

June 3 1945

Dear Ones,

I had better dig right into the pile of mail I have to answer - and boy it is a real stack - before I get off into a long review of my woes and worries. Last night I saw "Music for Millions" which disappointed me very much: too much "sick" and not enough "music!" Tonight we have "The Human Comedy" and I may risk that. Yesterday's mail, beside the batch from home, brought a note from the Osgoods; Bill Snower wrote from the hospital where he is bedded with arthritis; and I heard from Judy and Louis.

The answer in the TIMES on the question on Middlesex Medical School was very good and did not sound illogical; I hope that Uncle Arch and Aunt Anne do supply some local information on the topic. I agree that the writer is naive in not admitting the existence of quotas by race and religion. One thing I do not approve of is the talk of a "Jewish Medical School" - I can see a medical school sponsored by a Jewish hospital, or some limited venture of the type, but I can not see an entirely "parochial" institution. Education is not the place for religious demarcation, as are other civic, social, and service fields. It is interesting to see the reaction taken by non-Republican and even Republican publications to the solid anti-Reciprocal Trade vote; as the TIMES points out, the COP should not then wonder why its record is not sound enough to stand upon. One thing has been puzzling me: Hackett seems to write a daily book review for the TIMES - does that mean that he reads and digests a book a day and then writes his review? That is quite a pace to maintain. I see that you are now sending me another Jewish Newsletter: one thing these efforts do is to pull from the news the little items that might otherwise slip by - items which are often as indicative of the nature of things as the overall planning of a government, in fact more indicative. The result is of course that they are accused of muckracking; to my mind their job is one of good and should be recognized as such.

The history of Winston Churchill and his politics is certainly in the world limelight these days; no matter what you think of the man he cannot be denied a truly sparkling place in world history as a man and as a leader of men. If you could understand him and the element which he personifies, British policy would be easier to deal with; but he is the master politician and together with Britain he occupies a unique position in this world of standing for both freedom and right and for the British Empire policy; it takes a keen analysis to know which of the two he will support in any given situation - the British have played the two with a remarkably good balance for Britain.

Bill Snower brought up a point which several other people have mentioned to me - that is the bad press which San Francisco is getting. Every paper seems to be ready to tear the conference down, find the mistakes to the end that these criticisms, undoubtedly meant to be constructive, have the result of obscuring the real achievements of the Conference and what is more the general satisfaction of the public with the results. I received that TIME-LIFE-FORTUNE report on Dumbarton Oaks but I have not had time to digest it; I fell asleep last night while reading an Alumni Bulletin - a lot of fellows I know have been casualties. I will be looking for the booklet "What About Harvard" although I know my status pretty well and I shouldn't have much difficulty once I get back. I was not up to date on the status of the full employment clauses in the San Francisco conference but apparently PM feels that the English speaking nations did their best to ward off making that commitment; for my part I can see no objection to the charter's including that phrase or to the assumption that it is a world concern that full employment is made possible. In fact it is a basic part of international thinking. It is good to hear the comments of the fellows that they feel that Truman is taking hold - he is certainly showing himself to be an able politician; but only a review of the legislative and administrative achievements of the past year will be the proper basis for decision. We see that the fighting has broken out again in Syria; if the US does mediate, the result of the squabble will be most indicative of the course of events in the Near East. We have heard no word of Russia's saying or doing anything. I guess the Trieste affair will be straightened out in

time; again I am all for the people who fought and fought hard on our side - in any dispute they have the prior claim to our consideration of the arguments on their side. The last episode of the Lillenthal case, in which McKellar claimed a conspiracy against him practically, was a sad commentary on the Senator from Tennessee.

Thanks for the story of the campaign - you reached your goal for my money; with all the things that didn't click in the campaign, the result is certainly encouraging. This morning's paper said that Rosenman was being retained by Truman - I wonder if that is truly indicative or just an interim move? in any event it is a credit to the smoothness with which Truman is handling the enforced transition into the job as President. His cabinet changes seem to have been for the good; I hope that Schwelien back comes up with a new plan for organizing the role of government in labor problems; a live wire in the job could do wonders for the country. I was a little surprised to read a TIMES headline "Taft Concedes Nazi Industrialists already Operating outside Reich" - then I read on and found that it was not the Senator from Ohio. The more publicity that sort of information gets and the more its significance is emphasized, the better. It seems to me that Pearson and the rest of the press are wrong in trying to work out San Francisco in terms of opposing factions and alignments; the very fact that one day we're with the British against Russia and the next day the reverse is proof that there is something wrong in too much generalization. Certainly the US, Britain, and Russia stand at three distinct positions in world affairs and those must be understood - but they should be understood in terms of basic agreement rather than basic disagreement. Lippmann of all the columnists whom you send to me does the best job in taking the right approach, and as he points out, we miss FDR most in his ability to retain and create for others the proper attitudes for discussion and agreements, without creating pressures and rifts.

I may be all wrong but it seems to me that in the case of Martin Niemoller we have a typical German problem; there is nothing in the Pastor's case to indicate that he opposed the idea of world conquest of the Nazis, per se and as a matter of right and wrong. His religion made him turn against the Nazi regime; just as in the past year the succession of defeats has led most Germans to turn against the Nazis. What I am getting at is that the only thing we can find to label a good German besides the exiles are those who were passive toward Nazism, and to my mind that is no recommendation at all. And if the German opposed the Nazi regime it must be in entirety - its anti-Semitism, its world conquest, its race superiority, its Herrenvolk notion - not only those parts which were counter to his individual idea, while supporting the others. We cannot be too strict. I enjoyed the Cunningham article on Alpert. I have a wastebasket full of clippings and letters and I still don't seem to have made a dent in the pile!

Whenever I read - especially in PM - the comment that our foreign policy is to have no foreign policy and then a long discourse on what we should, I still come back to my belief that America's unique universal position denies us a clear cut and always applicable foreign outline. We work on basic principles and struggle along to apply them as situations arise; where we fall down is in the failure to apply or interpret those principles correctly. I can remember writing to you at great length on this almost a year ago - today is the completion of 51 weeks on this rock!

OK for now - I will try to remember to drop the Thurman grandparents' note of welcome.

All my love,

Regards to Doris

*E. Cunningham*