

16 June 1945

Dear Ones,

" good volleyball game tonight - the mail yielded Press Heralds and Alumni Bulletins and Center Bulletins, a note from Jay written on shipboard, a note from Herb Schreiber down at New Caledonia, a letter from Aunt Ida. I wrote V-mails to Aunt Ida and to Jay - very short and none too snappy.

The news from Argentina is discouraging - it puts Argentina, even though she hopped on the bandwagon, in the class with Franco's Spain; to my mind the only answer is that, although the goal of the Mexico City conference was a united hemispheric front and although the US espoused that cause vigorously at San Francisco even to the point of causing a major showdown, some definite action must be taken and not by the United States alone. The United States at San Francisco was not concerned with the nature of the Argentine government because we felt that the aims of the Pan American conference had prior consideration - I should not say "was not concerned" rather "regarded as secondary." We achieved that first objective of ours - we, the rest of the hemisphere, and the rest of the world can not longer choose not to consider the current crisis. (I cannot see the justification for your saying, Daddy, that the State Department has lost face - we supported Argentina on the basis of hemispheric unity, not her democratic institutions.) The fact that Argentina is a member of the United Nations Assembly will give us firmer grounds on which to deal with her - there are specific details of the charter such as freedom of the press for one which have been grossly violated and for these violations she can be called to the bar. In any event, it is imperative that the action taken to restore liberty in Argentina and eventually to Spain and the other nations now hampered in democratic growth and progress by enforced despotism be initiated by the group of nations not the individual nation of the US. We are in the peculiar position of still being the colossus of the North and our unilateral action often tends to drive the other Republics away from us instead of against the offender. As all this concerns our state department: no one will claim that Stettinius is a master politician or world diplomat - by any comparative standard he is a greehnorn. But he did handle Chatapultec and San Francisco has been a success - it may well be that Truman will decide to shift the State Department Team around a little and find the key spot for Jimmy Byrnes, in search of a firmer and more experienced hand to help him.

There does not seem to be much point in arguing the "economic planning" questions any further - we are getting nowhere: it seems to me that you ask the same questions and that I answer them only to have you ask them again in a different setting. I refuse to make an ogre of man's forms of political organization as you do; I refuse to create a Frankenstein of our governmental structure. I have a firm belief that democracy can work and can progress, but I am not sure that you do - I have no fears of political activity on a broad democratic base within an intelligent and progressive community. I trust implicitly in the doctrine that in the long run with the given condition of that functioning political democracy the majority decisions will reflect the best interests of the community as a whole and of the individual members within the framework of their society. I picture each man as living in a world in which his every move affects the life of every other person - the role which that very basic and simple factor places on the society's political and social organization is by no means a small one. Certainly the government which governs least governs best (and the ideal state is to have no government at all) - and no one is asking for more government than the society demands. You quote Jefferson and Paine - all right look at them as men of their times and ask yourself where they would stand today: there is not much doubt. I wish I were up on my Gov 1 and my History 1 - when you deny a solution to the dilemma of economic security and political, social, and economic freedom and equality of opportunity and rights, you deny human political progress.

OK for this Saturday evening. All my Love,

Jimmy

to feel that in time these inconsistencies in the fabric of world democracy will not be rectified. The very fact that the rest of the world is in line makes the few nations out of step stand out like black on white - that is good for we will become concerned about them but we must not deny the good of the rest and our progress because of them.

I do not mind your brief notes at all, Mother - when you send me six envelopes in one day, I could hardly expect more! You need never feel concerned over your end of our correspondence. In yesterday's letter, I think I dwelt a little on the question of Stettinius; one of Krock articles in my new batch of clippings covers the subject pretty well and it is my impression that Krock feels that a good deal of the criticism of Stettinius is not well founded, because it fails to evaluate the extremely delicate position of the Secretary of State and because more often than not it is a case of damned if he does, and damned if he doesn't. The same editorial page had the news that the Arab Council will meet in early July to discuss the current problems - there is some significance in their meeting in Cairo in Egypt where British influence in the Near East is centered; it becomes increasingly clear that some logical and agreeable way must be devised to ameliorate the Near Eastern situation - the confusion of mandates and semi-independent states, of Pan Arab and Zionist moves, of British and French designs, of popular and nationalistic movements, of oil concessions and economic guarantees, cannot be ignored. It seems to me that the US is the most logical power to assume the lead in working for this solution and a clearing of the air. I am still hopeful that the British election in July may have a marked affect on this critical issue.

OK for now - I fear that I am repeating myself in letter after letter, but the clippings on the same topics just get me going again and again. Of course the more I write to you, the more my own ideas are crystallized and clarified. (I hope.)

All my love,

Dumney