

Dear Ones,

Well, I slept in this morning - after I get off this note to you I will go up to the tent and listen to the football broadcast. Nothing special - it is still overcast and rainy. Both ~~Q~~isling and Laval are dead - no regrets. I cannot help but feel that Bowles is right in asking for an extension of price controls. The NY Times argues that lifting of price controls would be an impetus to production, but I cannot understand the economics of that stand - if prices go up, the same money will buy less, and that will certainly not encourage production; if prices go up and wages go up you may stimulate some production at first but the long run effect cannot help but be the inflationary cycle; however if wages go up and prices can be held fairly level, purchasing power will be increased and the production cycle can start with a firm basis, if industry is willing to accept the prospect of low profit per sale with a large turnover, instead of large profit per sale with a small turnover - the former is the more healthy for the national economy. In the meantime the disputes go on - both sides seem ready for a governmental decision on the reconversion wage-price policy.

From the clippings I received it appears that the Truman military program received not unfavorable comment. The stories which came out just before the actual speech indicated that Truman (as I thought) was not ready to commit himself to the one year idea. There is no need for my commenting any further on the Truman proposals; you know how strongly I favor them. The only string I attach is the guarantee of a thorough Army housecleaning. The Army has succeeded in alienating too many GI's and their families to hope to retain national confidence unless they make widespread and well publicized reforms under close civilian supervision. And it is up to the Army now to stop aiming its criticism at demobilization and to level its arguments at the need for passage of the legislation to get new soldiers; complaining about losing its current veterans will only get the Army into more unpopularity. The reaction of the Maine Congressmen and woman to the Truman proposals suggests that they will not oppose them; this is one measure which should by-pass all partisan lines.

Now I come to the clipping reporting on the speech of Philip Cummings - the headline on it annoyed ^{ME} "Let our Generals ~~be~~ Alone" is the exact opposite of my peacetime idea of keeping the Generals hopping all the time. Cummings believes that the State Department should not tell Eisenhower and MacArthur what to do, that they are like "dictators" - I hope that the Portland audience took that one in stride. After flaying the diplomatic service with the exception of Winant and Grew(!!!) he apparently scored isolationism but added "now is the time for Americans to take care of America and American affairs" - whatever that means. I think that my reaction to this gentleman would have been the same as yours, Mother. I would like to have been there and heard the reaction of the Portland audience during the question period.

The question of Army-Navy consolidation is raging hot and heavy by this time, I imagine.

David Lawrence has come out strongly in support of the Navy stand; he claims that the lessons of war are that unification is not justified and that the danger of military dictatorship is too real to risk one minister of national defense. The Navy favors the continuation of the joint chiefs of staff at most, the idea being that coordination should come from super-imposed bodies like a security council or what have you, instead of a wholesale merger. I can only speak from my own experience on Santo - the need for coordination exists at the lower levels more than any place else. There is no reason why there should not be one supply service to supply all the branches of the fighting Arms; there is no reason why a merger need destroy the tactical and strategic initiatives of the different fighting arms. The present system encourages not Army-Navy competition - but a harmful rivalry instead, a fight for commands, personal dislikes, failure to cooperate fully. The whole nation suffers for it. A merger contrived to bring honest coordination, planning, and economy is the best answer to this problem of command.

I hope that Uncle Lou had a satisfactory weekend in New York; I was a little surprised to read of Uncle Heine's new venture - what is the story behind this one? Has he given up Lynbrook? From what you say, I take that Dave Sacknoff is not ready to plunge into the relative turmoil of civilian life - well, I am glad that there are some officers willing to stay in; it means that more of us can be released. Dave must have more than enough points for discharge. All the reports on UNRRA would make it seem that the best answer would be to scrap that group and start another under the close supervision of the UNO; the Lehman organization has never been able to find its way out of the wilderness for lack of proper governmental support, for lack of honest administration, for lack of effective control. The point is that universal relief is a primary matter today and we need something to handle its difficulties. I wish I could see the US Congress showing some signs of life and speed on these questions as it did on pressure to demobilize the Army. If we are continually unprepared for the problems which arise, Congressional inflexibility is as big a factor as any.

The PM editorial on the news coverage given the dock strike in New York was well done. Since the first outbreak of the union revolt against Ryan, it has been made clear that demobilization has not been held up by the strikes - the strike came at an inopportune time and the natural role played by the NMU was easy meat for the "red-menace" boys of the conservative press; but the fact remains that this is an attempt by union members to secure representative and honest leadership for their group. Why this is an action to be criticized by those who howl most loudly about Union leadership dishonesty is beyond me.

I am glad that I rate the fancy stationery, Mother. I got a kick out of your two phone calls - from Mrs Schlosberg and the woman interested in planned parenthood - you do need a social secretary without a doubt. You ask about Judy Hatchfield - I'll take you at your word that you have no particular reason for asking! - I guess I still correspond with her; the pace of the correspondence is only three or four letters a year and since I answer all my letters shortly after receiving them it is she who sets that pace. It has been some time since I last heard from her. It could be that some letters from her and others are missing in the days mail which are still held up someplace along the line. I am sorry that you did not get to hear Pearson, Mother - he would have been a good antidote for Cummings. Bob Jacobs writes an excellent letter - I will have to get used to the idea that he is no longer a "younger cousin" by any educational standard. (From the number of times he referred to his new school as RPI, I'll bet that he hasn't learned to spell Rensselaer yet - I just had to look it up myself.)

Now to the question of the atomic bomb and our relations with Russia - it is quite clear by now that these two problems are inseparable. If I seem pro-Russian in my many commentaries it is because the clippings which I receive are predominantly anti-Russian. It seems to me that in dealing with Russia we have several advantages (aside from the bomb) and the most important one is that it is not hard to guess which way Russia will decide to act on critical questions. In any world perspective, a commentator would note that it is no longer the Russian enigma, but the enigma of the US that is poised before this globe of ours. And when you add the atomic bomb to the picture, you can see the result. The world looks to the US - what we, and we alone, do can make or break the rest of the world; the result is that as long as we remain an enigma the nations of the world must cling to their own devices (which can be interpreted naturally as anti-American) and criticize us for our failures. The American question is: can we trust these other nations to give up these individual programs if we clarify and guarantee our position? I think that the answer is yes - at least we can afford to try even to the point of sharing the use of the atomic bomb while retaining the element of know-how in manufacture for a later stage of world development. That is the way I see it - the ball is squarely in the hands of the quarterback of the US team.

I still like the way Pearson jibes at the War Department - for example his comment on the release of Charlie Trippie to play football for Georgia and his expose of the use of Wacs to aid the War Department to water down the mail pressure being brought to bear on Congress

Godfrey, here I go on my second ~~third~~ page letter in two days - I am liable to exhaust my powers of correspondence or some such thing. Thanks for sending me Daddy's letters from the woods. I'll accept his excuse about the pen's being poor, but I still wish that Daddy's observance of the Palmer method of penmanship were more strict - I know, I know, I'm no one to criticize.

I notice that the Times editorial comment on the Dublin NH meeting was the same as mine. The Times also heailed the full text of the German -control directive; it is quite clear that the Morgenthau line is the predominant strain and that if Eisenhower and Truman are effective in their administration the "heavy industry" boys will lose out in their attempt to retain a self-sufficient German economy. Well, that just aboutt cleans up the recent batch of clippings. I still have all the stuff from October 2 that came in yesterday and there should be material for one or two letters in it.

OK for now - the sun has come up - I think I'll go up to the tent and relax for a change -

All my love,

Regards to Doris

Sam