NW. - Politics
RR. - Grovey case
Re - Grovey case (Texas Primary)

May 27, 1935

Dear Mr. Margold:

Here is the letter which I wrote to Mrs. Roosevelt. She will probably get in touch with you.

Here is the Bulletin of the I.J.A. of which I spoke today. You will note on page 3 the article regarding the primary cases.

It is certainly great to know that you will draft the bill for us. It would be excellent if we could at least get it introduced and have hearings on it in the present session of Congress, soon after the Supreme Court decision in Grovey vs. Townsend.

I also enclose copy of letter from Manley Hudson regarding this.

I am writing Herrick today.

Will telephone you on Wednesday.

Ever sincerely,

Secretary

Nathan R. Margold, Esq.
Department of the Interior
Washington, D. C.

NW/RR

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

ARTHUR B SPINGARN
COUNSELLOR AT LAW

69 WEST 44TH STREET
NEW YORK CITY

re - Inquest - case
Texas Primary

June 3rd, 1935.

Mr. Walter White,
69 Fifth Ave.
New York City.

Dear Walter:-

This morning I am in receipt of a letter from Prof. Manley O. Hudson, reading as follows:- "I am afraid I cannot find time to draft the bill as you suggest before I leave for Europe in a few days. I am very sorry about it".

I understand that Margold is preparing a draft of such a Bill. When he has finished with it, perhaps it might be a good idea to send a copy to a selected group of the Legal Committee for their suggestions.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur B. Spingarn

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Politics
Re - Grovey case
(Texas Primary)

June
6th
1935

Dear Margold:

Here is self-explanatory copy of letter I received this morning from Mrs. Roosevelt.

Once again I have had to postpone my trip to Washington because of matters here. Can you give me some idea as to when you think you can let me have the draft of the bill dealing with primaries which you were generous enough to offer to prepare. We want, if possible, to get this introduced in this session of Congress for its psychological effect. If we wait too long after the Supreme Court decision in Grovey vs. Patterson, it will give our enemies a chance to strengthen their forces.

If you have any suggestions as to who would be the best man to introduce the bill, let me have them, won't you? What do you think of Bennett Clark, of Missouri? I don't want to have either Costigan or Wagner feel that I would impose upon them, and there might be a definite value in having a border state senator introduce the bill as this would rob it somewhat of the sectional angle.

Cordially,

Secretary

Mr. Nathan R. Margold
Solicitor of Department of Interior
Washington, D. C.

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR
WASHINGTON

June 13, 1935

Mr. Walter White, Secretary
N. A. A. C. P.
69 Fifth Avenue
New York City

Dear Walter White:

Enclosed herewith are the bills which I promised to draft. Bill No. 1 is in alternative form because I have not had enough time to consider the two alternatives and to make a selection between them. While the bills No. 1 and 2 could easily be combined together, I think it better from the point of view of strategy as well as from the point of view of logical treatment to introduce the two bills separately.

The bills have been drafted hastily and the memo attached thereto is merely intended to block out the general grounds on which their validity is based. I think you have enough now to submit to your Legal Committee and to other interested persons for discussion.

Hastie has read the bills and memo and is thoroughly in accord with my views. We both believe, however, that the language of the bills themselves can be simplified and improved and we will both give the matter further consideration.

With best wishes and regards, I am

Cordially yours,

(Signed)
Nathan R. Margold

enc

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Politics
Re - Grovey - case

June
16th
1935

Dear Felix Frankfurter:

I would not have sent this to you, in view of the letters that you have written me about your not being able at this time to express opinions, but Nathan R. Margold urged me to do so, thinking that you might be able to make an exception in this case.

You are familiar already with our long fight against the white primary, and the decisions in Nixon v. Condon and Nixon v. Herndon which we won. You will remember also the recent adverse decision in Grovey v. Townsend, with which case we had no connection.

Nathan Margold has drafted two bills to meet the situation. I enclose self-explanatory copy of letter together with copy of alternative drafts of Bill No. 1, copy of Bill No. 2 and supporting memorandum on the constitutional basis for the two bills.

We realize fully that there is no chance of getting either of the bills passed at this session. We do, however, want to get them introduced as soon as possible, preferably by a southern or a border-state senator (Costigan thinks that Neely will be excellent) in this session for their moral effect and as a basis for building of country-wide support for passage in the next session.

I would be most grateful if you would look these over and give me the benefit of your opinion as to the best form in which they may be introduced. Arthur Spingarn, James Marshall, and Max Lowenthal are also being asked to do the same.

Cordially,

Prof. Felix Frankfurter
Harvard University Law School
Cambridge,
Massachusetts.

Secretary.

WW:CTF

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

June
15th
1935

Dear Max:

You are familiar already with our long fight against the white primary, and the decisions in Nixon v. Condon and Nixon v. Herndon which we won. You will remember also that we discussed in Washington the adverse decision in Grovey v. Townsend with which case we had no connection.

Nathan Margold has drafted two bills to meet the situation. I enclose self-explanatory copy of letter together with copy of alternative drafts of Bill No. 1, copy of Bill No. 2 and supporting memorandum on the constitutional basis for the two bills.

We realize fully that there is no chance of getting either of the bills passed at this session. We do, however, want to get them introduced as soon as possible, preferably by a southern or a border-state senator (Costigan thinks that Neely will be excellent) in this session for their moral effect and as a basis for building of country-wide support for passage in the next session.

I would be most grateful if you would look these over and give me the benefit of your opinion as to the best form in which they may be introduced. Arthur Spingarn, Jimmie Marshall and Felix Frankfurter are also being asked to do the same.

Cordially,

Secretary.

Mr. Max Lowenthal
418 Central Park West
New York City.

WW:CTF

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

June
13th
1935

Dear Jimmie:

Enclosed is self-explanatory copy of letter from Margold containing alternative drafts of Bill No. 1, Bill No. 2, and of Preliminary Memorandum to meet the situation created by the Supreme Court decision in Grovey v. Townsend in the white primary.

There is practically no chance of getting either of these bills passed by the present Congress but it is imperative that we get them introduced in this session for their moral effect and that we may begin building up sentiment for active support of the bills in and passage by the next Congress.

Will you look these over and let me have your opinion about the exact form in which the bill should be introduced?

I am sending copies of the same documents also to Arthur Spingarn, Max Lowenthal and Felix Frankfurter asking their opinion.

Cordially,

Secretary.

James Marshall, Esq.,
150 Broadway
New York City.

WW:CTF

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

June
15th
1935

Dear Arthur:

Enclosed is self-explanatory copy of letter from Margold containing alternative drafts of Bill No. 1, Bill No. 2, and of Preliminary Memorandum to meet the situation created by the Supreme Court decision in Grovey v. Townsend in the white primary.

There is practically no chance of getting either of these bills passed by the present Congress but it is imperative that we get them introduced in this session for their moral effect and that we may begin building up sentiment for active support of the bills in and passage by the next Congress.

Will you look these over and let me have your opinion about the exact form in which the bill should be introduced?

I am sending copies of the same documents also to Jimmie Marshall, Max Lowenthal and Felix Frankfurter asking their opinion.

Cordially,

Secretary.

Arthur B. Spingarn, Esq.,
36 West 44th Street
New York City.

WW:CTF

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Politics
Re - Gruney - case

June
16th
1935

Dear Margold:

My best thanks for the bills and the memorandum. I have immediately sent copies to Arthur Spingarn, Felix Frankfurter, Max Lowenthal and Jimmie Marshall. I will write you as soon as I shall have heard from them.

Do keep me advised of developments, and especially about your interviews with Keyserling and Wagner. I suggest you ask Keyserling to advise you also regarding Copeland. I am doing my best from this end.

Cordially,

Secretary.

Nathan R. Margold, Esq.,
Solicitor,
Department of the Interior
Washington, D. C.

NW:CTF

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR
WASHINGTON

June 12, 1935.

5151

JUN 1 2

Mr. Walter White, Secretary,
N. A. A. C. P.,
69 Fifth Avenue,
New York City.

Dear Walter White:

Enclosed herewith are the bills which I promised to draft. Bill No. 1 is in alternative form because I have not had enough time to consider the two alternatives and to make a selection between them. While the bills No. 1 and 2 could easily be combined together, I think it better from the point of view of strategy as well as from the point of view of logical treatment to introduce the two bills separately.

The bills have been drafted hastily and the memo attached thereto is merely intended to block out the general grounds on which their validity is based. I think you have enough now to submit to your Legal Committee and to other interested persons for discussion.

Hastie has read the bills and memo and is thoroughly in accord with my views. We both believe, however, that the language of the bills themselves can be simplified and improved and we will both give the matter further consideration.

I have an appointment to see Keiserling tomorrow at 10 a.m. I shall try to arrange at that time to see Senator Wagner. I hope you are taking care of the matter with reference to Senator Copeland and Governor Lehman. The time has now come when immediate action is imperative.

With best wishes and regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

Nathan R. Margold

enc.

Frankfurter
ABS
Marshall
Rosenthal

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS