

May 15th 1945

Dear Ones,

Tonight we have played a couple of hours of bridge - it was a good night for it since it has rained all day and that made it too damp for movies. The game was mediocre - Nate Wolfe and I had all the cards but our play and bidding were weak; we are all poor players, but comparatively Nate is the poorest and that was the reason I stalled off playing for money - I don't like to gamble unless I have a partner in whom I have confidence. Art came back today and from first reports he had a wonderful time - Auckland apparently is just what the American soldier ordered. Mail today brought a note from Dan Penn who got an appointment to warrant officer - very fine news; a letter from Ruthie, and a collection from home.

I have three of your V mails HB and they certainly brought me up to date. Keep them coming, Toots. A Bulletin came and I got a kick out of the picture of <sup>Deb</sup>ett Silverman complete with wing collar. Is the Diamon chap (Lester?) who is married to the Wigon's eldest daughter (Rose?) still in the States? (I have forgotten all the names!) I will get to your letters that were still unanswered before today's letters came.

One thing is clear - all of the columnists, even those who are normally anti-Russian hold out the greatest hope for the San Francisco conference: the issues and points of discussion all ways boil down to certain basic considerations: the role of Russia, the role of the small nations, the British Empire, or what have you, in relationship to United States policy. All recognize the realism of Russia, the astuteness of Mr. Molotov. All see the potential of disagreement in every phase of the activity and all point out away to avoid the splits that might result. Specific questions of Poland, Argentina, and the protocol and diplomacy of the conference appear day after day. And in all the commentary there is a reflection of the fact that despite the surface agreements there are widely divergent points of view - let's take Lawrence and Lippmann. Lawrence's column on the day of the vote on Argentina points out that Russia was defeated because her policy of rejecting admission until a decision could be reached on the nature of the Argentinian government could be determined was not consistent with Russia's attitude toward the idea of the rest of the world's adjudging communism in its Russian model; he pointed out that Russia's argument was right but that her inconsistency denied its validity. Lippmann on the other hand talks on the subject of the showdown which Stettinius forced per se and argues a strong case for diplomacy over showdown voting and its distasteful accomplishments, accomplishments of outlining and creating overall splits rather than unanimity. I do not agree with Lawrence, I do with Lippmann - the standards that apply to Russia do not apply to Argentina, the non-belligerent. The reason for seating Argentina should have been in line with the Russian idea - examination of Argentina's internal set-up, relation of it to her foreign position, consideration of her democratic potential and how this decision would influence it, and then the decision. Obviously, the American delegations weighed these factors and made up their minds, but they should have ironed it out diplomatically instead of forcing it down by vote. Lawrence makes a common error - the standards which apply to one nation do not automatically apply to all others.

This typewriter is getting impossible - this letter is certainly garbled. The note from Evelyn would make her busier than 99/100's of the people in the Army in the New Hebrides; she writes well. I am a little confused over the fate of the campaign - I take it that the goal was not reached. There may be a summary of the results on the way to me now. I had better hit the sack - I am a little groggy -

All my love,

Regards to Doris

