

Dear Ones,

It is early Monday morning and as usual I dislike the idea of facing another week. I hope that we get Thursday off for Thanksgiving - no word on it yet although the Truman statement on the holiday inferred that we would. I see that Harvard came close against Brown yesterday - oh, well, next year. One of the clippings from the Boston Herald noted a plan to tear down the Kiosk in Harvard Square to help clear up the traffic tangle - the place won't seem the same without it. Last night I met one of the new Air Corps weather officers and he turned out to be a bridge fan; so we may be able to scrape^{up} a game again in the near future. All the air corps boys - both weather and communications - are young and they look like a group of college boys, which they are. They are a pleasant change from the predominant type of face and attitude around here.

I see that Eric Johnston is getting bigger and better boosts as the Republican for 1948. He is in a very good position now - he can't hurt his position very much as the successor to the unpopular Will Hays. So far it seems that Johnston has stayed away from Partisan issues - it is still my conviction that the Republican candidate for 1948 to deserve to win and/or to win must take a firm stand against the Republican old guard. As for Brewster and the publicity he is getting as a Senate investigator and what have you, still hasn't emerged as a much of a positive politician; his strength still lies in criticism.

I can't get over the wide publicity being given to the Army-Navy merger fight - every general and admiral is being given his chance to speak, and the picture gets no clearer for it. Now, I am in favor of the merger, at least the merger of the service-supporting troops (medics, ordnance, QM, what have you) but I don't see the necessity for this big scale fight between the services now - the merger doesn't touch upon our real need and it is wasting a lot of valuable time. There aren't going to be any Army and Navy forces to merge if Congress doesn't get busy. The need is so great that we must concentrate on getting some functioning and reform into our present system before can concentrate on a general overhaul. Our real needs cannot wait.

I wish you would tell me why the Lowell Thomas column is printed - as far as I can see, only his name sells the stuff being printed under his name. Or at any rate, he shouldn't be on the editorial page. I still get a kick out of Pearson and his jibes at the Army and Navy brass; and I think that he and Mrs Craig and probably every other progressive columnist in the country are dead right in leveling their guns at Congressional stubbornness and inactivity on critical issues. Each column you send seems to bring new word of individual or group action which blocks necessary legislation; now I do not mean that Congress should take executive plans and programs and just pass them without discussion. But Congress cannot simply not pass legislation and leave questions unanswered. Whether in agreement with executive policy or not, Congress must do something to meet our needs. We require actions and not simply speeches. Truman is partially at fault, since he is the executive and the nominal head of the majority party - but the basic fault lies in Congress, in the failure of its leadership, its organization, and most important its sense of public responsibility and understanding of its function. And in turn our democracy is at fault for not pressuring Congress into the proper action. We are the world's greatest democracy, but we are far from the world's greatest and best functioning democracy.

Dorothy Thompson's attitude on Germany continues to puzzle me. Her pity for the Germans is hardly realistic. I cannot see the justification for the "feel sorry for the poor defeated Germans" attitude. The German suffering is the last item on the world agenda for aid to the suffering - that is where it belongs. Especially in the face of the repeated reports of the inadequacy of our occupation and the dangers of German unrest. (What I did last night was to read over about half of the clippings and make notes on their subject matter - and use those notes for the outline of this letter.)

The reports of Unrest in Palestine have had the effect of centering world attention on the existing situation there. In terms of damage or significance, I do not think that they can do much harm - they are not comparable to the organized revolts of Java; they are no more than demonstrations. As long as the official attitude is non-violence, as it must be, we are all right, since the unruly element is a minute segment at the present. I hope that Truman and Attlee did hit upon some joint commission basis, so that the current discussions can get their proper airing. Weizmann apparently favors such a commission. The reports continue to pile in for the need of European relief; the FEA conference did not seem to accomplish very much - it seems as though the real work cannot be looked for until after the first plenary sessions of the functioning UNO councils.

The Bruch report seems to add more fuel to the fire of those who support the current Labor demands. My interpretation of his letter was that he was blaming industry for failure to go ahead without exorbitant profit margins; he certainly made no bones about favoring wage increases without proportional price raises and opposing the cuts in taxes which have just been passed. It remains to be seen whether the current labor-management discussions will have any better results than the specific discussions between striking unions and individual concerns. I should think however, that agreement on procedures could be agreed to if nothing else and that from the discussions can come definite agreements of strike voting, cooling off periods, arbitration boards, and the other matters. The Higgins decision to quit must have been a strong reminder to labor that they can't cut off their noses to spite their faces and expect to survive.

The question of aid to Britain seems to have a million and one aspects. The idea of supporting a Socialist regime seems to have been accepted, since it is beginning to dawn on people that socialism is not a denial of democracy, and that Britain has by no means given up the principles of democracy at home. However, the problem still remains of the significance and extent of our support and its tie in with the world economic and political picture. To my mind the basic answer is this: we are dependent on a functioning Britain and a healthy Britain - but that in no sense of the world means that we must stand by and let Britain sponsor Empire policies which are contrary to the best interests of the entire world and often contradictory to our own economic interests. We run the risk on one side of becoming too strong in our support of Britain and on the other of falling victim to the Anglophobes. We have the unique opportunity through the element of control given us by England's economic dependence on us for help in establishing herself again in the interdependent post war world to gain agreements and promises and commitments so that our support of the Empire will turn out to our own and to the world's best interest. We can and must support Britain and at the same time make clear that we have commitment to the support of the purely imperial and often anti democratic and anti free trade elements of British policy. We have no stake in the Britain of Empire by divide and conquer.

OK for today & things are going along fairly well - Mildred Pierce is the movie tonight.

All my love,

Regards to Doris

Sammy