

3 October 1945

Dear Ones,

Last night I wrote to Bill ^Shower and then we played a few hours of bridge; the movie to-night is another poor one, so I imagine we will try to scout up a game again. Today has been fairly hectic, what with orders and cancellations and all the indecision which suggests command confusion. One thing is clear - the men are moving out at a faster clip: all 70 point men are scheduled for shipment to the separation center at 502 by the 24th of this month; by the end of November all 60 point men and 75 point officers will be gone. That means that by December first Sprague, Rauth, and I will be all alone here. The funny part is that there still are no shipping prospects for all the stuff we have here.

I am little fearful for Dorothy Thompson - perhaps I too am a twentieth century savage, though I doubt it - but I cannot interpret the story of German atrocities as she does. I can not agree with her thesis of the decline of humanity. She writes powerfully and she writes well and she writes with a great deal of truth; but she puts an improper emphasis in her otherwise valid analysis. True the Germans are like us, are civilized, by the physical standards of literacy, of human conveniences, of technological advance - I wonder if she has ever read Huxley's brilliant book "Brave New World," for surely Huxley's picture is similar to the conscience-less, soul-less world which Miss Thompson all but conjures up for our era and its stress on scientific psychology of the masses and functional techniques in every activity from walking through thinking. If she had limited her approach to an examination of the German disease, she would have been on safer grounds; as it is she fails to balance the danger of de-humanization with the fact that that is exactly what we have been fighting against, that that is exactly why we emphasize the freedoms of the individual and of society; and in omitting this balance, her key sentence "All twentieth Century political life approaches this same 'functional' concept" is not entirely justifiable. I will agree that the basic need for our age is for conscience and soul in the individual and in society, that the danger which she points out is real - but the very task of our era is to prove that man can combine scientific and mechanical advance to the extreme stages of functionalism and yet retain his democracy in government, his freedom of thought and political and religious expression, his conscience, his belief in mankind, and his soul. Perhaps it is just that Miss Thompson is looking back on the negative and I am trying to base my views and criticisms on looking forward at the positive.

The reports of anti-Semitism in Europe underline Truman's order to Eisenhower and probably to American workers in UNRRA to assure the safety and well-being of displaced Jews. And the many difficulties which have arisen over property settlements and because of fascistic-nationalistic hangovers make the Palestine solution even more essential. Speaking of Eisenhower, I think his move in replacing Patton by Truscott in Bavaria was the only thing he could do - Georgie had shot off his mouth once too often. I'll bet that PM hit the roof after his statement on political parties and Nazism. Mrs Craig's article on the Murray Bill was excellent - private enterprise does not have the guarantee all by itself to avoid those drops in employment charts which mean human misery to the unemployed. And she makes another critical point: it is not to deny the value and importance and vigor of work to say that work is no longer an end in itself - life in America must be earned but it is rich and full.

From the multitude of clippings, whether the topic be race problems in Detroit, Argentina, Army tangles, or the problems we face in rehabilitation in Europe, it is obvious that there should be no lack of serious matter for discussion back home. The trouble is that all this is very unglamorous stuff - raising money, feeding people, making loans, ironing out administrative wrinkles hardly compare with a dash across France or an atomic bombing. We could see continuity and interrelation in war; I hope that we find it running through our peacetime issues. The need for information and intelligent analysis is greater now than ever before. The Mallon article on the Truman speech struck a different note from most of the others and so I will treat it separately. (I wonder how Pegler reacted to the swing to the Left of Center, just after he had written two columns more or less in praise of Truman.) Mallon sees the Truman program only in the light of a CIO program and not in the context of a national requirement and he predicts Congressional opposition. His reasons

are that the program is unpopular, that the CIO-PAC is weak and unpopular. I don't think that either of his reasons are confirmed by the facts of the case. On the contrary, the leadership of Henry Wallace has been greatly enhanced within the past few months; even the NAM admitted that he did not threaten to overthrow the American Way. Certainly the full employment measure has received wide (if some times grudging) support throughout the country; and there is also the idea that we either take the Truman proposals and accept them or modify them into an equally consistent pattern or we have nothing at all. To my mind something is amiss in Mallon's thinking when he says the CIO is unpopular - unpopular with whom? Surely not the union members; propobably not the members of any union who, though they may not favor the CIO, will not oppose the vigorous pro-labor policies it espouses. I wonder what Mallon's index of popularity is.

It seems as though Chiang not only has the Russian treaty behind him, but he also has the fact that he was able to forestall Red moves into the occupied areas. No doubt this helps explain Mao's continued dleiberation and the delay in announcing an overall Chinese agreement. Chiang certainly has the upper hand, and practical politics may well dicatate Mao's acceptance of Chiang's promises for China as the basis for the abandonment of the separate communist military establishment. With his ace trumped, Mao may have to take what he can get. In turn, Chiang's fairness and honesty will be indicative as to the trustworthiness of his promises to give China a solid democratic basis in the face of the opposition of the war lords and the fascistic elements of his own Koumintang.

It is time to shower and I didn't even cover all the clippings in one envelope!

All my love,

Sumner