

**FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT LIBRARY  
PRESIDENT'S SECRETARY FILE  
SERIES 4: DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE  
BOX 59  
FOLDER: Navy, July - December 1941**

**United States Senate**

**MEMORANDUM**

To Adm. Stark.

I shall not bother  
the President with this.  
I have told Adm. Robinson -  
son to go ahead  
on program as outlined.

JF

To  
Dept on  
12/12

PSF Navy Plan - 1941

In reply refer to Initials  
and No.

NAVY DEPARTMENT  
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS  
WASHINGTON

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

December 11, 1941

I consider it imperative that, for the next few years, we utilize our naval shipbuilding capacity to the utmost, by laying down new ships as soon as building ways are made available by the launching of ships in the current naval building program. Some building ways will become available in March 1942.

On this basis the appended tables show the additional combatant ships that can be laid down within the ~~next~~ calendar years 1942, 1943 and 1944, without interference with the present naval or merchant shipbuilding programs.

These tables are based on information available in November 1941 and do not fully take into account the effects of the recently ordered speed-up in our current naval program. Undoubtedly this speed-up will permit some advancement, particularly in the latter part of this supplementary program, but it is too early to make an accurate estimate of its effects.

This supplementary program does not include any battle-ships because it appears impracticable to include them without interference with current building programs.

The progress of the war may dictate some modification of the numbers and types presented in these tables.

It is respectfully recommended that immediate authorization be obtained to build 900,000 additional tons of combatant ships. It is further recommended that this authorization permit transfer, within the total of 900,000 tons, of tonnage from one type to another as war experience may dictate.

Franklin D. Roosevelt Library

DECLASSIFIED

DOD DIR. 5200.9 (9/27/88)

Date- 3-3-59

Signature- Carl S. Spicer

J. H. R. Stark.

In reply refer to Initials  
and No.

Op-10-MD

NAVY DEPARTMENT  
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS  
WASHINGTON

December 13, 1941

Dear Mr. President:

We have very carefully gone over your thoughts as presented by Jack on the Carrier Program.

First, I would bring to your attention the fact that we have six C-3 merchant type vessels being built by the Maritime Commission (one just delivered) now being converted to LONG ISLANDS for the British. The flight deck extended to full length of the ship.

Second, the British have asked us for nine more converted ships of this type.

Third, we are looking into the additional fifteen for ourselves.

Getting these twenty-four additional vessels will be at the expense of the Allied shipping situation, with which you are familiar. We are taking this up with Land and of course under the new setup, Harry will be in this.

Now as to the Carrier Program (additional to the above) which we sent over:- both Newport News and New York Ship have reversed their previous statements that they could build HORNETS, that is, 21,000 ton ships, more quickly than they could ESSEX type of 27,500 ton type; this for the reason that the ESSEX type is now in production, is easier and quicker to build, and sources of supply of materials are fully developed. The reason that they are easier and quicker to build is:- the construction is simple and the ship can be erected quicker since the parts go together better. The ESSEX type has been specially engineered for rapid production by making the maximum use of welding. This was not done on the HORNET type. A redesign of the HORNET type to permit welding would mean much delay.

The small RANGER-WASP type has very inferior protection against under-water damage. They are really very vulnerable.

The ESSEX is much superior to either the HORNET or the RANGER. It has a much more reliable engineering plant and far better under-water protection.

You will remember when you called me over the phone I told you all dates referred to calendar years; that is correct. In making up the typewritten sheet, an error was made in using the term "fiscal" year.

We are working on the assumption that you approve the overall 900,000 tons and are sending over a bill for your approval.

It is my understanding that Senator Walsh and Congressman Vinson are prepared to push the bill through, once you approve.

The General Board, Bureau of Ships, and Bureau of Aeronautics concur with me in the recommendation that we build ships of the 27,500 ton ESSEX class.

*J. R. Stark*

The President  
The White House

SHIPS BUILDING DIVISION (785)  
BUREAU OF SHIPS  
NAVY DEPARTMENT

NOVEMBER 14, 1942

EXTENSION TO CURRENT BUILDING PROGRAM

*No. Collected?*  
*No. Fiscal?*

	1942		1943 (1ST HALF)		1943 (2ND HALF)		1944		1945	1946	1947	TOTAL		
	LAY DOWN NO.	TONNAGE	LAY DOWN NO.	TONNAGE	LAY DOWN NO.	TONNAGE	LAY DOWN NO.	TONNAGE	COMPLETE NO.	COMPLETE NO.	COMPLETE NO.	COMPLETE NO.	NO.	TONNAGE
<i>NAVY</i> AIRCRAFT CARRIERS (CV)	1	21,000			1	21,000			1	1			2	42,000 CV
<i>NAVY</i> AIRCRAFT CARRIERS (CV)	1	28,855		<del>28,855</del>	2	56,310		2	56,310	2	2	2	6	170,730 CV
LARGE CRUISERS (CB)								5	141,750		2	3	5	141,750 CB
LIGHT CRUISERS (CL)	2	21,000 <i>OK</i>	4	84,000 <i>OK</i>	1	10,500		11	115,500	2	6	10	18	189,000 CL
LIGHT CRUISERS (CL)					1	6,300					1		1	6,300 CL
DESTROYERS (DD)	11	24,255 <i>OK</i>	38	83,750 <i>OK</i>	35	77,375	4		62	17			84	185,220 DD
DESTROYERS (DD)	2	3,424 <i>OK</i>	8	13,696 <i>OK</i>	8	13,696	4		12				18	30,816 DD
SUBMARINES (SS)	7	13,218 <i>OK</i>	10	16,220 <i>OK</i>	14	22,828	7	25,568	14	13			54	86,508 SS
TOTALS	24	109,348	61	183,951	62	208,009	15	41,351,006	91	60	14	5	188	852,324

NOTE: THE ABOVE TOTAL TONNAGES HAVE BEEN INCREASED BY APPROXIMATELY FIVE PER CENT (5%) ABOVE THE DESIGNATED UNIT TONNAGES NOW UNDER CONSTRUCTION TO TAKE CARE OF WAR DEVELOPMENTS.

	ESTIMATED COSTS PER INCREMENT INCREASE		1942		1943 (1ST HALF)		1943 (2ND HALF)		1944		TOTAL	
	UNIT COST	NO.	NO.	COST	NO.	COST	NO.	COST	NO.	COST	NO.	AMOUNT
CV AIRCRAFT CARRIERS	\$55,000,000	1	1	\$55,000,000			1	\$55,000,000			2	\$110,000,000
CV AIRCRAFT CARRIERS	84,840,000	1	1	84,840,000	1	84,840,000	2	169,680,000	2	169,680,000	6	509,040,000
CB LARGE CRUISERS	84,587,000						5	422,935,000	5	422,935,000	5	422,935,000
CL LIGHT CRUISERS	40,844,000	2	2	81,688,000	4	163,376,000	1	40,844,000	11	445,284,000	18	735,192,000
CL LIGHT CRUISERS	30,000,000						1	30,000,000			1	30,000,000
DD DESTROYERS	14,634,000	11	11	160,974,000	38	556,092,000	35	512,190,000			84	1,229,256,000
DD DESTROYERS	12,000,000	2	2	24,000,000	8	96,000,000	8	96,000,000			18	216,000,000
SS SUBMARINES	7,625,000	7	7	53,375,000	10	76,250,000	14	106,806,000	23	175,467,000	54	411,966,000
TOTALS		24	24	\$459,905,000	61	\$976,598,000	62	1,010,520,000	41	\$1,217,366,000	188	\$3,664,389,000
GRAND TOTALS			85	\$1,436,503,000			\$147	2,447,023,000	188	\$3,664,389,000		

00549

CONFIDENTIAL

December 12, 1941

Franklin D. Roosevelt Library

DECLASSIFIED

DD DIR. 5200.9 (9/27/58)

PROPOSED EXTENSION TO CURRENT BUILDING  
PLAN

Date- 3-3-59

Signature: *Carl L. Spicer*  
Type

<u>Calendar Year 1942</u>								
Type	Number That Can Be Laid Down In 1942	Tonnage by Type	Estimated Completion In:					
			1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	
CV-9 Class	2	56,910		1	1			
CL-55 (Cleveland Class)	2	21,000		2				
DD	13	28,665	7	6				
SS	7	11,214	7					
1942 Total	24	117,789	7					

<u>Calendar Year 1943</u>								
Type	Number That Can Be Laid Down In 1943	Tonnage by Type	Estimated Completion In:					
			1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	
CV-9 Class	4	113,820			2	2		
CL-55 (Cleveland Class)	7	73,500			5	2		
CL51 (Atlanta Class)	1	6,300			1			
DD	89	194,273	4	68	17			
SS	47	75,294		14	33			
1943 Total	148	463,187	4	82	53			

<u>Calendar Year 1944</u>								
Type	Number That Can Be Laid Down In 1944	Tonnage by Type	Estimated Completion In:					
			1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	
CV-9	2	56,910					2	
CB (Alaska Class)	5	141,750				2	3	
CL-55	9	94,500			1	8		
1944 Total	16	293,160			1	10		

Three Year Total      188      874,136

Keels to be laid in 1944 not included in contract awards now being made but the authorization granted should be for the entire amount of tonnage, i.e., 874,136 (rounded off to 900,000).

In reply address not the signer of this letter but Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.

Refer to No. Aer-1-GB  
CV

NAVY DEPARTMENT  
BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS

WASHINGTON

12 December 1941

**CONFIDENTIAL**

MEMORANDUM to THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

SUBJECT: Large versus small aircraft carriers.

1. Many studies of subject matter have been made by the Navy Department, in the most recent of which it has been necessary to take careful cognizance of the following factors which vitally affect design and displacement features:

(a) The increasing size, power, weight, and endurance of modern carrier airplanes.

(b) The increased take-off run necessary to launch these planes and corresponding increase in landing speed.

(c) Increased storage space required for fuel, oil, weapons, and other supplies incident to subparagraph (a) above.

(d) The need for heavily armored decks to protect hangar spaces from the lighter bombs and the vital spaces below the protective deck from penetration by heavy bombs.

(e) Sufficient beam to permit the degree of compartmentation needed to insure good water-tight integrity and damage control incident to under-water damage by mines or torpedoes.

(f) The vital necessity for high speed, thus requiring for any given tonnage large boiler and engine room spaces with corresponding reduction in spaces available for aircraft, their accessories, and supplies.

(g) Large, fast elevators needed to accommodate the latest planes and to accelerate their handling to and from the flight deck.

(h) Greatly increased anti-aircraft installations which of necessity encroach on the flight deck areas otherwise available for the operation and handling of airplanes.

2. Consideration of the foregoing leads to a strong case for the large carrier; by "large" is meant a type of the minimum overall dimensions and displacement of the ESSEX class, i.e.,

Standard displacement	.....	27,000 tons
Trial displacement	.....	33,700 tons
Length	.....	820 ft.
Beam	.....	93 ft.
Speed	.....	33 knots plus.

3. This type is capable of carrying a balanced complement of airplanes of formidable offensive potentialities (fighter, bomber, and torpedo) and has embodied characteristics which give for its displacement the maximum degree of security, protection, and flexibility of operation to its aircraft.

Franklin D. Roosevelt Library  
**DECLASSIFIED**

**DOD DIR.** 5200.9 (9/27/58)

Date-

3-3-59

Signature-

*Carl S. Spicer*

*J. H. Towers*  
J. H. Towers