Dear Dannie:

Mr. Bachrach has been very thoughtful about sending me copies of correspondence concerning developments in the Barcelona matter and it looks to me as though the situation were not encouraging in spite of all the great efforts which you all are making and I think this is largely due to the still strange and impossible attitude of the British Government. In spite of the fact that British prestige has so greatly decreased in so many parts of the world, the influence of Great Britain in Spain was so great for so many years that I cannot help but believe that the voice of Britain still carries a great deal of weight there. So far as the Canadian Government is concerned, it is still timid, but I am inclined to believe that it would be willing to go very much further, especially in the last months, but as long as the Government in London takes this attitude, it is difficult for the Canadians to assert themselves.

So far as the U.S. is concerned, there is not any doubt that Culbertson did a great deal of harm, in my opinion, while he was there in the Embassy, for I believe that he was never in sympathy with the interest which our Government took in this matter of Barcelona, and it is very easy for high officials and low ones to catch the spirit on the part of one who is talking for the Government. Now that Griffith is there I do not think things are much better because, although he ought to be 100% for private enterprise and probably is in his heart and so far as his pocket is concerned, he is playing a game of his own. I think he has very little fundamental interest in anything that does not further his own personal aims.

The news in the press recently is not encouraging regarding U.S. aid to Spain. It looks as though the conversations started by the Navy and the mission of General Spry are to be followed up. The enclosed article from the New York Times, airmail edition of January 2, will be interesting to you. You know that ECA passes out of the picture at the end of 1951 and the so-called
Mutual Security Agency takes its place, and the head of this is Averell Harriman. I gather that all types of aid, military and economic, are to be controlled directly by this Agency which Harriman heads, and this includes Point Four aid to undeveloped countries.

I do not know whether you know Averell Harriman, but he is an old and good friend of mine and I think he is a very understanding man. It would be an extraordinary thing if he were not deeply attached to the principles of private enterprise and were not deeply incensed by the treatment of the Barcelona Company. Whether you know him or not, I think it would be a good thing if you could go to see him while you are in Europe. I think he spends most of his time in Paris, but you could easily learn of his whereabouts through our Embassy in Brussels or London, and it is even possible that you could see him more conveniently for yourself somewhere other than Paris. I think you could tell him the Barcelona story in its main outlines in less than ten minutes and sufficiently to arouse his interest and I believe, his action in some ways. I do not think it would be advisable to ask Harriman to read a lot of material because he has not got the time to do it. By the same token, as I know him well, I know that he would become impatient at a long recital of the Barcelona matter, but you would be able to present the whole matter to him in a few minutes, and Harriman would immediately catch the broad implications of the case. I think he could go far in seeing to it that certain things are done by Spain before she is given certain assistance whether it be military or economic, by the U.S.

I do not know whether Sam Berger is still with Harriman. He was formerly a secretary in the American Embassy in London and occupied himself with labor matters. He knew all the labor leaders and principal people in the Labor Government and was on very friendly and, in some cases, intimate terms with them. About two years ago Berger was transferred to Washington where he became one of Harriman's principal secretaries and assistants and it is altogether possible that he may be with Harriman in Paris. Berger is a very good friend of Nat Samuels and I am sure you have heard Nat speak of him. Personally I have never felt too sure of Berger's fundamental convictions and have felt that he may be a little to the left, but it would be difficult for me to think that Harriman would keep someone addicted towards the left with him. But you and I have lived long enough to know that strange things happen in this world.

I do not mention Berger's name with the idea that you should seek Harriman through him because I am sure you can approach Harriman directly or through friends of much greater importance than Berger. I would suggest a direct approach to Harriman by yourself. I do not know whether such a conversation with Harriman fits in with your plans and possibilities, but I merely mention this because
I consider it as one of the possibilities for doing something useful. Harriman is in such an important position that once he has certain convictions, he can go far towards doing things or stopping things from being done.

I am dictating this letter rather hurriedly, as I just saw this clipping today, and I thought it would be important to you because of the Benton Amendment mentioned therein and of the possibilities which lie in a conversation with Harriman.

With all good wishes, I am

Cordially and faithfully yours,

George S. Messersmith.