

DOS REVIEWED 18-Mar-2013: DECLASSIFIED FOR RELEASE IN FULL

Berlin, January 5, 1948

~~PERSONAL AND SECRET~~

Dear Jack:

General Clay is taking renewed interest in the question of direct reporting by Department of State officials in Germany to the Department. He took exception to a telegram sent by Bremen to the Department (372, December 24) which was repeated here regarding a conversation which Altaffer had with a German.

As you know, General Clay has never taken kindly to the matter of direct reporting by State Department personnel here, and the question has arisen from time to time. He said in this connection that he had never agreed with my point of view which is that as the two Departments of the Government are directly concerned with German affairs and as the Department of State has direct responsibility for foreign affairs generally and for German affairs as an essential element thereof, the solution of the difficulty lies in the closest kind of cooperation between the two Departments. Both are responsible agencies and neither is entitled to a monopoly. I pointed out that as far as State Department participation is involved we had been successful, I thought, in giving to Military Government valuable support and cooperation. In no sense could it be said, as General Clay suggests, that we are here operating as "political commissars." Our British, French and Soviet colleagues all report directly to their respective foreign offices and the

American State

The Honorable
John D. Hickerson,
Office of European Affairs,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

- 2 -

American State Department representatives should not be put in an inferior position. Furthermore, in respect of reporting by Consulates as an example, the British and French consular officers in our zone all report on matters coming within their cognizance to their Governments and I doubted that the Department would be inclined to agree that American consular officers should not have the right to report directly to the Department. General Clay feels that their reporting on matters concerning the occupation and Military Government, particularly, should be limited to reporting to the US Political Adviser at Berlin. He proposes to raise this question directly with the War Department and I am therefore bringing it to your attention. You may wish to give the question a little study as it might come up one way or another.

As I have told you, General Clay has never been happy in his own mind about our separate channel of communication as he feels that this is an encroachment on his authority as Military Governor. He believes that the latter should not be placed in the position of having another agency of our Government report on his activities. He said that if a civilian High Commissioner were appointed he is convinced that the latter would not tolerate that position and suggested that at the time when we had a High Commissioner in the Philippines the State Department representative did not report directly. I told him that I thought he was misinformed regarding the latter point. As I remember, our officer did report directly to the Department of State from Manila. I also pointed out that in places like Japan and Korea the State Department maintained a separate channel of communication. I emphasized also that what was important to me was that there be a spirit of cooperation between the two Departments bearing responsibility for German affairs and that I doubted that the State Department would be in a position to renounce its separate channel in an area as important as Germany.

All the best to you.

Yours ever,

Robert Murphy

RM/mk