

August 14th 1945

Dear Ones,

I will start this letter now and probably finish it after supper. The Japanese situation has rather overshadowed the European accomplishments of Potsdam and I appreciated the TIMES reports very much - aside for the Council of Foreign Ministers I was pretty much in the dark as to its results. It is clear at the outset that Truman more than held his own, and that the leaders of the Big 3 have found that the change in personalities has not affected the effectiveness of our unity - Truman and Attlee carried on in perfect style. (For fear of getting off on another tangent I will not mention that I think that that is as brilliant a tribute to the effectiveness of the foundations and relationships which Roosevelt inspired as one could ask.) The job of cleaning up Germany and Europe is not very exciting and hardly very pleasant. First of all Russia was granted her Eastern spheres of interest and they were given priority; it is clear that Russia has the power to enforce her will by force if she so desires. In return the Western powers have a prior interest in the western areas of Europe. Yet these arrangements are made in the spirit of agreement and harmony - we are working together and the fact that Bulgaria, Finland, et al., are primarily of Russian interest geographically does not mean that they will not be discussed by the Secretaries of all the nations. The point is that the superstructure has been erected over nationalism, the framework is proving that it is a workable basis in the Allied Control Council. We have infinitely more than a balance - we have a working agreement; the approach combines the realities of European requirements with the idealism of our war aims. Whatever differences arise, arise within a context of agreement; Yalta has been cemented in the practical questions of conquered Europe. Certainly the results of Potsdam must be encouraging to men of good will all over the world; the possibility of splitting the unity of the United Nations grows dimmer and dimmer - though that does not seem to keep the defeatists from trying.

I thought that the Times article on the home-front pressure on the Army was encouraging as hell. I don't doubt but that the Army is fouling up reconversion and that its wastefulness and poor administration are becoming more obvious day by day; the end of the war must mean the end of the Army's economy of waste - waste of moneys, of equipment, of manpower - if what we see at this level is any indication, then the Mead Committee must be wallowing in waste at the top of the Army ladder; with the end of the war, the military will cease to have its hold over army policy and it is good to know that Congress is contemplating reform. We need a post-war Army, but it cannot be the same Army which we have now - the danger lies in discrediting the whole Army and in not realizing that the need is for reform and not denuding our armed forces.

The British elections continue to gain most of the columns; everyone from England to Timbuctu seems to have adopted the policy of wait and see - certainly the hopefuls would seem to outnumber the pessimists, David Lawrence and Paul Mallon notwithstanding. To hear the arguments of Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill brought into the current discussion as though the theories of social economics which they wrote were meant to be wholesaley applied to the situations of todays day and age is a little amusing. We are in an age of new definitions and somewhat new social values; we are in an age of a comparatively saturated economy; we are in an age in which we have learned that the enterprise-profit system does not necessarily mean the greatest good for the greatest number in terms of the social norms which we have found to be essential for the general welfare. And I am sure that Mills and Smith would be among the first to note this as progress, and good progress, not as the work of the devil.

That more or less brings me to the Hunt-Crumboch case; it seems to me that the issue is very clearly defined. On the one side by the Brandeis dictum that a union cannot strike for an unlawful purpose; the other, the court decision that as long as there is no illegal combination the union can decide to refuse to sell their labor to an employer. I do not think that Justice Roberts was correct in saying that the case was not within the immunity that labor is "not a commodity or article of commerce" which is granted under the Clayton Act. These men refused to work for the employer because of his connection with a strike back in 1937; they consistently refused to supply the labor he needed and as a result he went out of business; their refusal is not wholly comparable to a strike - to that extent Justice Roberts



is right. In other words, they are not refusing to work because they don't get vacations or because there aren't enough drinking fountains; they refuse to supply labor because of ill will between the two contracting parties, a grudge on the part of the Union. In this particular case, I would say that the grudge is probably unjustified and no more than mere vindictive spite; however, that does not affect the basic problem involved. As long as labor is not in an illicit conspiracy, there can be no reason for forcing the union to sell its man hours any more than there can be for forcing a manufacturer to sell his product if he does not want to. If the manufacturer did not sell his commodity to keep the price up or to aid in some market conspiracy, he would then be subject to punishment under the law, and the same should be true of labor. Brandeis is right that in a judgment on a strike it should be found against the union if the strike is illegal. But this is not a strike, it is a refusal to work for no illegal reason, just human nature. In some ways this case is unique, since in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred labor is looking for work and not refusing it. Since the welfare of labor depends on the widest use of the labor pool - whereas the profit motive sometimes calls for the restriction of production - it is hardly likely that labor will conspire against the national welfare. No, I think the majority decision was the correct one.

Well, here we go again - Domei has just announced that the Emperor will make a statement and everyone seems to have gone wild again. Perhaps something will have come through by the time I return to the tent again. If the Tokyo answer has any if's or and's or But's in it, I think that an atomic bomb would be the most effective answer.

Thanks for your review of the cottage doings, Mother - I am glad that HB had the chance to reciprocate and invite her friends out to the Foreside with her; the fact that she is getting some social balance is swell too. It is too bad that all the tenants are not like the Martins; I am sorry that we are losing them - he must have done very well. What ever happened on my insurance policy anyway?? The incident of Don Dorsey and the sailboat is a reminder that things haven't really changed at Menikoff - that was a standard event in our heyday. As for my mentioning the sailboat - I wouldn't know what to do with one! Let's wait until I hit upon something I really want when I get back and we will select a substitute. In your comment on Gannett you did not mention who will take over his little press empire when and if he leaves the scene - his children? Doesn't he have a son who is a Lt. in Ordnance with the Air Corps in England? Please don't berate your letters for not being "erudite" Mother! The longer and newsier and chattier they are, the better I like them. you can leave the controversial stuff for Daddy - anyway, just between you and me and the lamppost, I think we would find that you and I tend to agree as often as Daddy and I tend to disagree.

I brought TIME down with me - I did not bring the issue in which Mrs Luce's plumping for war with Russia was discussed but I think that her attitude (publicized significantly through the channels of the Hearst Press) may reflect the feeling that dominates the columns of the Weekly Newsmagazine. It seems to me obvious than any critic who uses the line that there is an unbridgable gap between the American democratic way and the Russian totalitarian way is doing nothing more than leading the way to the inevitable conflict idea. I dispute the theory that it is totalitarianism which we were fighting quite strongly; we were fighting Fascism. The Luce approach can only be labeled as obstructionist and non-constructive. TIME itself is less outspoken, but the thread is the same. A good example is in the comment on the Communist move in ousting Browder and "ready to fight for Stalinism." They say that the delegates "followed their orders" - no doubt a direct line from the Kremlin. Now, I am not saying that the American Communists do not feel a kinship to the Russian experimentors, but TIME deliberately makes the unjustified point that these people are Russians first and Americans second. This type of bias (similar to that which hits you in the face every time you open the Readers Digest) tends to color everything in one's critical appreciation of the magazine. I probably am a Russophile, but I see no constructive justification for such a tack - not even in terms of the most selfish American interest.

OK for this time -

Regards to Doris.

All my love,

Sumner