

Dear Ones -

No mail came in over the two day holiday apparently - so I will try to continue the letter I wrote yesterday. It is clear that the question of nationalism is rising to the fore again all over the world. China first: as nearly as I can tell the current fighting for railway control and strategic position is going on while the Communist representatives are still in Chungking and conversations seeking a basic agreement are still going on. What strikes me first is that Communist China is pretty strong in view of the fact that they are not receiving Russian aid, while the Nationalist armies are armed and trained by the US. This is interesting in view of the war-time arguments of the anti-Communists like Judd that the Chinese Reds were a negligible fighting factor and existed only because the Japs didn't want to defeat them. But what I am concerned with is the US role. We cannot undo the training we did for the Chungking armies and we cannot recall the arms which were sold for lend-lease fighting. We cannot withdraw troops as long as it is inconsistent with the requirements for the control and evacuation of jap elements left in those areas of China. But the most important thing is that we cannot ignore what is going in China, we cannot wash our hands of it. It is our responsibility to try to see that intra-Chinese decisions are made without violence, to insure that these decisions are reached without external pressures which are contrary to our basic principles, but to exert pressure to guarantee that the decisions are consistent with those principles of democratic methods. In other words we should step in if the situation became comparable to say Bulgaria and a Red minority were given disproportionate power or if the situation became comparable to Greece and a government was being maintained without a fair test of public support. Our stake is not in Chiang or in Mao - it is in democracy in China; if the minimum democratic standards fail in China, we have lost a part of that for which we fought. It is our job to try every method to facilitate negotiation, to form conciliatory and mediation commissions, to create the atmosphere of cooperation rather than conflict, to bring the Chinese solution into consistency with the world standards which are gradually seeking to define and make effective through the UNO.

What applies to China applies in almost every other case. In the East Indies the Indonesians have forced another similar situation on to the lap of the world organization. I will say at the start that our immediate step should be to disavow the British action in giving ultimatums and bombarding Sorebaja. The British support of the Dutch is typically British but it is not consistent with what should be America's stand. Now that the issue has been broached we have no reason to support the Dutch rule simply because it is the continuance of a rule which was legal under a now non-existent world order - Spain, Argentina, there are many examples to prove that legality is not the standard by which we must judge. I have no idea as to the strenght of Soekarna's revolt; apparently it is strong enough to have resisted persuasion and force up to now; I do know that the Dutch have promised eventual Indonesian independence within a Dutch Commonwealth which is indication enough that the native elements are on the verge of deserving recognition. And the point is that this is by no means simply a Dutch affair - it concerns every peace-loving nation in the world and certainly every major empire. To say "Let the Dutch solve it" is to kid ourselves as we kidded ourselves from 1918 through 1941. Our first effort should be to end the current hostilities; the appeals of the Moslem leader to Truman are indication that the natives, who were the original protagonists, are willing to let the UNO decide the justice of their cause. What is done in Java and Sumatra will be indicative of the policies to be followed in Indo-China, Malaya, and most important India and the Near East. The world order and its primary impartial participant, the United States, must rise to the responsibility - we are not maintaining any Holy Alliance, we are maintaining principles of political conduct.

This brings me back to Palestine in a round about way. Of course Palestine is unique but the same statements apply - we cannot say "Let the British solve it" when the British obviously cannot or will not solve it and leave a tinderbox untended. And similarly we must apply the same world standards of democratic justice. The Jews are not a minority within a country, we are not a subjected majority - our claims of a different type. The question for the world to decide is the comparative justice of our claims against those of the Arab

League. It is interesting to note that the Arabs of the Levant and the Indonesians of the East Indies have mohammedanism in common. But there the similarity of their organizations end. As yet the Arab league has proved to have no coordinated mass support; it has yet to disprove that it is any more than a superimposed high sounding group backed by the interest of oil and empire. The riots in Cairo which started off against Jewish establishments soon showed their true color when they became indiscriminate llootings. The world has yet to have a definitive proof of the true attitude of the Arab masses.

While I am on the topic, I guess I should touch on South America - apparently Braden is being opposed by those who oppose "intervention." One of the conditioning factors in intervening in South America is that nationalism is strong enough in South America so that intervention often takes the form of meddling in ill-defined local politics and creates antagonism toward the meddlers on the part of both the disputants. Therefore such intervention must be handled with the greatest finesse and care - it must not have the unwanted affect of creating further antagonisms. In all cases our application of our democratic minimal standards must be consistent with the realities of practical politics.

Rosey just came in with the word that mail is in - a pleasant surprise. I have just had a long bull session with the two majors, Moore and Trosper. There is a slight element of apple polishing in my friendliness but I have nothing to gain by carrying on Thorpe's antagonisms and I have that handicap to overcome; my opinion toward the two gentlemen has not changed - it is just part of my adjustment to local conditions!! Things are very quiet on this holiday - unless some shipping comes in things are going to pretty quiet for some time - well, I'll have plenty of time to catch up on my mail. I still am carrying about \$80 dollars excess funds around with me - a strategic reserve in case I ever get to take a trip or if the poker games pick up again. This afternoon the Colonel is entertaining and I will wander over to his hut for a cocktail or two; more and more I feel that he is the definite grandfather type! Rumor has it that we are getting influenza inoculations today as part of the program to prevent the epidemics that ravaged the states after the last war.

Mail just came in - four envelopes of clippings from home and notes from Jerry Brown who is on his way home, Betty Freedman, and a bulletin from Phillips Brooks House. I need no reminders of the glories of Harvard! To think that there is such a thing as the class of '48 - to me the class of '44 will always seem to be the last word! I still am making no dent in the clippings - they will have to wait for another letter, I guess. I am glad that Uncle Harold had a pleasant visit - I can imagine that it was not hard to convince him to stay overnight: the aroma of balogna frying in an egg batter always did the trick in my day!

OK for right now - all my love -

Regards to Doris

