

July 23rd 1945

Dear Ones,

I am down in the depot; last night I went to bed fairly early, but stayed up to read the latest Coronet. The girls on the cover of Coronet beat them all - mmm. Things are quiet these days; I am glad that I don't have to worry about guard for another month or so.

Again thanks for keeping me up to date on Boston, Mother; (I was a little surprised that in your first letter describing the set-up in the office that you did not mention the problem of the brothers-in-law.) I think that time and age will eventually mellow the participants and solve the current disagreements. There is nothing like a big family - that brings me to the other side and Bobby Morris. Thanks for the details; sounds like quite a little meller-drammer, what with the parental opposition and the resultant filial stubbornness. I expected Aunt Etta to be enthusiastic; I imagine that the young love will find a way.

I am not particularly in favor of an amendment to limit the tenure of the Presidency to two terms; the argument that unlimited tenure has dangerous tendencies in view of the ever increasing role of government as an employer isn't especially strong since a man or a machine could do the damage in eight years as well as in 12 or 16. The strongest argument for it to my mind is that it would force our political leaders to think in terms of building younger men to leadership stature. I am glad that Patterson came forward with his defense of the Army system of court martials - my only complaint against the system is that there is sometimes no uniformity in punishments and that some commanders do not make an effort to get the best men for the various jobs in the Court Martial Board, that it is regarded as just another detail-job to be done. In fact if the best personnel were chosen - lawyers, older men (not the old fuddy-duddies who are just so much dead weight in the Army set-up,) teachers - the average Court Martial board would deserve little or no criticism. The manual of courts-martial is fair. I enjoyed my few C-M experiences while I was with the 30th.

It is interesting to note that even though a number of commentators have said that Ickes will be out of the Cabinet in the near future all are in agreement that Wallace is in to stay. I do not think that Wallace's loyalty to the Democratic Party during the election and after his defeat as the Vice-Presidential Candidate is the most important reason; the answer to my mind is that Wallace still represents the left of center cause which FDR always embraced and which has been the spark plug of the Democratic party program since 1932. Wallace comes closest to symbolizing the government for continued economic and social planning and legislation. His years in the Cabinet and as Vice-president will give him political stability and maturity; and certainly Truman is aware of his stature and importance as a political planner and idealist and as a politician. A balance of the qualities of Truman and Wallace would put the Democratic Party on as strong a basis as it has ever been in terms of long range political promise and stability.

I was a little surprised to read in Pearson's column that Lawrence Steinhardt is strongly anti-Soviet - he is the son-in-law of Morgenthau, I believe. It was always my impression that his efforts in Moscow and in Ankara had shown him an able diplomat and, in contrast to Bullitt, more friendly than opposed to the Russian regime. We are really bombarding Japan with our propaganda broadcasts - it certainly would be encouraging to see these have some positive results. Jap propaganda is still buzzing along in dismal failure; I almost fell out of bed last night when a Japanese commentator was quoted as saying that the B-29 raids were a blessing in disguise since now the Japs have all the scrap metal they could wish to have! Oh, brother.

That sort of clears the deck for this noontime -

All my love,

Regards to Doris

