junior officers than for men of senior rank. Normally the Service recruits from 40 to 50 officers each year; 46 were admitted in 1940; 46 in 1941; and 35, who passed the examination in 1941, were commissioned in 1942. These officers had shaped their education for the preceding four to six years to prepare themselves for a Foreign Service career. Now the supply is cut off and the Service is shrinking due to deaths and retirements in the face of increasing responsibilities.

In order for the Department to meet these growing responsibilities, the Foreign Service must not only have an adequate supply of professional officers but its morale must be maintained at a high level. Up to the present time the excellent morale of Foreign Service personnel has been based primarily upon the conviction that they were performing work vital to the successful prosecution of the war. A considerable number have been subjected to the dangers and privations of war at some time or other since hostilities commenced in the Far East in 1937 and in Europe in 1939, and all are willing and anxious to serve wherever they can be of maximum usefulness.

Many of the younger members of the Service asked to be released in order that they might enter the armed forces, and all applications were carefully considered in order to determine whether the applicants would be of greater value in the armed forces than in the Foreign Service. The number was so large that the Foreign Service

was

was threatened with complete disruption at a time when it had work of vital importance to perform. Officers of military age were not denied their right of appeal, but it was pointed out to them in all sincerity that they not only are considered essential to the war effort in their present positions, but, in view of their irreplaceability under present conditions, they should remain in the Service as a matter of duty irrespective of their personal feelings.

The Department accordingly would be placed in a most embarrassing position if the constituted authorities do not agree with the Department's view that the services of the officers concerned are essential, and it would find it extremely difficult to take any course other than to grant requests for a release hereafter. The combined result of losses of those whose occupational deferments are not approved and those to whom releases could not well be refused would impair seriously the Department's ability to meet its essential responsibilities. While the loss of essential personnel would be very serious, I am even more concerned over the effect it would have on the morale of these public servants who have been making such an important contribution to the war effort. An increase in this Department's responsibilities as the war progresses is inevitable, and I am particularly anxious that the Foreign Service should not be weakened at this time.

I submit a list of persons recently disapproved by the Review Committee, all of whom I regard as essential to war-connected activities of the Foreign Service. These comprise 17 Foreign Service Officers, several Foreign Service code clerks at remote or extremely difficult posts, and several diplomatic couriers. I have not included persons filling positions which can be dispensed with or filled by persons not eligible for military service. Each of the cases on the attached list is being submitted to you on appeal in a separate communication for consideration on its individual merits. The present letter was considered necessary, however, in order to give a report on the total number of Foreign Service personnel released pursuant to your letters of September 28 and October 25, 1943, and to discuss in general the serious effect the loss of essential personnel at this time might be expected to have.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS WHOSE CASES HAVE BEEN
DISAPPROVED BY THE REVIEW COMMITTEE OF THE
WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

<u>Name</u>	<u>Post</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Date of Appointment</u>
Gannett, Michael R.	Nadras, India	24	12/ 8/41
Rosenberg, William S.	La Paz, Bolivia	25	11/ 4/42
Godley, George M.	Bern, Switzerland	26	3/20/41
Blue, William L. <i>Palermo, Italy</i>	Ciudad Bolivar, Venezuela	29	3/20/41
Burns, Findley, Jr. <i>to Naples</i>	Madrid, Spain	26	2/20/42
Carnahan, George	Barranquilla, Colombia	29	5/12/42
Green, Caspar D.	Concepcion, Chile	28	3/20/41
Greene, Joseph N. <i>Algiers</i>	Ottawa, Canada	23	12/18/41
Lee, Armistead M.	Dakar, French W. Africa	27	2/20/42
Lutkins, LaRue R.	Habana, Cuba, under assignment to Chungking	24	2/20/42
Martin, Edward W. <i>Winnipeg</i>	Hamilton, Bermuda	26	3/20/41
Poole, Richard A.	Barcelona, Spain	24	3/20/41
Rockwell, Stuart W.	Panama, Panama, under assignment to Algiers <i>(15/44)</i>	27	3/20/41
Sparks, Joseph S. <i>Karachi</i>	Havana, Cuba	27	12/19/41
Wanamaker, Allison T., Jr.	Bilbao, Spain	25	3/20/41
Williams, William L. <i>Port of Spain</i>	Caracas, Venezuela	24	2/20/42

CODE CLERKS WHOSE CASES HAVE BEEN DISAPPROVED
BY THE REVIEW COMMITTEE OF THE WAR MANPOWER
COMMISSION

Southerland, John Harlan	Addis Ababa, Ethiopia	25	7/ 7/41
Weldon, Walter Bruce	Ankara, Turkey	30	4/16/41
Cohagen, John A.	Moscow, U.S.S.R.	22	1/ 5/42
Whitney, Henry McA.	Kabul, Afghanistan	29	7/ 7/43
Howell, James Austin	Bern, Switzerland	27	3/19/41

DIPLOMATIC COURIERS WHOSE CASES HAVE BEEN
DISAPPROVED BY THE REVIEW COMMITTEE OF
THE WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Mueller, Paul H.	Rio de Janeiro, covering South America	26	6/26/41
French, Harry George	Cairo Middle East	25	2/16/42

Mr. Mueller serves in addition as Communications Officer, with responsibility for the supervision of the Courier Service in the area mentioned.

PSF State Dept folder 2-44
file Confidential
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

February 17, 1944

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT.

The attached letter from the Department of State, which you sent me, is an appeal from a decision of the Review Committee on Government Deferments which has declined deferment for 23 employees of the State Department. The list of these employees with their present post, age, marital status and date of appointment in the Department is attached.

I have had a long hearing on these cases in which the Department of State was represented by Assistant Secretary Howland Shaw and Mr. Davis, and the Review Committee was represented by its Chairman, Mr. Puryear, and Mr. Schartle.

The Department of State contends that its "Foreign Service Officers" should be deferred as a group because they are engaged in war work and have taken special training and passed special exams for this purpose.

I do not think that they are entitled to deferment as a group. If you will notice, none of them has any pre-Pearl Harbor children and they range from 23 years of age to 29. The youngest, 23 years, was appointed 2 years ago when he was only 21 and the oldest was appointed almost 3 years ago when he was 26. I do not think these young men, many of whom are single or just married, should be deferred while fathers are being drafted in government and out of government.

The only basis that I can see for deferment of some of them is that they are stationed at places which have been described as having very difficult climates so that older men or women could not serve.

I do not think that any of the 5 Code Clerks should be deferred. They are all single ranging from 22 to 30 and have been deferred for some time.

The 2 Couriers might be deferred on the basis of very confidential work and the necessity of strong physical condition.

I would like to spend 5 minutes running over this list with you. I have a file on each of these men.

Jm
S. I. R.



DEPARTMENT OF STATE
WASHINGTON

February 9, 1944

My dear Mr. President:

With reference to our correspondence regarding the Selective Service status of Foreign Service personnel, I am pleased that the importance this Department places on the retention of its numerically small group of permanent Foreign Service Officers has been quite generally recognized. I note with concern, however, that the Review Committee has recently disapproved a number of junior Foreign Service Officers who are essential to this Department's war activities and who are irreplaceable under war conditions.

The Department has made a study of all male Foreign Service personnel of military age with a view to releasing all who could be replaced. Out of the 494 cases reviewed, this Department's Agency Committee approved 281 requests for deferment (57%), and disapproved 213 (43%), of which 68 were deferrable on physical or other non-occupational grounds and 145 have been or are to be released when called for induction. Since December 7, 1941, 227 Foreign Service personnel of military age were released up to January 31, 1944, and in addition 125, who have been disapproved for occupational deferment, will be released when called, making a total of 352. Of the 423 Foreign Service personnel of all categories who are now deferred on occupational grounds, 191 are Foreign Service Officers.

Thus the Department has made a sincere endeavor to cooperate with the Selective Service authorities by anticipating the standards of the Review Committee, and has made considerable sacrifices to this end. The release of so many men from our Foreign Service, which was already understaffed, has occasioned considerable inconvenience, but it was hoped that, by retaining the permanent officers, the necessary adjustments could be made without impairing functions essential to the war effort.

The President,

The White House.

effort. I am convinced, however, that this cannot be done without the assistance of all available permanent officers, who form the backbone of the Foreign Service. Their training, experience and general competence make them indispensable. As stated in my letter of October 5, 1943, the ability of the Department to fulfill its responsibilities in the war depends on retaining the limited supply of specially selected professional officers.

There is a particularly acute shortage of junior officers. Although the period of their service may be relatively short, they make a valuable and essential contribution because of the qualifications on the basis of which they were selected; and, as their experience grows, their value is increasing. All are now doing responsible and necessary work. In fact, there is a greater demand for competent junior officers than for men of senior rank. Normally the Service recruits from 40 to 50 officers each year; 46 were admitted in 1940; 46 in 1941; and 35, who passed the examination in 1941, were commissioned in 1942. These officers had shaped their education for the preceding four to six years to prepare themselves for a Foreign Service career. Now the supply is cut off and the Service is shrinking due to deaths and retirements in the face of increasing responsibilities.

In order for the Department to meet these growing responsibilities, the Foreign Service must not only have an adequate supply of professional officers but its morale must be maintained at a high level. Up to the present time the excellent morale of Foreign Service personnel has been based primarily upon the conviction that they were performing work vital to the successful prosecution of the war. A considerable number have been subjected to the dangers and privations of war at some time or other since hostilities commenced in the Far East in 1937 and in Europe in 1939, and all are willing and anxious to serve wherever they can be of maximum usefulness.

Many of the younger members of the Service asked to be released in order that they might enter the armed forces, and all applications were carefully considered in order to determine whether the applicants would be of greater value in the armed forces than in the Foreign Service. The number was so large that the Foreign Service

was

was threatened with complete disruption at a time when it had work of vital importance to perform. Officers of military age were not denied their right of appeal, but it was pointed out to them in all sincerity that they not only are considered essential to the war effort in their present positions, but, in view of their irreplaceability under present conditions, they should remain in the Service as a matter of duty irrespective of their personal feelings.

The Department accordingly would be placed in a most embarrassing position if the constituted authorities do not agree with the Department's view that the services of the officers concerned are essential, and it would find it extremely difficult to take any course other than to grant requests for a release hereafter. The combined result of losses of those whose occupational deferments are not approved and those to whom releases could not well be refused would impair seriously the Department's ability to meet its essential responsibilities. While the loss of essential personnel would be very serious, I am even more concerned over the effect it would have on the morale of these public servants who have been making such an important contribution to the war effort. An increase in this Department's responsibilities as the war progresses is inevitable, and I am particularly anxious that the Foreign Service should not be weakened at this time.

I submit a list of persons recently disapproved by the Review Committee, all of whom I regard as essential to war-connected activities of the Foreign Service. These comprise 16 Foreign Service Officers, several Foreign Service code clerks at remote or extremely difficult posts, and several diplomatic couriers. I have not included persons filling positions which can be dispensed with or filled by persons not eligible for military service. Each of the cases on the attached list is being submitted to you on appeal in a separate communication for consideration on its individual merits. The present letter was considered necessary, however, in order to give a report on the total number of Foreign Service personnel released pursuant to your letters of September 28 and October 25, 1943, and to discuss in general the serious effect the loss of essential personnel at this time might be expected to have.

Sincerely yours,

Enclosure:
List

Cordell Hull

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS WHOSE CASES HAVE BEEN
DISAPPROVED BY THE REVIEW COMMITTEE OF THE
WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

<u>Name</u>	<u>Post</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Date of Appointment</u>
1 Gannett, Michael R.	Madras, India	24 M.1c	12/ 8/41
2 Rosenberg, William S.	La Paz, Bolivia	25 M.	11/ 4/42
3 Godley, George M.	Bern, Switzerland	26 S.	3/20/41
4 Blue, William L.	Ciudad Bolivar, Venezuela	29 S.	3/20/41
5 Burns, Findley, Jr.	Madrid, Spain	26 S.	2/20/42
6 Carnahan, George	Barranquilla, Colombia	29 M.	5/12/42
7 Green, Caspar D.	Concepcion, Chile	28 M.1c a	3/20/41
8 Greene, Joseph N.	Ottawa, Canada <i>Trans. to Algiers</i>	23 M.1c al	2/18/41
9 Lee, Armistead M.	Dakar, French W. Africa	27 M.	2/20/42
10 Lutkins, LaRue R.	Habana, Cuba, under assignment to Chungking	24 M.	2/20/42
11 Martin, Edward W.	Hamilton, Bermuda <i>Trans. to Europe</i>	26 M.	3/20/41
12 Poole, Richard A.	Barcelona, Spain <i>Belgium-Lux</i>	24 S.	3/20/41
13 Rockwell, Stuart W.	Panama, Panama, under assignment to Algiers	27 S.	3/20/41
14 Sparks, Joseph S.	Habana, Cuba <i>Trans. to Caracas or Calcutta Ind.</i>	27 M.1c al	12/19/41
15 Wanamaker, Allison T., Jr.	Bilbao, Spain	25 S.	3/20/41
16 Williams, William L.S.	Caracas, Venezuela	24 S.	2/20/42

CODE CLERKS WHOSE CASES HAVE BEEN DISAPPROVED
BY THE REVIEW COMMITTEE OF THE WAR MANPOWER
COMMISSION

17 Southerland, John Harlan	Addis Ababa, Ethiopia	25 S.	7/ 7/41
18 Weldon, Walter Bruce	Ankara, Turkey	30 S.	4/16/41
19 Cohagen, John A.	Moscow, U.S.S.R.	22 S.	1/ 5/42
20 Whitney, Henry McA.	Kabul, Afghanistan	29 S.	7/ 7/43
21 Howell, James Austin	Bern, Switzerland	27 S.	3/19/41

DIPLOMATIC COURIERS WHOSE CASES HAVE BEEN
DISAPPROVED BY THE REVIEW COMMITTEE OF THE
WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

22 Mueller, Paul H.	Rio de Janeiro, covering South America	26 S.	6/26/41
23 French, Harry George	Cairo Middle East	25 S.	2/16/42

Mr. Mueller serves in addition as Communications Officer, with responsibility for the supervision of the Courier Service in the area mentioned.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE
WASHINGTON
February 19, 1944

*BSF
State*

file

Dear Judge,

I have just received a verbal report from those present at the meeting held in your office on the 16th on Foreign Service deferment cases.

I want to express to you on behalf of the State Department my appreciation for your sympathetic understanding. The State Department representatives were greatly impressed by your broad and impartial point of view on the problem.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

The Honorable
Samuel I. Rosenman
The White House
Washington, D. C.

ES

MEMO FOR THE FILES

File

SIR discussed these deferments
2/22/44 with the President in the
presence of Under Secretary Stettinius.

February 22, 1944

Honorable Edgar S. Puryear,
Chairman, Review Committee on
Deferment of Government Employees,
War Manpower Commission,
Washington, D. C.

and

Honorable G. Howland Shaw,
Chairman, Agency Committee on Deferments,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

Gentlemen:

The President has reviewed the appeal taken by
the Department of State from the decision of the Review
Committee on Deferment of Government Employees involving
sixteen Foreign Service Officers, five code clerks and
two couriers. X67

His conclusion is that only one of them be deferred,
to wit, Mr. William L. Blue stationed at Ciudad Bolivar
in Venezuela. X

Very sincerely,

SAMUEL I. ROSENMAN
Special Counsel to the
President

X 20

X 252

X 1413-D-Review Committee folder

X 1413-D-Agency Committee folder

PST
State

1413

February 22, 1944

Honorable G. Howland Shaw,
Chairman, Agency Committee on Deferments,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

and

Honorable Edgar S. Puryear,
Chairman, Review Committee on
Deferment of Government Employees,
War Manpower Commission,
Washington, D. C.

Gentlemen:

The President has reviewed the appeal taken by the Department of State from the decision of the Review Committee on Deferment of Government Employees involving sixteen Foreign Service Officers, five code clerks and two couriers.

His conclusion is that only one of them be deferred, to wit, Mr. William L. Blue stationed at Ciudad Bolivar in Venezuela.

Very sincerely,

SAMUEL I. ROSENMAN
Special Counsel to the President
February 22, 1944

February 17, 1944

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT.

The attached letter from the Department of State, which you sent me, is an appeal from a decision of the Review Committee on Government Deferments which has declined deferment for 23 employees of the State Department. The list of these employees with their present post, age, marital status and date of appointment in the Department is attached.

I have had a long hearing on these cases in which the Department of State was represented by Assistant Secretary Howland Shaw and Mr. Davis, and the Review Committee was represented by its Chairman, Mr. Puryear, and Mr. Schartle.

The Department of State contends that its "Foreign Service Officers" should be deferred as a group because they are engaged in war work and have taken special training and passed special exams for this purpose.

I do not think that they are entitled to deferment as a group. If you will notice, none of them has any pre-Pearl Harbor children and they range from 23 years of age to 29. The youngest, 23 years, was appointed 2 years ago when he was only 21 and the oldest was appointed almost 3 years ago when he was 26. I do not think these young men, many of whom are single or just married, should be deferred while fathers are being drafted in government and out of government.

The only basis that I can see for deferment of some of them is that they are stationed at places which have been described as having very difficult climates so that older men or women could not serve.

I do not think that any of the 5 Code Clerks should be deferred. They are all single ranging from 22 to 30 and have been deferred for some time.

The 2 Couriers might be deferred on the basis of very confidential work and the necessity of strong physical condition.

I would like to spend 5 minutes running over this list with you. I have a file on each of these men.

S. I. R.

POSSIBLE DEFERMENTS

1. Gannett ' - Madras, India
2. Rosenberg ' - La Paz, Bolivia
4. Blue, Wm. L. - Ciudad Bolivar, Venezuela OK
6. Carnahan, G. - Barranquilla,
9. Lee x - Dakar
10. Lutkin ^ - Chungking
11. Martin - Leopoldville, Belgian Congo
14. Sparks - Karachi or Calcutta, India
16. Williams - Caracas (spell with La Guyara & Ciudad Bolivar)

~~22, Couriers -- hard physical work and confidential nature~~

- ① Bad climate - stress there - predecessor had
Leads as result of x has in U.S.
- ② 11000 feet high - most unhealthy in
service in Lopez
- ③ ~~Godley~~ Isolated in Suez Canal
- ④ Bad climate - Opusco River - sea level -
Malaria & dysentery in Venezuela
- ⑤ — how in Madrid
- ⑥ Bad climate - Bermangulla
- ⑦ One officer post opened at request of Navy in Chile
hot different climate.
- ⑧ No reason I can see - now transferred to Algiers (for Italy)
- ⑨ how in Tientsin - advised to Bahad
- ⑩ To be transferred to Chungking
- ⑪ In Bermuda now - I see no reason for this
Now transferred to Leopoldville, Belgium Congo
- ⑫ In Barcelona now
- ⑬ In U.S. now - Transferred to Algiers

- (14) no reason here Now transferred to Karachi, or
Calcutta, Ind
- (15) Now in Spain

February 17, 1944

- (16) Caracas - Spent with each at
Campeche & La Guayra & Ciudad
Bolivar to get malaria out.

Dear Judge Rosenbaum

The three Foreign Service Officers whom we
discussed yesterday afternoon and whose names
were felt inappropriate have been changed
to the following:

Code Clerks - Takes 9 mos to
learn

- (17) Ethiopia

- (18) Ankara

- (19) Moscow

- (20) Afghanistan

- (21) Bern

Sincerely yours,

J. Howard S. ...

J. Howard S. ...

- (22) Only 3 mos requested 175 for organizational
job

Judge Samuel I. Rosenbaum,
The White House.

- (23) Commers by report book - 215 as to Loyalty, Etc.

The White House.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE
WASHINGTON

February 17, 1944

Dear Judge Rosenman:

The three Foreign Service Officers whom we discussed yesterday afternoon and whose present posts were felt inappropriate have been transferred as follows:

Joseph N. Greene, Jr. -- Ottawa to Algiers (eventually Italy) to serve on the staff of the United States Member of the Advisory Council to the Allied Control Commission for Italy.

Edwin W. Martin -- Bermuda to Leopoldville, Belgian Congo.

Joseph S. Sparks -- Habana to Karachi, India or Calcutta, India, both of which require additional officer personnel.

May I say how much we appreciated the careful hearing which you gave to us.

Sincerely yours,

G. Howland Shaw

G. Howland Shaw

Judge Samuel I. Rosenman,
The White House.

February 9, 1944

My dear Mr. President:

With reference to our correspondence regarding the Selective Service status of Foreign Service personnel, I am pleased that the importance this Department places on the retention of its numerically small group of permanent Foreign Service Officers has been quite generally recognized. I note with concern, however, that the Review Committee has recently disapproved a number of junior Foreign Service Officers who are essential to this Department's war activities and who are irreplaceable under war conditions.

The Department has made a study of all male Foreign Service personnel of military age with a view to releasing all who could be replaced. Out of the 494 cases reviewed, this Department's Agency Committee approved 281 requests for deferment (57%), and disapproved 213 (43%), of which 68 were deferrable on physical or other non-occupational grounds and 145 have been or are to be released when called for induction. Since December 7, 1941, 227 Foreign Service personnel of military age were released up to January 31, 1944, and in addition 125, who have been disapproved for occupational deferment, will be released when called, making a total of 352. Of the 423 Foreign Service personnel of all categories who are now deferred on occupational grounds, 191 are Foreign Service officers.

Thus the Department has made a sincere endeavor to cooperate with the Selective Service authorities by anticipating the standards of the Review Committee, and has made considerable sacrifices to this end. The release of so many men from our Foreign Service, which was already understaffed, has occasioned considerable inconvenience, but it was hoped that, by retaining the permanent officers, the necessary adjustments could be made without impairing functions essential to the war effort.

The President,

The White House.

effort. I am convinced, however, that this cannot be done without the assistance of all available permanent officers, who form the backbone of the Foreign Service. Their training, experience and general competence make them indispensable. As stated in my letter of October 5, 1943, the ability of the Department to fulfill its responsibilities in the war depends on retaining the limited supply of specially selected professional officers.

There is a particularly acute shortage of junior officers. Although the period of their service may be relatively short, they make a valuable and essential contribution because of the qualifications on the basis of which they were selected; and, as their experience grows, their value is increasing. All are now doing responsible and necessary work. In fact, there is a greater demand for competent junior officers than for men of senior rank. Normally the Service recruits from 40 to 50 officers each year; 46 were admitted in 1940; 46 in 1941; and 35, who passed the examination in 1941, were commissioned in 1942. These officers had shaped their education for the preceding four to six years to prepare themselves for a Foreign Service career. Now the supply is cut off and the Service is shrinking due to deaths and retirements in the face of increasing responsibilities.

In order for the Department to meet these growing responsibilities, the Foreign Service must not only have an adequate supply of professional officers but its morale must be maintained at a high level. Up to the present time the excellent morale of Foreign Service personnel has been based primarily upon the conviction that they were performing work vital to the successful prosecution of the war. A considerable number have been subjected to the dangers and privations of war at some time or other since hostilities commenced in the Far East in 1937 and in Europe in 1939, and all are willing and anxious to serve wherever they can be of maximum usefulness.

Many of the younger members of the Service asked to be released in order that they might enter the armed forces, and all applications were carefully considered in order to determine whether the applicants would be of greater value in the armed forces than in the Foreign Service. The number was so large that the Foreign Service

was

was threatened with complete disruption at a time when it had work of vital importance to perform. Officers of military age were not denied their right of appeal, but it was pointed out to them in all sincerity that they not only are considered essential to the war effort in their present positions, but, in view of their irreplaceability under present conditions, they should remain in the Service as a matter of duty irrespective of their personal feelings.

The Department accordingly would be placed in a most embarrassing position if the constituted authorities do not agree with the Department's view that the services of the officers concerned are essential, and it would find it extremely difficult to take any course other than to grant requests for a release hereafter. The combined result of losses of those whose occupational deferments are not approved and those to whom releases could not well be refused would impair seriously the Department's ability to meet its essential responsibilities. While the loss of essential personnel would be very serious, I am even more concerned over the effect it would have on the morale of these public servants who have been making such an important contribution to the war effort. An increase in this Department's responsibilities as the war progresses is inevitable, and I am particularly anxious that the Foreign Service should not be weakened at this time.

I submit a list of persons recently disapproved by the Review Committee, all of whom I regard as essential to war-connected activities of the Foreign Service. These comprise 16 Foreign Service Officers, several Foreign Service code clerks at remote or extremely difficult posts, and several diplomatic couriers. I have not included persons filling positions which can be dispensed with or filled by persons not eligible for military service. Each of the cases on the attached list is being submitted to you on appeal in a separate communication for consideration on its individual merits. The present letter was considered necessary, however, in order to give a report on the total number of Foreign Service personnel released pursuant to your letters of September 28 and October 25, 1943, and to discuss in general the serious effect the loss of essential personnel at this time might be expected to have.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL

FA:MBD:AMD:NA
2/7/44

DISAPPROVED BY THE REVIEW COMMITTEE OF THE
WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Name	Post	Age	Date of Appointment
Gannett, Michael R.	Madras, India	24	12/ 8/41
Rosenberg, William S.	La Paz, Bolivia	25	11/ 4/42
Godley, George M.	Bern, Switzerland	26	3/20/41
Blue, William L.	Ciudad Bolivar, Venezuela	29	3/20/41
Burns, Findley, Jr.	Madrid, Spain	26	2/20/42
Carnahan, George	Barranquilla, Colombia	29	5/12/42
Green, Caspar D.	Concepcion, Chile	26	3/20/41
Greens, Joseph N.	Ottawa, Canada (Trans. to Algiers)	23	12/18/41
Lee, Armistead M.	Dakar, French W. Africa	27	2/20/42
Lutkins, LaRue R.	Habana, Cuba, under assignment to Chungking	24	2/20/42
Martin, Edward W.	Hamilton, Bermuda (Trans. to Algiers)	26	3/20/41
Pooler, Richard A.	Barcelona, Spain	24	3/20/41
Rockwell, Stuart W.	Panama, Panama, under assignment to Algiers	27	3/20/41
Sparks, Joseph S.	Habana, Cuba (Trans. to Karachi)	27	12/19/41
Wanamaker, Allison T., Jr.	Bilbao, Spain	25	3/20/41
Williams, William L.S.	Caracas, Venezuela	24	2/20/42

CODE CLERKS WHOSE CASES HAVE BEEN DISAPPROVED
BY THE REVIEW COMMITTEE OF THE WAR MANPOWER
COMMISSION

Southerland, John Harlan	Addis Ababa, Ethiopia	25	7/ 7/41
Weldon, Walter Bruce	Ankara, Turkey	30	4/16/41
Cohagen, John A.	Moscow, U.S.S.R.	22	1/ 5/42
Whitney, Henry McA.	Kabul, Afghanistan	29	7/ 7/43
Howell, James Austin	Bern, Switzerland	27	3/19/41

DIPLOMATIC COURIERS WHOSE CASES HAVE BEEN
DISAPPROVED BY THE REVIEW COMMITTEE OF THE
WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Mueller, Paul H.	Rio de Janeiro, covering South America	26	6/26/41
French, Harry George	Cairo Middle East	25	2/16/42

Mr. Mueller serves in addition as Communications Officer, with responsibility for the supervision of the Courier Service in the area mentioned.

558 1 1944

STATE DEPARTMENT

The following cases sent to Judge Rosenman by special messenger at his request-

Martin, Edward Webb Age 26, Vice Consul, Consulate General, Hamilton, Bermuda
Disapproved

Poole, Richard A., Age 24, Vice Consul, Consulate General, Barcelona, Spain-
Disapproved

Rockwell, Stuart Wesson, Age 26, third secretary and Vice Consul, Embassy, Panama
Disapproved

Wanamaker, Allison Temple, Jr. Age 25, Vice Consul, Bilbao, Spain
Disapproved

Whitney, Henry McAlpin, Age 29, Clerk, Legation, Kabul, Afghanistan
Disapproved

Southerland, John H. Age 25, Clerk, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia-Disapproved

-Rosenberg, William S., Age 25, Vice Consul & 3d Sec. Embassy, La Paz-Disapproved

-French, Harry George, Age 25, Courier, Cairo-Disapproved

Howell, James Austin, Age 27, Clerk, Legation, Bern-Disapproved

Lee, Armistead M., Age 27, Vice Consul, American Mission, Dakar-Disapproved

Blue, William L. Age 29, Vice Consulate, Ciudad Bolivar, Nevezuela-Disapproved

-Cohagen, John A. Age 22, Foreign Service Clerk, Embassy, Moscow-Disapproved

Green, Caspar Dunham, Age 28, Vice Consul, Vice Consulate, Concepcion-Disapproved

Greene, Joseph N. Jr. Age 23, 3d Secretary and Vice Consul, Legation, Ottawa-
Disapproved

Sparks, Joseph S., Age 27, FSO, Embassy, Habana-Disapproved

Williams, William L. S. Age 24, Vice Consul, Caracas-Disapproved

Lutkins, LaRue R. Age 24, Vice Consul, Habana-Disapproved

Weldon, Walter Brice, Age 30, Clerk, Embassy, Ankara-Disapproved

-Mueller, Paul H., Age 26, Diplomatic Courier, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil-Disapproved

Godley, George McM. age 26, 3d Sec. Legation, Bern-Disapproved

Burns, Findley, Jr. Age 26, 3d Sec & Vice Consul, Embassy, Madrid

Gannett, Michael R. Age 24, FSO-Madras-Disapproved

Carnahan, George, Age 29, Vice Consul, Barranquilla, Colombia-Disapproved

4-0