

May 11, 1945

Dear Ones,

This new ribbon fascinates me - everything is so clear and legible, compared to the old and faint one!! I misdated the letter I wrote yesterday - I am sure I wrote the 11th when it actually was only the 10th; I made the mistake all day long and got confused on a number of scores. I am oriented again now. I wrote to Bill Snower last night and I also wrote a note to the local Zionists in answer to their offer. Tonight Hal will be over and we will probably go to services; I am moderately busy and the days keep rolling along. Volleyball is one of the high points of the day and I do not miss Spanish especially. Drabness is still the order of the day. I owe a letter to Aunt Anne.

I still have a handful of clippings from PM and the TIMES magazine section and I'll breeze through them again. Boy, if the number of organizations that have descended on San Francisco as lobbies is any indication of the vigor of our new world, then we can have no doubt but that there is enough enthusiasm and vitality to work out the many problems of peace; everything from Republican Spain to Zionism and back. It is a healthy sign and every problem deserves a place on the agenda - as for Spain specifically, I am all for a few healthy rebuffs at Franco and a growing pressure for the defeat of his regime; the figures on political prisoners in Spain and the record of the fascist falangist rule are hardly bright spots on the Franco ledger. And it seems as though such pressure on Spain would have strong and favorable repercussions in all of South America. This is the question we discussed before, Mother: we cannot tolerate the continuance of a flagrantly fascistic and unconstructive government within nations of the post-war world. We are fighting fascism, not just the Fascist Powers who actually warred against us. As for Argentina, I feel that the Peron regime is on very shaky ground and the seating of Argentina at San Francisco may have the result of upsetting the fascist elements of his regime; as usual I am rather poorly informed on the many details to arrive at a real conclusion. What I recall of my history though is that Argentina does have the basis for a good political democracy - but that her tendency has been to economic imperialism, based on her own healthy economy, over her neighboring nations. However, it is my impression that Argentina as she stands now is salvageable, but that her current policies must be recognized for what they are. With the end of the war stimulus to her prosperity and with a new day in which we can concentrate and work on such problems the changes we desire may be made; it must be carefully handled though lest national dander be aroused to the point of nullifying constructive efforts. The problem of maintaining external pan-American union is also a factor to be considered.

Austria seems to be the next question; the Russian conquerors have set up a government on their own hook and apparently without prior approval of the United States and Great Britain. The situation is similar in its handling to the Polish question. At Yalta the provisions were set up for a tripartite settlement but in each case the Russians seem to have jumped the gun and gone against the spirit of the Yalta settlement. (We are not now discussing whether the government set-up is good or bad; we are talking of the method.) It is not hard to understand the Russian picture and the Russian program - it may be a little more difficult to justify it. Russia is determined that Europe will not foster any growth which will be a positive threat to her country, which will be the nucleus for a reawakened anti-Soviet, pro-German development. Therefore at Yalta when the questions were raised, she must have been insistent on these points, and it must have been agreed that although there would be joint commissions, the nation most immediately and physically concerned was the Soviet. My conclusion would be then that Russia has felt that the Allies have not moved fast enough for her, that they are not stepping into the breach quickly enough or with the proper recognition of the problem. The result is that although the Russian solution may be just, the method is contrary to our understanding of the agreement



and the result is that those who oppose Russia or any solution along pro-Russian lines find ~~new~~ support from those who may approve of the solution but not of the method. The entire situation reflects the fact that Russia still has some hesitation over the singleness of purpose of the American and British peace programs. I do not know the whole story - if Russia called in her allies and said "We want to do something about Austria immediately and this is why" and was told to wait, that all would come in good time, then there is more justification for her action. Too many people are extremists - either everything Russia does is good or everything Russia does is bad. I think that we face a situation where a very definite and clear and effective policy faces one that is much more vacillating - needless to say, the first is going to present the latter with facts accomplished. It happened in Rumania, in Poland, and now in Austria. The fault is just as much ours because the responsibility for constructive policy is ours as well as Russia's - we cannot expect Russia to sit back and wait for us since she has crystallized her stake in these affairs so much more clearly than we have. The constructive conclusion should be that this is further proof of our need of effective cooperation; that we still have a long way to go. And specifically - that our State Department and the British Foreign office are still predominately slow moving and cautious, if not conservative. At the present time Russia is the protagonist of the cause of effective world peace and action - on specific questions, in other words, Russia is forcing the issue. It is a healthy and constructive challenge to us to offer something better.

Well, that is enough for this session - I still have most of the clippings untouched!

All my love,

Regards to Doris.

