

Reply to Payne's Memo of Oct 1-3, 1943.

Oct. 10, 1943.

Letter sent Payne
was copied from this
draft.

Dear Harry:

I hope that what I am going to say in this letter about the copy you have prepared for Mr. Wells re the Jeep will not be treading on the toes of a prize baby of yours. I know what a job it must have been to get all this copy together. But I feel that I must tell you frankly the effect I believe it will create on a reader who is at all critically minded.

In the first place, you have to bear in mind that Mr. Wells' article is to be passed on by the War Department Press Bureau. As the copy now stands, it hasn't a chance of getting by. It is too highly critical of personalities and measures to permit it to receive any color of official sanction. While I think the facts ought to be frankly stated, I think it is best to allow them to speak for themselves, without adding any embroidery.

In the second place, you haven't clearly indicated the ~~roots~~ genesis of the military conception of the car. So far as you have

gone.
^ into this, you have represented it as the
outgrowth of the ^{to make clear} Short-Howie carrier. I have
repeatedly attempted that there was never
any connection either in function or design
between the Howie carrier and the jeep.

About two years before you appeared
in the War Department, I held a session
in person with the Infantry Board at Fort
Benning on the subject of the Howie carrier.
It was unanimously agreed that this
vehicle should be rejected, not of the
ground of deficient performance, but
because the conception of the car was
fallacious; that is, we believed that
the use of an unarmored assault car
was an utter impracticability.

The Howie car had nothing in
common with the jeep in conception. It
was not a cross-country car but would
have to be transported on a truck to a
point near the front-line where it would
be put into action. It was not a
weapons carrier but a ^{firing} platform for a
weapon. It was designed for front-line

use, the jeep for movement in rear of the front line. It had much more relation to a tank than to any other form of motor ^{transport.} ~~power carrier~~

You also connect the ~~jeep~~ with the motor cycle. The carrier was never intended to perform any of the functions of the motor cycle and ~~had no relation to it.~~ ^{The two vehicles had no common features of design.}

I don't think you intended to create these impressions, but that's the way your copy reads to me.

If you bring the ^{Howie} carrier into the picture at all, I think you ought to state

Though the Howie carrier had no connection with the jeep ^{in the minds of the people responsible for the military conception of the jeep,} I think there was a connection (entirely coincidental) in your mind. When you first appeared in the War Department, you were given the impression ^{by high authorities} that the Howie carrier would be adopted. ~~and~~ When you first appeared at the office of the Chief of Infantry, you appeared to believe that we would be required to accept the carrier and that ~~it was~~ ^{the only question} to be settled was one of detail. It was some time before you became

convinced that we would on no account accept the Howie carrier. At the same time, ~~you would~~ ^{we informed you} informed that the infantry was interested in replacing the motorcycle by a vehicle more efficient for cross-country movement, and it was from this angle that the development of the jeep commenced. Later the possibilities for other missions became apparent.

So that is all there was to the connections between the jeep, the Howie carrier, and the motorcycle. The only connection was that as different projects, they were under consideration at the same time; i.e., the Howie carrier as assault vehicle on its own account, the jeep as replacement for the motorcycle and weapons carrier. If you bring the Howie carrier into the picture at all, I think it ought be about as above described. I feel particularly keenly about this matter because certain persons in the War Department have laid claim to credit for the development of the jeep because they forced consideration of the Howie carrier - in fact did all they could to force its adoption. It seems a strange (and) thing. Thirdly, you convey the impression that

the man-handling feature originated with the jeep. This was an outstanding feature of the $\frac{1}{2}$ ton truck, though not of course in equal degree with the jeep. When in 1938, I was trying to have the $\frac{1}{2}$ ton weapons carrier replaced by the $\frac{1}{2}$ ton, I had moving pictures ^{made} of the $\frac{1}{2}$ ton being man handled out of trouble by an infantry squad while the $\frac{1}{2}$ ton took about half a company. I think that in all fairness, Marmou-Herrington ought to be given credit for their contribution.

~~Lastly~~ Fourthly, I think Colonel Lee is not given the place he is entitled to. You don't mention him in connection with the amphibious development, yet he and he alone was responsible for initiating the amphibious project.

Fifthly ~~Lastly~~, I think your treatment of the whole subject partakes a little too much much of the romantic. If I do not mistake, what is wanted is a factual account of the genesis of the jeep; anything in the nature of a sales talk won't fit the case.

Lastly, I don't think you do yourself

justice. You create the impression that your activities were for the most part promotional - which is what too many people are saying already. This obscures the really big ideas in connection with the development: on the military side, ~~the~~ light weight to permit man handling combined with qualities of sturdiness to stand difficult cross-country movement and low silhouette to decrease vulnerability; on the engineering side, the realization of these qualities through decrease in the dimensions of the wheel base - a simple idea but one which seems to have occurred to no one before. (over)

I guess I ~~don't~~ ^{hardly} need to say after the above comment that I don't see any way in which I could be helpful in suggesting amendments to your copy. To be of any service I should have to re-cast your draft completely - which you haven't asked me to do.

Sincerely,
GAF

denouncement that people who tried to face through
a fallacious proposition, should on that ground
lay claim to credit justly accruing to the
agency which defeated them and faced through a
wholly unrelated development

The people who conceived these ideas and
initiated ^{the action} and prosecuted the development are
the ones around whom the story should
be built. You can safely ^{omit} the small fry
and the pretenders who climbed on after
the project was well on the road to success.
As I have told you before, I have no
ambition to be removed from the quietude of
my retired ~~status~~ ^{life} by any build-up in
connection with the pep. To assign any
interest I ^{may} have the matter to Colindale
to whom after all I owe acknowledgment for
the accomplishment of my office in this connection.

G.L.P.