

29 October 1945

Dear Ones,

It has been a fairly busy day and another week is off to a flying (?) start. Right now we are in the midst of a rather interesting discussion - Major Trosper, who has just moved up to the job of executive officer, called and wanted us to send someone out to the depot to release some vehicles to the French - it is now 4:45 and naturally Thorpe raised the roof and this time he is right: it is after working hours and there is absolutely no justification for our going out of our way when the vehicles might just as well be picked up in the morning. Thorpe has been exited all day - he wants the work to get done so that the old man will release him. He got mad and ranted at me and Rauth and everybody else, I guess. It will blow over - things are going pretty well and he is exaggerating our difficulties. I caught him in at least three out and out falsehoods during one of his blasts at me. Great Sport ... I got a haircut today, so the past ten hours have not been a total loss. Some mail dribbled in; I wouldn't be surprised if the October gaps are pretty close to bridged by now.

I read the Marshall report in full and I think that the introductory and concluding sections should be reprinted to reach the widest possible public. Marshall's explanation of what military preparedness in an atomic age means is brilliant and indisputable. Marshall's grasp of our problem in international affairs as related to our internal attitudes and our military programs is excellent. There is a good deal of whitewashing in the report, - he glides over what to my mind have been serious errors of omission on the part of Somervell's Army Service Forces; I also feel that in the question of the wisdom of using individual replacement instead of training entire new replacement units he overlooks the aspects that concern the Service troops and this post war period. Because we have no newly activated units the point discharge system is stripping units of all but its newcomers and taking away all the key old-time non-coms. I put a notice up on our bulletin board to tell the officers that I had the report in full - I will be interested to see if anyone asks to read it.

I am running through a lot of clippings on Palestine and the London conference - there is little more to comment on the current Zionist situation; as for London, it is interesting to note that the majority of critics while recognizing Russian intransigence and ready to admit that the failure of Positive US policy is just as basic a snag - perhaps that it is a fundamental reason for that intransigence. I see that Susan Brandeis was listed by PM as the only liberal on the NY Board of Regents - they also omitted the name Gilbert. She apparently will not be one of the objects of the CIO's campaign to liberalize that body. PM's coverage of the Dewey proposed health plan for NY seemed very fair; even if it wasn't ballyhooed on the first page. The Pearson report of Army-Navy-Interior-State shenanigans over the control of our Pacific bases is another bit of evidence to point to the necessity of coordination among the branches of our government. The discussion over the Braden appointment will probably start the old debate going on our intervention in internal politics in South America and the relation of our policy to the policies being supported elsewhere in the world. It is still my contention that we are concerned with the governments of the nations of the world - and that a logical function of the UND is to assure minimum standards of democratic practices. Presented properly and within the proper context, I am sure that Russia would join in this stand - her treaty with Chiang is one indication.

I was a little surprised at the Lerner-PM commentary on the Marshall report - his idea of an enlarged NYA struck me as having nothing to do with the Boston boat at all. I was in agreement with the Times comment. I see that the Times has come out for Morris; a little more support like that will tend to make the New York race more evenly three sided and less indicative in terms of national politics. Aside for the sociological aspect of the movies and theatre and the problem of Art for Art's sake or purpose in Art, the Lerner editorial on Mildred Pierce raised an old question in my mind; I admire Cain's work, he is the past master of realistic narrative, but how Mildred Pierce can be effectively screened is beyond me - the same question bothers me as concerns his Postman Always Rings Twice: without the element of passion, both the stories will have to be revamped.

OK for now - I'm about ready for some more letters -

Almy love. *Summer*