

May 7

Dear Ones,

Not much special - the weekend was uneventful; we played volleyball in the afternoon and I wrote a couple of letters in the early evening. We finished up with a poker game and a little snack. My tent is more or less the meeting place - it is in the center of the area and it is all fixed up with a table and benches, and of course there is the famous bar with its stocks of canned goods (not bottled.) Abe really had a neat set-up there.

I guess that the topic for this note will be small nations - I reread the Borgese article on "Freedom from Shame" in an old Life, and it ties in with the Chicago round tables and several of the other clippings. Borgese's point is the best taken and it is clear and simple: the peace of Europe in the long run depends on a freedom from shame and on the recognition of self-determination. It is only on those conditions that the European nations can build healthily - and no matter what your big power circumstances the house they build is one of cards unless this Wilsonian point is recognized. As you know I do not wholly subscribe to the conclusions to which this argument leads. We are still working on the first phases of peace and at this stage of the game our judgments must necessarily be comparative and not absolute. There is no denial that the long-run planning for peace must consider not only the guarantees of individual freedoms to the individuals of Europe but must work for the establishment of respected national governments; there is no denial that national feeling runs high in Europe and that satisfaction of national freedom and recognition are of crucial importance. When you boil it down, the question resolves itself to Poland and the Balkans - France and the low countries have no irridenda, Germany and Italy are the vanquished, not the victors. The question mark runs from the Baltic to the Aegean. And its reason is clear - there are no clearly defined ethnic lines: you find pockets of Bulgars in Grecian Macedonia, you find Rumanians and Croats in Hungarian Transylvania, you find the Polish city of Lwow in the center of a predominantly Russian countryside. The answer in terms of the political entities of European states seems to be a series of Curzon lines formed by international commissions when it is obvious that two ethnic groups are hopelessly intermingled. And the second part is then to provide for migration of those sections who wish to be within certain physical boundaries. In other words the very facts of the case put self-determination in a different light. (At this juncture, it would be well to remember the United States in 1861 when we had the most striking demonstration of self-determination in the world's history - the secession of South Carolina from the Union. This question must be studied in the context of the world.) What I am driving at then, is that the fact that Poland was given the Curzon line as a sine qua non and given the conditions under which she must start reconstruction is not in itself a dangerous denial of self-determination - the condition of the world today has set certain realistic requirements on self-determination as a world policy. And in reality these limitations need in no way cause shame, or the feeling of servitude among the non-English speaking peoples of Europe, or a negation of political freedom. The growth and pride of these nations will come from their ability to develop democratic and social systems and to fit them into the world picture, to become integral and functioning members of the world community; because borderlines may be drawn and certain types of policy may be forbidden - examples: outlawing of the Communist party, creation of disproportionate armies and navies - there is no reason to grow downcast and disheartened. Some of the current complaints are mere noise - the constructive opportunity for the Poles, specifically, is there for them to grasp; we cannot forget that the small nations bear a burden of proof too - Poland had the fascism of Pilsudski, Greece that of King George and Metaxas, Italy succumber early to Mussolini, and so on. We are now crossing the first of many thresholds - the building of a peace cannot be cut and dried.

I didn't know what to think when Bill Cunningham came up with the conclusion that we need a man like FDR at San Francisco as our best argument and guarantee of what we want - I wonder how that jibes with some of his previous comments of the role which FDR assumed in foreign affairs. OK for this noon - I heard from Juj this morning -

Regards to Doris.

All my love, *Gunn*