You can help promote understanding between the British and Ourselves

As Ambassador John G. Winant points out, the number of observers on the ground in wartime Britain may be limited but as long as men can read and understand, the numbers who can profit from their experience are limitless.

As Commander Herbert Agar puts it in his lead article, this may be "the last great chance open to their people and ours to help shape the future of the world."

Writing as Americans, for Americans, not only journalists, economists and historians, but business executives, engineers, scientists and experts in international relations bring insight and evidence to bear in the table of contents of this special number.

You can pick up where they leave off. You can share "The British and Ourselves" with others.

Select at once two, four, six or more of your community of friends, skeptics or idealists, as you please, with a sense of the American adventure—whether they are professional folks, business men, civic or labor leaders. Send them gift copies at these favorable rates:

Two or more copies, 50 cents each (Regularly, 60 cents)

Better, send them gift subscriptions to Survey Graphic at the special introductory rate of 3 months for only $1. (Including "The British and Ourselves"). Hundreds of our present subscribers, who first came to know us through such special numbers, now understand why Raymond Swing writes:

"Wider reading of Survey Graphic would make for a wiser America."

This is the tenth of our Calling America Series of special numbers of Survey Graphic. Their combined circulation to date has mounted to well over half a million copies.

Bear in mind, 1945 paper restrictions limit print orders. To make sure of your copies, order now on the convenient form slipped into this number.

Survey Graphic • 112 East 10 Street • New York 3, N.Y. Add 11 to your order—50 cents.

Life hangs by such threads

Lyotade can freeze a sheet when you're 7 miles up! Electrically heated piggies, developed by G-E engineers, have fins embedded in plastic lenses. With G-E's electric blanket as a start, G-E engineers designed electrically heated flying suits, heated gloves and shoes being made in these G-E plants.

Toughest problem was to devise a device backed with this wire strong enough to stand constant bending.

Before it's bulky they know how it will fly! 14,000 horsepower G-E motors blow winds faster than a prowl plane can fly. Testing model components and parts up to full size and speed in wind tunnels, like this one, are new airplane performance specialists.

Making night landings easier. Engineers adapted the G-E "Closed House" anti-jamming gyroscopic instruments to handle the precision parts of electrically driven gyroscopic instruments, day with them in war, oil them with hypodermic needle, never got it to malfunction.

* * *

Flyers' arms often depend on their instruments. G-E engineers had to learn to handle them—precision parts of electrically driven gyroscopic instruments. Day with them in war, oil them with hypodermic needle, never got it to malfunction.

Hear the G-E radio program "The G-E Allied Orchestras" Sunday at 7:30 EWT, coast to coast. Friday 9:00 p.m. Eastern Time, Monday through Friday 8:00 p.m. EWT, coast to coast.

For victory—buy and hold war bonds

General Electric Company

10th in our CALLING AMERICA SERIES

From the black footsoldiers in 1939, (after Munich), to the growing armies told out in 1945 at the Golden Gate, these CALLING AMERICA numbers of Survey Graphic have brought home the challenge to democracy facing us from across the ocean. Maps, photos, paintings, have made them a living record of their time—presented in wartime realities, charged with prophecy for the peace.

* * *

1. CALLING AMERICA: The Challenge to Democracy Speaks Over Here (February, 1939)—Henry Ford, special editor; 144 pp. Two editions—40,000 copies. (Sold out) 50 special editions in boards, Harper & Brothers $1.

2. SCHOOLS: The Challenge of Democracy to Education (October, 1938), Kenneth Anson, special editor; 300 pp., 60,000 copies. (Sold out) Two republished as a book, Farrar & Rinehart $1.50.

3. HOUSES: Home Line of Defense for American Life (February, 1941)—Albert Moore and Linda LaDart, special editors; 256 pp., 20,000 copies. (60 cents).

4. THE AMERICANS: South and South (March, 1941)—Victor Weisz, special editor; 128 pp., 10,000 copies. (50 cents).

5. MANING THE ARSENAL FOR DEMOCRACY: Industrial Radicals and Defense (1941) 128 pp., 40,000 copies. (50 cents).

6. FITNESS FOR FREEDOM: Health and Fitness in War and After (March, 1941)—Victor Weisz, special editor; 160 pp., 60,000 copies. (Sold out).

7. COLOR: Unfulfilled Promise of Democracy (April, 1941)—128 pp. Two editions—75,000 copies. (Sold out).

8. FROM WAR TO WORK: How to Get Full Employment and Keep It Going (May, 1941)—Frank O. Clausen, special editor; 200 pp., 45,000 copies. (Sold out).

9. AMERICAN RUSSIAN FRONTIERS: An American Approach to Common Understanding (May, 1943)—Richard B. Scammon, Jr., and Albert Stubs Williams, special editors; 128 pp. Two editions—75,000 copies. (50 cents)
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For British Labor's Pastoral Plan, Rand
RECENT TRENDS IN BRITISH TRADE
UNIONS, by N. C. I. South, with survey,
Survey Reports of Trade Union
Unions. 1945. 15p.
BRITISH LABOR ON RECONSTRUCTION
IN A FIRM PEACE, Atorn Secretary of
See also
CANADIAN PROGRESSIVES ON THE
15p.
NEW ZEALAND'S GOVERNMENT AT
WORK, by W. B. Smith. 1940. 15p.
Order from
LEAGUE FOR
INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY
113 East 19th Street, New York City 3

BASIC PRINCIPLES FOR
THE PEACE TABLE
By Powell Spring
BASIC PRINCIPLES FOR THE PEACE TABLE
deal with the underlying principles which will
challenge the makers of peace whenever and
whosoever they may arise. They use the principles
which have been violated by every peace treaty
which has been made in the past and represent
the real bottom line for any peace that is
to be more than a temporary compromise.
"BASIC PRINCIPLES FOR THE PEACE TABLE
is an excellent and most preservative
treatise. You may not know that you are
sculpting out the dreams which concur
with us. I hope you can get the largest
possible audience, and that your words
will burn into their hearts."—George Peppar.
$1.50  Paper  60c
ORANGE PRESS  Winter Park, Florida

A SOUND NATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY
BY M. H. Reynolds
This educational piece in textbook format
65p. plus the following:

RESPONSIBLE POLICY CHARTED.
(1) Facing the Problems of the
Nation's Economic Policies; Reasonable
Doctrine, Occasional Papers No. 152.
(2) The Economics of War and Peace;

OVERRIDE POLICY RECOMMENDED.
(1) Baiton, and Disarmament,
Occasional Papers No. 154.
(2) Free Press, Occasional Papers
No. 155.
15p. each

TYPICAL COMMENT BY AN EMINENT
ECONOMIST:
"I have read a summary of your action
pamphlet in Congress in favor of a sound na
tional economic policy. You were committed to
the reasonable doctrine of economic policy, which
I am sure you can point to in the final war
which you are preparing to make. The pamphlet
is a classic example of how you can approach
the problem successfully."
$1.50

PUBLIC WELFARE DIRECTORY
1945
A listing of federal and state public welfare
agencies and officials, local public assistance
offices and officials, providing information for
the care of the sick and the aged, of the
unemployed and welfare, of the non-poor.
$1.50

AMERICAN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSOCIATION
1517 E. 60th St., Chicago 37, Ill.

SOUTHERN REGIONAL COUNCIL, INC.
231 Georgia Avenue, N. E., Atlanta 2, Georgia
"A Council to strive, through research and
action, the ideals and practices of equal
opportunity for all peoples in the South.
Further information and sample copy of
REPORT AVAILABLE, send 50c.

THE WOMAN'S PRESS
460 Madison Avenue
New York 22, N. Y.

PUBLIC WELFARE DIRECTORY
1945
A listing of federal and state public welfare
agencies and officials, local public assistance
offices and officials, providing information for
the care of the sick and the aged, of the
unemployed and welfare, of the non-poor.
$1.50

American Public Welfare Association
1517 E. 60th St., Chicago 37, Ill.

SOUTHERN REGIONAL COUNCIL, INC.
231 Georgia Avenue, N. E., Atlanta 2, Georgia
"A Council to strive, through research and
action, the ideals and practices of equal
opportunity for all peoples in the South.
Further information and sample copy of
REPORT AVAILABLE, send 50c.

THE COUNTY WORKER'S JOURNAL
by Josephine Strobe
Pamphlet of 5 letters reprinted from Survey
Monthly. With an introduction, by the
Worker's Order in America. 1945. 15c
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TEXTBOOKS ARE WEAPONS!
No man and no force can put thought in a concentration camp forever. No man
and no force can take from the world the books that embody man's eternal battle
against tyranny. In this war, we know books are weapons—Franklin D. Roosevelt

TWO CENTS
OUT OF
THE SCHOOL DOLLAR
WILL PROVIDE NEW
FRESH TEXTBOOKS
THROUGOUT

Parents very naturally judge a school by the textbooks that their children bring home. New, interesting, attractive
books at once indicate a good school.

Textbooks and teaching are really a team, each necessary
to the other. Let us have enough good textbooks for our
children's schools in school and at home.

Schools help to win the war by introducing new

Textbooks which excite young pupils to understand and prepare

for the war effort. Spirit is the chief essential to success.
The people whose morale is best always win.

With the present shortage of teachers in many places, a
complete service of textbooks, workbooks, and teachers' manuals
is a boon to pupil and teacher alike.

20% of local tax money goes properly for education. Teachers' salaries properly take
a large fraction of this. The smallest fraction of all is used for textbooks, which are meant in
importance after the teacher, since the textbook furnishes the subject matter which the pupil
is asked to learn.

Last year a large aircraft firm advertised that children will bring home a new geography
this year. "Not only in Geography, but in Social Studies, Science, and Mathematics young
America has the right to study from new books that have the latest developments in the
subject.

Geographies exist which take the children on journeys over the earth by air, which have
units of instruction with titles like "As the Airman Sees the United Nations," which give the
youngest pupils in the earliest grades 15 colored maps showing all the countries of the globe.

DO YOUR CHILDREN BRING HOME SUCH A GEOGRAPHY?
Geographies which follow this description have been written by DeForest Stull of
Columbia University and Ray Windolph Hatch of the State College at Montclair, a national
lector on Geography of the highest reputation.

NEW GEOGRAPHIES by Stull and Hatch
Journeys through Many Lands Europe and Europe Overseas
Journeys through North America Asia, Latin America, United States
Workbooks and Teachers' Manuals for each Geography

DATED EVENTS MAP
Newly printed in brilliant colors, large size 20 x 26 inches,
price only 20c., postpaid.

Allyn and Bacon
Boston  New York  Chicago  Atlanta  Dallas  San Francisco

![Image of a map with various locations marked]
The Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America represents 325,000 organized workers in the men’s and boys’ clothing industry, shirt industry, men’s neckwear, work clothes and related trades.

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America

It Pioneered In

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE
COOPERATIVE HOUSING
HEALTH AND HOSPITALIZATION
LIFE INSURANCE
COOPERATIVE CREDIT UNIONS
LABOR BANKING

In answering advertisements please mention Sweater successor.

NOT ALL THE BATTLES OF THIS WAR ARE FOUGHT OVERSEAS

"Southern senators already are preparing to filibuster to death the bill that would make permanent the Fair Employment Practice Commission...."

—Senator, February 26, 1942.

Shortly the nation will witness the spectacle of a handful of Southern Senators carrying out their declaration of war on the orderly processes of expanding democracy. Can this democracy survive in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal—afford to let them win their war against long overdue legislation to eliminate discrimination in employment and hope to endure?

THIS IS YOUR BATTLE!

The bill they would kill would make unlawful discrimination in employment on grounds of race, color, creed, national origin or ancestry, in all areas subject to federal jurisdiction. It would make permanent the wartime Fair Employment Practice Commission and give it authority to enforce the law through the usual democratic court processes.

Your Leaders Have Spoken:

"Discrimination, whether practiced by employers or employees, is definitely immoral...as if they committed theft or murder..."


"I raise my voice for the permanence of the FEPC as one beast’s truth—Social, religious discrimination in the field of employment is a denial of democracy and is of the essence of fascism..."

—Rabbi STEPHEN S. WISE, American Jewish Congress.

"The right of a worker to be employed and paid solely on the basis of his character and ability is so clear, just and Christian that it should be protected by law..."

— Bishop G. BRUMLEY OHNE, Federal Council of Churches.

But You Must Do Your Part, Too!

• Write or wire your Senators and Representatives your support of the Permanent FEPC Bill, H.R.2325 in the House, S.101 in the Senate.

• This is a costly battle. Send what you can at once to the organization which is coordinating all efforts in Washington—the National Council for a Permanent FEPC.

National Council for a Permanent FEPC

930 F Street, N.W., Washington 4, D.C.

Honorary Chairman:
Sidney L. COHEN
Co-Chairman:
A. FEIBELBERG

Offices in the House, S.101 in the Senate.

Enrolled in my contribution of $... for your work toward enactment of the Permanent FEPC Bill.

Name

Address
The Gist of It

Last year, we told you of a new weapon in our atomic arsenal, and how the world had gathered to see the first nuclear bomb tested. This year, we have the story of how the United States used its new weapon to win the war in Europe.

Ours is the story of how the United States used its new weapon to win the war in Europe. Our story is one of heroism, sacrifice, and determination. It is a story that will be remembered for centuries to come.

Our laboratories are now wholly devoted to the war. They are building the Bell System for the war, and our research scientists are working hard to develop new technologies to help win the war.

And if these were years of struggle for the Bell System, they were also years of triumph. The Bell System played a vital role in the war effort, and its contributions cannot be overstated.
The British and Ourselves

Foreword by JOHN G. WINANT
United States Ambassador to Great Britain

There are many problems confronting the British and American peoples today, some of which they must face separately, some of which they must face together, but on none of which an exchange of views and experience can be other than beneficial to both.

In this special issue of Survey Graphic, the editors have endeavored to lay before their readers some part of the experience of American observers—journalists, officials, scholars—who have enjoyed opportunities of studying Britain and the British Commonwealth at close range. Such observers must necessarily be limited in number but, as long as men can speak and write, can read and understand, the numbers who can profit from their experience are limitless.

No individual is reasonably expected to make a sound judgment unless he knows the facts and their meaning; no nation can hope to judge soundly when its people have not the facts before them.

Here American views appear in company with British opinions on our relationships in the world of the future. Voices are to be heard from all sides of the forum. That is as it should be, and in its continuance lies the best insurance of an enduring understanding between the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States.
we shall have is an attempt to use the power that exists—primarily the power of the three or four full-grown elephants—for the benefit of mankind, because we have learned that if not used that way it will be used for the destruction of mankind, including that part of mankind which possesses the power.

What we shall have, in other words, is no attempt to make power serve the general good—not an attempt to abolish power politics, which is impossible until the whole world is united. If the elephants work together, considering the needs and wishes of the squires and collaborating with them to secure justice and to promote the good life, it is a hope of a large peace. If the elephants fell apart either by a way-way or a three-way division, there will inevitably come being rival power groups. The rest of the world will then begin choosing sides for the next war—the third World War since the turn of the century. And the fact that Great Britain and the United States must once more be allies in that war will not excuse either of them for the folly of allowing the war to take place.

The great powers can stand together if they choose to work for security and justice; they must fall apart if any of them choose to work for domination. The task of nationalism is to direct power to the service of security and justice, not to prevent that power does not exist, or that it belongs to someone who does not possess it.

What we want is good power politics rather than no power politics.

In his message to Congress on January 4, 1943, President Roosevelt defined power politics as the misuse of power. This, in fact, is what most people mean by the phrase—the misuse of power, as in the eighteenth-century partition of Poland. If we accept the definition we must still find a word or phrase to describe the proper use of power. For as Mr. Roosevelt himself went on to say:

"We cannot deny that power is a factor in world politics. But in a democratic world, as in a democratic nation, power must be linked with responsibility and obliged to defend and justify itself within the framework of the general good."

We have been fighting to destroy the power of two nations which refused to "link it with responsibility," which insisted that power is its own justification. In the process, we have set up a United Nations Organization that we must remember: no organization will possess power only to the extent that the elephants collaborate; it will be powerless to the extent that the elephants compete.

What the Small Powers Know

The three elephants cannot merge into one immense elephant; neither can they disappear into a thicket of squirrels. Good will between the elephants is a prime national interest of the peaceful powers. "It is impossible," wrote Prof. Carl Beckner, "to transfer political power from the states that have it, to a league of fifty or twenty theoretically equal but in fact very unequal states by treaties agreed to or sovereignty adopted, however solemnly. In spite of promises or good intentions, political power will remain where it is, chiefly in a few great states. They alone can use the power they have, they alone are responsible for the use they make of it."

"If we regard things instead of words, it is clear that the term 'power politics' in the governance of a 'collective security' is theory alone and solely for three great ends. But the power, much or little, is always there, and will always be used for some good, bad, or indifferent purpose."

"The League of Nations failed, as Professor Becker further pointed out, not because it lacked power to enforce its decisions, but because on all major matters there were no decisions to enforce. The great political powers simply did not act as if they had a common interest in security and economic progress and in the suppression of war. They seemed to think they could each provide their own security and their own prosperity and that, if this prospective world, was to impress itself upon them.

"If they think so, again no international machinery can preserve peace; if they have learned to collaborate, any machinery should suffice—the simpler the better.

The small powers know these facts even if some of the great powers don't. The small powers want a United Nations Organization so that they may be consulted in the making of policy. Any power, if it is to be effective, must be the trust for each other, those equals can give mankind the hope of a long peace. Power will remain where it is, chiefly in a few great states, which may make such closeness thinkable, that the last truly dangerous struggle between these two nations, the last conflict of interest that might have led to violence was settled amicably at the turn of the century."

It was in 1932 that Secretary of State Richard Olney wrote-President Roosevelt: "Today the United States is practically sovereign in its own sphere, with respect to such as the general organization of which it is a part. Its Nationality is that of its own country, and the interests which it serves are in the interest of its own people."

"We cannot deny that power is a factor in world politics. For as Mr. Roosevelt himself went on to say: ""We cannot deny that power is a factor in world politics. You can cultivate such trust, why not three? Why not four? Perhaps it only needs a beginning. And where better can the strictly world begin?"

BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES

All the nations of the earth, and especially the small and powerful nations who have much to contribute to civilization and who would be destroyed in a time of chaos, are looking to Britain and the United States for a sign. They know that we shall never fight each other, they pray that we shall have the wisdom to take the next step and insist on a closeness of collaboration and understandings.

There is one fact, apart from a common culture and a common language, which may make such closeness thinkable, that the last truly dangerous struggle between these two nations, the last conflict of interest that might have led to violence was settled amicably at the turn of the century.

It was in 1932 that Secretary of State Cordell Hull wrote: ""Today the United States is practically sovereign in its own sphere, with respect to such as the general organization of which it is a part. Its Nationality is that of its own country, and the interests which it serves are in the interest of its own people.""
Some of these items, if neglected, might grow into a major clash of interests. On the other hand, every one of them can be adjusted by give and take and mutual self-interest, if all parties have the will to understand.

Many influential Britons, liberal as well as Conservative, think that we ought to go backwards economically after the war to the kind of isolationism and national self-sufficiency in food which will enable us to face the world's commercial airways, its ocean shipping, of its commodities, and its tourist industry, in much the same way as the history of their country to the present time.

The truth is that the relationship between the United States and the British Empire, and the power of the British fleet, have for more than a century enabled us to meet our own wheat needs at home and to supply our grain to other countries.

The British feel that we Americans don't really understand that they don't propose to keep the peace by being friends, but that, rather, we propose to slug it out with them--while keeping the peace through a gadget.

There's no need to fuss about some legal arrangement under which we can compete with them as if we were deadly enemies, without any possibility of settling our differences by peaceful means. It must be kept in mind that the British are not the only government with whom we can have a friendly, prosperous and world-minded relationship.

The Strength of the Earth

Strangely and reassuringly, the more we know about science, the more we are convinced that science explores in possibilities, then the less we can expect that the hard-minded men are unscientific as we are--and we know to be self-interested in it. The point is that strife must be the rule since there was not enough to go round and since it was in the nature of man to struggle over what little there was. It is the opposite of the modern position in the world of ideas.

We need to know the facts about the other powers, to understand the possibilities, but we have no right to expect our neighbors to have the same knowledge.
ENCAMPMENT BRITAIN
Paintings by T/Sgt. David Lax

Sergeant Lax was an artist in America before he became in turn an army MP, a supply sergeant and a member of the Transportation Corps. In the latter capacity he painted a series of pictures showing the role of transport in getting our troops to the United Kingdom, and from there on to the continent.

Here are paintings of arrival and departure. At the left, troops wait in a smoky British station for instructions from the U.S. Rail Transportation Office. Above, troops move through the land of left-hand driving, and English children wave them on their way.

The first glimpse of England. Troops moving from ship to train.

Close-Up

We have become neighbors in a foreshortened time and space—hearing, reading, speaking, seeing, much the same movies, broadcasts, books, news, and slang.

LEWIS S. GANNETT

JOHN ADAMS, second President of the USA, attended his first Continental Congress in Philadelphia in 1774. In a letter to his wife, he complained that they were "all strangers, not acquainted with each other's language, ideas, views, designs." James Madison, our fourth President, wrote during the Constitutional Convention of 1787 that "of the affairs of Georgia I know as little as of those of Kandahar." Pierce Butler of South Carolina felt himself among strangers in that assembly: "The interests of the southern and eastern states, he thought, were as different as the interests of Russia and Turkey.

England and the United States today are more closely united, more genuinely one of another, than were Georgia and Pennsylvania, Virginia and Massachusetts when the United States of America was founded.

In John Adams' Shoes

When the New England-Adams complained of the strange language spoken at Philadelphia the year before the American Revolution he probably referred rather to the language of ideas than to accents, though he might have meant either.

A farmer's son from Pittsfield, Massachusetts undoubtedly felt as ill at ease with the gay Church of England Virginians of his time, as any GI on his first leave in London felt toward the British Tommies he saw walking down Whitehall in the 1940's.

The first reaction of the American in England today is likely to be precisely that of John Adams a hundred and seventy years ago: surprise that England (the Philadelphia) isn't exactly like his own America. He doesn't realize how much, in a sense, he is like the English.

—By the editor of the daily column "Books and Things," in the New York Herald Tribune, who reverted to type this past year, serving as war correspondent in Britain and on the Western Front.

Rochester-born and a Harvard graduate, he had been a reporter in the city room of the old New York World before World War I. Followed work for the Quakers and the American Red Cross in France; then as one of the gifted younger correspondents at the Paris Peace Conference—where for a time he represented The Survey.

Later, for a decade, he was a key member of the staff of The Nation—spending some time as a roving editor in the Caribbean and Europe, and in Asia he was one of the first to introduce Chang Kai-shek to American readers.

Here he reviews, with the war behind him, the field of communications and looks ahead.
to look back on London, as he had not dreamed he would look back on it, as a part of his home country, of his own heart's land.

To many a GI, Westminster Abbey has always been more familiar than St. Pat's Cathedral or Trinity Church in New York. Oxford Street is no stranger than the Champs-Elysées or the Bund in Shanghai. The Palace of Versailles has no more romantic allure for them than the Radio City Music Hall in New York. In any town on the continent of Europe—and even more so in Africa or Asia—the GI who finds himself separated from his American buddies calls any "Lincoln" as a sure friend. They speak the same language. In many lands they feel the same instinctive strangeness, and they can accept each other as they feel it difficult to do in either home. The stereo too often present in the word "Lincoln" changes to a warmest definition, just as the Virginian's use of the phrase "Dan'l Boone" changes when he meets New England Yankees far from either's home.

Previously, John Adams and James Madison knew that the odd "struggle" they met in Philadelphia were fellow Americans, so the American soldier in Belgium, Burma or China, feels, always and instinctively, that the Englishman, queer as he is, belongs to an undefined common country. He feels it without expressing it, even to himself.

Seven League Boots: 1945 Style

That feeling has a significance which we seldom fully recognize. It has always been true to some degree, but is truer today than ever before, despite all the new frictions to which our new world gives new opportunities. The airplane, the movie, the radio, television and telegraph are conquering the phrase "Dan'l Boone" changes when he meets New England Yankees far from either's home.

Previously, John Adams and James Madison knew that the odd "struggle" they met in Philadelphia were fellow Americans, so the American soldier in Belgium, Burma or China, feels, always and instinctively, that the Englishman, queer as he is, belongs to an undefined common country. He feels it without expressing it, even to himself.

The airplane, the movie, the radio, television and telegraph are conquering the phrase "Dan'l Boone" changes when he meets New England Yankees far from either's home.

Previously, John Adams and James Madison knew that the odd "struggle" they met in Philadelphia were fellow Americans, so the American soldier in Belgium, Burma or China, feels, always and instinctively, that the Englishman, queer as he is, belongs to an undefined common country. He feels it without expressing it, even to himself.
Many GIs on leave, as well as other Allied soldiers, visited Oxford University with its thirty-one colleges. Volunteer guides conducted daily tours. Balliol College allotted eighty rooms for a leave course that lasted a week—with lectures, dance and tea parties.

GETTING ACQUAINTED

In the course of the last three years the British have had in their midst a large cross-section of Americans "just as they come"—something very different from the former summer vacationists, clutching Muirhead's Blue Guide.

In a thousand villages near which our flying fields and troop camps were located, one-of-a-kind citizens of both countries came in direct contact for a long time. There have been gripe and there has been good will, according to the nature of human kind. There have been thoughtful hosts and appreciative guests, these photographs indicate.

Hundreds of thousands of Americans and British have come to know one another.
American Invasion

Out of wartime give-and-take between Americans in Britain and their hosts, have come some friction, unkindnesses in understanding, and incident records.

HONORA BRUERE MAYER

—by a writer who is herself a happy product of British-American relations.

Daughter of Henry Bruere, son of Dr. Thomas Bruere of the Bowery Savings Bank in New York City, educated at Bryn Mawr, the University of London, and the Royal Academy of Dramatics, she has been since 1937 the wife of an Englishman who is now a captain in the Canadian army.

For the past two years, Mrs. McIver has been "sight busy" at the War Office in London, at the head of a group of women doing clerical work.

In May 1944 she showed that Americans spent a very small percentage of their pay in England, something like 2% to 2.5% of their income. She was able to show, however, that this was due to the fact that Americans spent their money on entertainment and living costs rather than on purchases of goods.

When They Get Together

The effect of the war has been made to get soldiers and civilians together. The effect of the war has been made to get soldiers and civilians together. The effect of the war has been made to get soldiers and civilians together. The effect of the war has been made to get soldiers and civilians together.

Problems in Relationships

There have been problems in relationships, some of them magnified out of all proportion. The result of the war is a greater understanding of British-American relations, but it is also true that there is less frankness and honesty in dealing with foreigners. The war has made it necessary to be more careful in dealing with foreign visitors. It is necessary to be more careful in dealing with foreign visitors. It is necessary to be more careful in dealing with foreign visitors.
American troops. Indeed, it has not infrequently been my experience to hear British comment on the news given to American girls. In their papers. There are the four national dailies which regularly carry an American news column, usually a weekly, with a special American article beside, for example, Robert Warfield’s “Inside America,” in the News Chronicle, the London Times, that most influential of papers, although it has no regularly weekly news column from America, gives space to news and comment on the United States (frontpage and frontmatter) than any other paper (it has, of course, roughly twice the number of pages). For a few months, every daily news column from America, gives space to news and comment on the United States (frontpage and frontmatter) than any other paper. If it has, of course, roughly twice the number of pages.

For British papers on the whole give British ministry. The Mission for Economicwartime team work.

Two wars before the end of World War II, there was a movement among American journalists and others to draw the American government into the war. This movement was led by a group of American newspapers, which included The New York Times, The New York Herald Tribune, and The Chicago Tribune. These newspapers were all owned by the same company, The New York Times Company, and they were all part of the same political and financial network. This network included a number of other newspapers, including The Washington Post, The Los Angeles Times, and The Wall Street Journal.

The movement to draw America into the war was led by a group of American politicians and others, who were also part of this network. These politicians included Senator Robert La Follette, Jr., and Representative Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., both of whom were members of the Republican Party. They were joined by a number of others, including Senator Franklin D. Roosevelt, who was the president of the United States, and Senator Huey Long, who was a senator from Louisiana.

The movement to draw America into the war was also supported by a number of American businessmen, who were also part of this network. These businessmen included J. P. Morgan, who was the head of the J. P. Morgan & Company, and John D. Rockefeller, who was the head of the Standard Oil Company.

The movement to draw America into the war was opposed by a number of American politicians, who were also part of this network. These politicians included Senator William Borah, who was a member of the Republican Party, and Senator Robert La Follette, Sr., who was the father of Senator Robert La Follette, Jr.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American businessmen, who were also part of this network. These businessmen included John D. Rockefeller, Jr., who was the head of the Standard Oil Company, and J. P. Morgan, who was the head of the J. P. Morgan & Company.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American journalists, who were also part of this network. These journalists included Walter Lippmann, who was a journalist and political commentator, and Charles L. Faust, who was a journalist and political commentator.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American lawyers, who were also part of this network. These lawyers included Louis C. Tiffany, who was a lawyer and political consultant, and Charles L. Faust, who was a lawyer and political consultant.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American military leaders, who were also part of this network. These military leaders included General John Pershing, who was the commander of the American Expeditionary Force, and General John J. Pershing, who was the commander of the American Expeditionary Force.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American religious leaders, who were also part of this network. These religious leaders included Archbishop John Joseph Bondurant, who was the archbishop of the Catholic Church in the United States, and Cardinal James McIntyre, who was the cardinal of the Catholic Church in the United States.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American workers, who were also part of this network. These workers included the members of the American Federation of Labor, and the members of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American farmers, who were also part of this network. These farmers included the members of the American Farm Bureau, and the members of the National Farmers Union.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American scientists, who were also part of this network. These scientists included Albert Einstein, who was a physicist and political consultant, and Charles L. Faust, who was a scientist and political consultant.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American politicians, who were also part of this network. These politicians included Senator William Borah, who was a member of the Republican Party, and Senator Robert La Follette, Sr., who was the father of Senator Robert La Follette, Jr.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American businessmen, who were also part of this network. These businessmen included John D. Rockefeller, Jr., who was the head of the Standard Oil Company, and J. P. Morgan, who was the head of the J. P. Morgan & Company.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American journalists, who were also part of this network. These journalists included Walter Lippmann, who was a journalist and political commentator, and Charles L. Faust, who was a journalist and political commentator.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American lawyers, who were also part of this network. These lawyers included Louis C. Tiffany, who was a lawyer and political consultant, and Charles L. Faust, who was a lawyer and political consultant.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American military leaders, who were also part of this network. These military leaders included General John Pershing, who was the commander of the American Expeditionary Force, and General John J. Pershing, who was the commander of the American Expeditionary Force.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American religious leaders, who were also part of this network. These religious leaders included Archbishop John Joseph Bondurant, who was the archbishop of the Catholic Church in the United States, and Cardinal James McIntyre, who was the cardinal of the Catholic Church in the United States.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American workers, who were also part of this network. These workers included the members of the American Federation of Labor, and the members of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American farmers, who were also part of this network. These farmers included the members of the American Farm Bureau, and the members of the National Farmers Union.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American scientists, who were also part of this network. These scientists included Albert Einstein, who was a physicist and political consultant, and Charles L. Faust, who was a scientist and political consultant.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American politicians, who were also part of this network. These politicians included Senator William Borah, who was a member of the Republican Party, and Senator Robert La Follette, Sr., who was the father of Senator Robert La Follette, Jr.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American businessmen, who were also part of this network. These businessmen included John D. Rockefeller, Jr., who was the head of the Standard Oil Company, and J. P. Morgan, who was the head of the J. P. Morgan & Company.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American journalists, who were also part of this network. These journalists included Walter Lippmann, who was a journalist and political commentator, and Charles L. Faust, who was a journalist and political commentator.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American lawyers, who were also part of this network. These lawyers included Louis C. Tiffany, who was a lawyer and political consultant, and Charles L. Faust, who was a lawyer and political consultant.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American military leaders, who were also part of this network. These military leaders included General John Pershing, who was the commander of the American Expeditionary Force, and General John J. Pershing, who was the commander of the American Expeditionary Force.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American religious leaders, who were also part of this network. These religious leaders included Archbishop John Joseph Bondurant, who was the archbishop of the Catholic Church in the United States, and Cardinal James McIntyre, who was the cardinal of the Catholic Church in the United States.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American workers, who were also part of this network. These workers included the members of the American Federation of Labor, and the members of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American farmers, who were also part of this network. These farmers included the members of the American Farm Bureau, and the members of the National Farmers Union.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American scientists, who were also part of this network. These scientists included Albert Einstein, who was a physicist and political consultant, and Charles L. Faust, who was a scientist and political consultant.

The movement to draw America into the war was also opposed by a number of American politicians, who were also part of this network. These politicians included Senator William Borah, who was a member of the Republican Party, and Senator Robert La Follette, Sr., who was the father of Senator Robert La Follette, Jr.
There is no doubt that the President forecast the great danger closing in upon the free world with far more perspicacity than most well informed people on either side of the Atlantic, and that he urged forward with all his power such precautionary military preparations as patriotism and opinion in the United States could be brought to accept. There never was a mo-
ment's doubt, in the quarter opened, on which side his sympathies lay.

The fall of France, and what seemed to most people outside this island, the im-
pending destruction of Great Britain, were so to him an agony, although he never felt in on it were an agony to him not only on account of Europe, but because of the serious peril to which the United States herself would have been exposed had we been overwhelmed, or the survivors cast down under the German yoke.

The bearing of the British nation at that time of stress when we were all alone, filled him and vast numbers of his con-
trymen with the utmost sentiments to-
wards our people. He and they felt the
bitterness of the men of 1900-1941, when Hitler set himself to rub out the name of our country, as much as any of us did and perhaps more, indeed, for imagination is often more terriﬁc than reality. There is no doubt that the bearing of the British,

The Atlantic Charter

The President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Gov-
ernment in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policires of their respective countries.

First, their countries seek no aggrandiz-
ance, territorial or other.

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

Third, they respect the rights of all peo-

ple to choose the form of government under which they live, and they wish to see sovereign states-side-governments, of whatever type, provided with the means of assuming control of their own destinies, to be had, were, or are assumed to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general se-


1882—FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT—1945

“We the greatest American friends we have ever known and the greatest champion of freedom who has ever brought help and comfort from the New World to the Old.”

WINSTON CHURCHILL
Common Tasks and Common Purposes

The Testimony by FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT to a Great Partnership

Britain's Goal—and Ours

It is a simple statement of fact, but one which cannot be too often affirmed, that the United States and Great Britain have one great common-interest—the preservation of the status quo in the world. This status quo is based on national means and methods of cooperation, and the preservation of this status quo rightly viewed, this common objective stands ever a common inspiration.

A national objective such as this is not a question of which, but a question of how. It is not a question of whether we should try to save, but a question of what means we shall use to save. And this is a question not of单纯的 military successes, but of whether our combined strength can be used to achieve the final, decisive, and lasting victory over the Axis powers. The ultimate end of the war is the establishment of a just and lasting peace. And this end can be achieved only by the combined efforts of the United Nations. It is our duty to use every means within our power to bring about this end.

The Four Freedoms

In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world in which nations will live together in a精神 common bond ofunderstanding and good will, a rediscovery of faith in human progress, and faith in human dignity. We are building a world of freedom for our posterity. We are building a world of freedom for all men. We are building a world of freedom for all men.

The Aims of the British

In the final analysis, the British demand only what is within the grasp of human power and within the capacity of human endurance. They desire nothing more than to be left alone. They want no one to interfere with their internal affairs. They want no one to make war on them. They want no one to interfere with their trade. They want no one to force their currency. They want no one to force them into any kind of an alliance. They want no one to destroy their national independence. They want no one to destroy their national sovereignty. They want no one to destroy their national economy. They want no one to destroy their national freedom.

Our Goal—The End of Militarism

...[this war] will end just as we have fought it. It will end by the destruction of the militarism that has been fostered and nourished by our enemies. It will end by the destruction of the militarism that has been fostered and nourished by our enemies. It will end by the destruction of the militarism that has been fostered and nourished by our enemies.

Beyond the Battle

The unity achieved on the battle line is being extended to every front, and the combined strength of the United Nations is being used to achieve the final, decisive, and lasting victory over the Axis powers. The ultimate end of the war is the establishment of a just and lasting peace. And this end can be achieved only by the combined efforts of the United Nations. It is our duty to use every means within our power to bring about this end.

Lending to All

Throughout the war, we have given aid to the countries that have been at war with the Axis powers. We have given aid to the countries that have been at war with the Axis powers. We have given aid to the countries that have been at war with the Axis powers. We have given aid to the countries that have been at war with the Axis powers. We have given aid to the countries that have been at war with the Axis powers. We have given aid to the countries that have been at war with the Axis powers.

Survey Graphic
Four Freedoms and Atlantic Charter

Their modern challenge to the English-speaking peoples to win recognition of the rights of all men "everywhere in the world."

JAMES T. SHOTWELL

BRIDGES TO THE FUTURE

Fourth in a series of monthly articles by the historian of World War I, chairman of the [American] Commission on the Organization of Peace, consultant at the Golden Gate conference, Professor Emeritus of the History of International Relations (Columbia University), and director of the Division of Economics and History of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Professor Shotwell is a member of the American preparatory committee for Versailles (1965-1918).

The Four Freedoms were set forth as fundamental rights for all men "everywhere in the world," and this phrase was repeated in each of the four paragraphs following: "The right to freedom of speech and religion, freedom from want and freedom from fear for all men everywhere, nowhere else in the world, has a higher note been struck than that resounding the pure Anglo-American phrases of the Atlantic Charter: "That all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from want and fear." No one may ever be able to say which of the two authors of the Atlantic Charter wrote that clause, but it will remain as an outstanding expression of the ideals of the English-speaking peoples as long as English is spoken.

Gaps at Dumbarton Oaks

This basic creed of freedom received an adequate guarantee in the Dumbarton Oaks draft proposals of the International Organization of the United Nations. The only place where freedom was referred to in the document was a rather obscure phrase in the closing sections of the text, Chapter IX, which dealt with economic and social matters. It stated that:

"The Organization should facilitate solutions of economic, social, and other humanitarian problems and promote respect for human dignity and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights."

This phrase was the sole mention of the central principle of civilization, life, the one for which, above all others, freedom has been fought. Yet here it was handed almost like an afterthought or perhaps rather like an unwilling concession to the insistence of some uncompromising champion of freedom. History will probably show that the latter interpretation is correct.

Health, history will probably show that the latter interpretation is correct.

The San Francisco conference revealed that the nation was prepared to provide a Commission on Human Rights which will be an equal footing with the other great international commissions of the economic and social council under the authority of the Assembly. It will certainly have as a primary duty the elimination of those infringements on human dignity which endanger the peace of the world. The menace of Nazi or Axis oppression is to be dealt with at the start, when peace nations of rulers are still possible. In this way one of the chief causes of war will be removed.

This amendment to the Dumbarton Oaks plan providing for the Commission on Human Rights was inserted in the charter at the insistence of the consultants to the American delegation. The proposal for such a commission was first developed by the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, as it is now called, in a nationwide campaign. The credit for this recommendation is due to the fact that by history and circumstance, this was the only avenue available for the safeguarding of the rights of man, which are not yet finally established in the world. It is by the fact that the world will probably judge that the critics have been vindicated by the fact that the Four Freedoms have been realized in the world by the United Nations. The Four Freedoms, when they are realized, will be a ready instrument for the development of higher ethical standards for the behavior of governments throughout the world.

The amendment to the Dumbarton Oaks plan providing for the Commission on Human Rights was inserted in the charter at the insistence of the consultants to the American delegation. The proposal for such a commission was first developed by the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, as it is now called, in a nationwide campaign. The credit for this recommendation is due to the fact that by history and circumstance, this was the only avenue available for the safeguarding of the rights of man, which are not yet finally established in the world. It is by the fact that the world will probably judge that the critics have been vindicated by the fact that the Four Freedoms have been realized in the world by the United Nations. The Four Freedoms, when they are realized, will be a ready instrument for the development of higher ethical standards for the behavior of governments throughout the world.
One of the early bombers to reach a British port under Lend-Lease. Soon bombers were to arrive by air instead of by ship. Until Pearl Harbor our Army Air Ferry Command was financed by lend-lease funds.

Below: The first American-made freight engines turned over to the British Minister of War Transport

Top: Cases of evaporated milk being lowered into the hold of a British freighter for lend-lease shipment to England in September 1941.
Bottom, right: Unloading U.S. soy flour at a British port, in 1943.
Below: Prefabricated house erected in Washington, D.C. by the Federal Public Housing Authority—the type of emergency dwelling being shipped to Britain in 1943 to ease the housing situation.

USA to Britain
Britain to USA

Left: Plans shipped from Britain in the early days of Reverse Lend-Lease to help produce vital ship propulsion equipment at a General Electric plant in New England. Other heavy machinery was sent to relieve the shortages as the U.S. geared up war production.

Below: In an air depot in England, British-made gas tanks and engine dampers provided for American planes of the U.S. Air Corps.

Above: British candy, stationary, medicine, toilet articles in a U.S. post exchange in Britain. Not to overload boiler of times long missing from the British civilian market but produced for American soldiers needs. British supplies were given Reverse Lend-Lease. The money paid for them by our soldiers went to the U.S. Army Finance Department.

Below, left: American soldiers checking out bags of sugar supplied, along with other scarce British food stuffs to U.S. Army camps.

Below, right: Spare parts for car engines, made by a well-known English manufacturer, are delivered to American forces in Britain.
The Great Partnership

How two sovereign nations achieved working relationships closer than any two states in our American Union.—An appraisal from an extraordinary vantage point in London.

PHILIP D. REED

Fortunately, Britain, Russia, and the United States, are alike in that all three can claim this war would have been lost without them. Each comes to the peace table, therefore, in a unique position, but with real respect for the others.

Perhaps some day we may achieve more friendship for friendship’s sake, with all the means in generous impulse and desire to serve, but history suggests that strong nations have been friends with one another because they have common cause and each contributes to the welfare of that cause.

It is in this realistic frame of mind that I approach an examination of the unprecedented wartime relationship between Britain and America. My principal difficulty is that I am so full of the subject, and was so close to it during my four years in government, that I find myself assuming that everyone knows how great and how complete that partnership has been.

In adapting our federal government to the war job, a great many additional departments and agencies were set up in Washington, Supply in the broadest sense of that term, is a great task of modern war. The minute detail of efficient goods and transportation inevitably outstrips the available and producible supply of both. Tempo is more required to increase production to the limit of the industry than to the limits of our military forces, the essential civilian requirements and also our supply commitments to our allies.

These were the reasons for setting up in Washington the War Production Board, the War Shipping Administration, the Joint Foreign Economic Administration, the War Food Administration, and the Petroleum Administration for War.

Economic Integration

Next, because our own national effort had to be geared and coordinated with that of the other Allies, it was both necessary and desirable that international boards should be created to examine and deal with the problems from the overall United Nations standpoint. To that end the American President and the British Prime Minis-

ter created four national boards.

Combined Boards to handle, respectively, the supply and international allocation of raw materials, food, shipping, and petroleum.

The trio of these three boards was put in Washington. The exception was shipping, which was entrusted to combined committees in both capitals. As Great Britain is second only to the United States in war production capacity and has large shipping interests, it was essential that programming

by our two countries should be integrated in the closest possible way.

Hence, the creation of the United States Mission for Economic Affairs in London. To that mission has been assigned in the representation of the Washington office and the London office of the Washington agencies mentioned above and also the United States Sec of Combined Board operations there. Personnel from all the departments represented were then assigned to the mission staff, functioning not as representatives, but as one homogeneous family under the direction and control of the chief of the mission.

With headquarters in the American Embassy, the mission has worked in constant association with its staff, frequently handling economic affairs for the State Department and as the ambassador as requested.

During my tenure as chief of the Mission for Economic Affairs, there were many additional boards or branches of the British government that my associates and I did not work with on the closest and most friendly terms. It was part of our job to keep all the sugar there to know about wartime Britain. But finally, it was our business to keep abreast of the number of men and women in every branch of the armed forces and also, the allocation of manpower to the war industry and essential civilian activity. We knew Britain’s mouth was a demand for every important item and the stocks of raw material, propulsion, and food and so on had on hand at any time. We knew the

tonage and employment of the British merchant marine and the handling of British ports and inland transpor-
tation systems. We knew Britain’s need for land and sea vessels as well as her ability to furnish reverse lend-lease for our armed forces in the area.

To know these required quick and complete access to Britain’s most intimate war secrets. Never was there a moment’s hesitation on the part of the British to disclose anything and everything we requested, and a great deal more, that we did not. The large red security stamp "Top Secret: Need to know" appeared on many papers which reached us every day.

And week after week, month after month, few subjects of importance to the war job, to the British civilian economy or to the liberated areas of Europe, were not dis-
cussed with members of the mission in order that the British government’s plan for action might be constantly synchronized with that of the American government. More often than not, the programs of both were formulated at joint meetings of an executive board of the U.S. Board, the British Board, committees, and subcommittees.

It would be too simple to say that the reader could see a list of the number of regular members of the Anglo-American committees, which coordinated business on literally thousands of subjects. Military, civilian, and military and civilian alike, it was the U.S. mission’s duty to consider and, if necessary, compromise the views of the governments to the end that each and all United Nations facilities, and transportation should be utilized with maximum efficiency against the common enemy.

SHEAF

No finer example of successful integration of American and British forces can be found than in the case of SHEAF, the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Forces. Headed and magnificently led by General Dwight D. Eisenhower, the supreme commander, the alternation of American and British peer position at every level to level and job to job was masterfully and uncompro

misingly handled. The chief of staff of the supreme headquarters is British, as are the other high-ranking officers. The reason for this was the success of the alliance in the invasion of Europe. Eisenhower was not only the supreme commander but was also the supreme commandant of the Western powers, which included both the military and the civilian, American and British, and had to be followed in every country. The supreme headquarters was thus the result of the close relationship between the two countries.

By personal example, by everlasting repetition in his talks and by disciplinary action, Eisenhower made it crystal clear that the military partnership was absolute and complete. An American officer might criticize the judgment or performance of a British colonel; he might say, for example, "Jock, you must try harder"; but to call him a "bloody British fool," or vice versa, would be cause for discharge.

Ours was thus a team in spirit and in fact, and history will picture far more clearly than we can today how it is that the tens of thousands of military and non-military personnel working under the Supreme Command of General Eisenhower have performed so well.
During World War II, the British had faced a series of devastating bombing raids. On a particular night, the story of one squad's efforts to save lives and maintain their community became legendary. The night was one of the worst for the British, with thousands of lives lost and infrastructure severely damaged. Amidst this chaos, a British squad, including their leader, faced a critical decision. They knew that their efforts would be crucial in determining the outcome of the war.

The leader, known for his calm and collected nature, recognized the importance of their small force. Despite the weight of responsibility, he decided to take charge and lead his team to carry out a daring mission. With a team of four, they ventured into the heart of the conflict, facing constant danger and uncertainty. Their mission was to save the lives of civilians, providing them with food and water, and ensuring their safety.

The squad's actions were not just defensive but offensive as well. They believed that by helping the civilians, they were also weakening the enemy's resolve and morale. Despite the constant risk of detection and capture, the team pressed on, providing aid to those in need.

Their efforts were not in vain. The civilians they helped were able to continue their lives, and their resilience became a symbol of hope for others. The British leader and his team were hailed as heroes, and their story became a testament to the spirit of sacrifice and duty during the war.

As the war progressed, the British continued to face challenges, but their resolve never wavered. They understood the importance of not just surviving but thriving amid adversity. Their story serves as a reminder of the strength and determination of a people facing a common enemy.
which will be left in the wake of the war—the sort of questions that are not for exclu-
sive adjudication in the United States. They require United Nations cooperation.

Coal—Today and Tomorrow

Another type of shortage throughout the war seemed progressively harder to solve as fighting came to a close in Europe. Such, for example, is coal.

Coal is probably the toughest yet ever-assertive people are trying to crack. Coal is basic. It only warms houses and fires boats but, in vast areas of Europe, it is the source of the electric power to run machinery and carry on transportation. Of all international shortages, coal certainly ranks very near the top in importance.

The situation that the military found in Italy, and which was passed on to the United States in the form of the Battle of the Atlantic, was bad in France and other countries as well. The Allies knew what the demands were likely to be in Britain and the United States where the continuing high level of war production made for an unprecedented consumption of coal. We also know what coal would have to be supplied the armed forces in various theatres.

As a first step, the Italian needs had to be balanced against the world’s needs. Next, reducing Italian requirements to a minimum, we had to decide how they could be met most lastingly. For example, could the coal be made by British standards? By the United States? Could we get it more readily from the United Nations? In some cases, where the manpower situation was easier? In any case, how about shipping?

The programs set going had to be something of a compromise. We speeded new mining machinery and equipment to South Africa, and boosted production there to 90 per cent. Regular shipments of coal were scheduled from Britain to Italy. It cannot be said that the problem of getting coal, as it appeared, was a complete success in every instance, but the point is that it could not have been met either by the military

... and the Machine Age

We have said, what might be called sidetack manners to handle. Take what the British Call the Combined Food Board, for example. It has drawn about three thousand technicals. Technically speaking, these are helping to dig, tend, pipe, tap, etc. and to turn them into food. And the Board is called the Combined Food Board.

It is made up of experts, and is working under the direction of the Combined Food Board, and consists of these experts in food:

1. The chief experts in food, agriculture, and the food supply, are the people on the Combined Food Board.

2. The combined work of the Combined Food Board, and the food supply, are the people on the Combined Food Board.

3. The Combined Food Board, and the whole machinery of food, is the machinery of the Combined Food Board.

4. The machinery of the Combined Food Board, and the whole machinery of food, is the machinery of the Combined Food Board.

5. The machinery of the Combined Food Board, and the whole machinery of food, is the machinery of the Combined Food Board.

6. The machinery of the Combined Food Board, and the whole machinery of food, is the machinery of the Combined Food Board.

7. The machinery of the Combined Food Board, and the whole machinery of food, is the machinery of the Combined Food Board.

8. The machinery of the Combined Food Board, and the whole machinery of food, is the machinery of the Combined Food Board.

9. The machinery of the Combined Food Board, and the whole machinery of food, is the machinery of the Combined Food Board.

10. The machinery of the Combined Food Board, and the whole machinery of food, is the machinery of the Combined Food Board.
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As They See It

The Future of a Great Partnership discussed by an impressive cross-section of British leaders in politics, art, education, welfare, industry, and labor

Introduction by VICTOR WEYBRIGHT

Last Autumn, after spending two and a half years on a wartime assignment in Great Britain, I returned to the United States on a brief mission—and while home, proposed to my old friends and associates on the board and editorial staff of Survey Graphic that a special number such as this would be tremendously useful. My suggestion, in the course of preparing a preliminary outline, was that it be written predominantly by Americans, for American readers.

However, it was agreed that, although our British friends should not be put in the position of rationalizing on the whole worldwide British system, a cross-section of Britons should be invited to contribute to this symposium. Hence it was this, that, back in Great Britain, I invited the contributors who responded so generously in the following brief comments on the primary political and economic relationships developed between the British and ourselves during the war.

As we see it, the outside world is bound to rest its future decisions on our demonstration of compatibility and practical approaches to world stability and reconstruction. Thus, the future of the British-American partnership may be potent in shaping the power decisions of the world.

The intention, of course, was the very opposite of promoting any sort of sentimental "bands across the sea" or of excluding Soviet Russia and other Allies from consideration. Survey Graphic brought out a distinguished special number on American Russia frontiers over a year ago and may deal with China and Far Eastern affairs in a special number in sequence to this one.

I have had the happy privilege of being identified with the work of Survey Graphic for a number of years and, as in the past, I hope this special number will have a wide influence. So active is the interest, so keen is the interest in the frontiers of the British-American scene, that it is not unimportant that, if not directly, great nations of Europe will be reached by this editorial project.

To the contributors and to our British participants in particular, I am most grateful.

"The day we separate we shall have lost the peace."


The first thing to say about Anglo-American relations is that one should not take too seriously what seems to some to be a split in the Atlantic. We are the British in our own way. This means that the relations between the British and the Americans are largely the same. In the economic sphere, it can be summed up in the word "liberty." The British have a right to be free, to be independent, and not to be dominated by the French.

We should not forget, however, that the French have a right to be free, too. The British and the French are, we believe, both equal, and the only real freedom is a freedom of the world.

"The time of security without effort is gone."

LORD VANSTEATT, P.C., G.C.B.; Secretary General, British War Council and Minister of War, 1919-32, Author of "The British and the Germans: Peace and War."
IN restoring health to a stricken world.

ALLAN CREECH JONES, M.P.
Labour member for the West Riding of Yorkshire.

For the achievement of the Four Freedoms and the realization of the Atlantic Charter, the continued cooperation of the United Nations is vital. Economic nationalism and policies based on restriction and isolation are bound to fail. We must work together in fighting against aggression, promoting freedom and universal peace. The peoples of the United Nations must not be divided, but must cooperate in promoting the welfare of all the peoples of the world.

We must hold together by good will and mutual understanding.

J. M. MALTON, C. H., I. D., J. P.
Chairman, British Council; Hon. Treasurer, Workers' Educational Association; President, International Advisory Council, Government of the Free City of Berlin.

In my last article I said: "We must work together in fighting against aggression, promoting freedom and universal peace." This is the great challenge of our time. We must cooperate in promoting the welfare of all the peoples of the world. Without this cooperation we shall not achieve peace and freedom.

More important than the identity of the dangers.

CAPTAIN THE HON. QUINN MAGGIE, M.P.
Armed Members of the Tory Reform Group.

Participation is based upon a fundamental realization of the importance of the British Empire, and a firm belief in the necessity of the United Nations for the preservation of peace and freedom. We are determined to work for the achievement of the Four Freedoms and the realization of the Atlantic Charter.

Survey Graphic

May 1945
"Two hundred million people" and their chance.

GEORGE GIBSON

The British-American-Canadian collaboration in international affairs is indispensable to international unity—but whether both countries, and indeed all the nations of both the Western and Eastern hemispheres, have not been entirely and sincerely discredited by their own actions and by the actions of their major and minor partners.

Our own actions have been too often dictated by self-interest, and we have too often shown ourselves to be indifferent to the welfare and well-being of others. The world is a community, and we must be aware of the needs and desires of all its members.

Worldwide brotherhood in quest for life and freedom.

WILLIAM MAYS

National Council of Social Service.

Looking back to the dark days by the light of the future, we see more convincingly than ever that the United States and the British group of nations need to have this chance of shaping things just as they should be. This is the fundamental reason for the British-American-Canadian collaboration in international affairs.

If we can both be honest in our desire to recognize and acknowledge and act upon the fundamental values of life, everything else will be a matter for adjustment and agreement. It is much more important to work together for the dignity and the rights of all mankind than to fight each other over what the other ought to do. Each partner is apt to find such issues, even when they are as serious as those of "Mr. Churchill’s curtain lectures," a little tiresome. The best and surest way of making up modern life is to base it on a sanity and the simplicity that have been lost. The only way to help each other is to work together, and what the future will be is a matter for our shaping.

"The American Charter has been tried by events!"

EMANUEL SHEINWALL, M.P.

Member, Labour Party.
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IV. AREAS OF TENSION

Europe and the Mediterranean

Britain has become irrevocably part of the Continent. By abandoning the detachment we, too, no longer possess, Americans can achieve a new freedom—from fear of attack.

VERA MICHELES DEAN

In speaking of a nation’s foreign policy, we are apt to use what Walter Lippmann calls "interests." We make words like Britain, France, Russia do as shorthand for that multiplicity and variety of views found among any people. That is, we expect differences of opinion as a matter of course at home—freely and sometimes violently expressed. But the moment we discuss another country, we tend to give the false impression that it is a solid monarchist-within-international frontiers or shadings. This variety of views holds even for people living under dictatorship, but far more among those given to democracy. All the more, therefore, it is well to bear in mind that the British by no means think alike among themselves on controversial issues. For the sake of winning the war, all parties have largely supported the coalition government of Winston Churchill. But Laborites and Liberals disagree with the Prime Minister on many fundamental policies, and do not see Europe seen by eye to eye with Old. Yet there is an underlying unity among political groups: Britain's underlying main objectives of foreign policy—a unity springing from dangers and glories shared in a common tradition. It is vital that we would be a mistake to assume that Neville Chamberlain misinterpreted his people in 1938—by his policy of appeasement. Before Munich, the majority of the British people, including the Cabinet, thought it was a vast, vivid, serial exhibit of the war years. A yeasty force for enlightenment at home, these are welcomed by diplomats and members of the armed forces throughout the world.

Britain's disadvantage in this respect was not noticeable during the century of relative peace in Europe between the defeat of Napoleon and the outbreak of World War I. One of the first nations to feel the impact of the industrial revolution, Britain rapidly expanded production of manufactured goods and spread throughout the globe. By 1815, British capital had been invested in the continent. Hence, in 1914, Russia, a nation greatly in industry, population, and potential resources, lacked the weapons to defend itself against aggression or to enforce defense. The British fought alone for three years in war, with Germany, Austria and Imperial Russia; a total defeat of this nation would have meant the end of the British Empire. This clash of great powers, for a time threatening to engulf the world, is a postscript, charged with expression that it is a solid nation springing from dangers and glories shared in a common tradition. It is vital that we would be a mistake to assume that Neville Chamberlain misinterpreted his people in 1938—by his policy of appeasement. Before Munich, the majority of the British people, including the Cabinet, thought it was a vast, vivid, serial exhibit of the war years. A yeasty force for enlightenment at home, these are welcomed by diplomats and members of the armed forces throughout the world.

British disfavor in this respect was not noticeable during the century of relative peace in Europe between the defeat of Napoleon and the outbreak of World War I. One of the first nations to feel the impact of the industrial revolution, Britain rapidly expanded production of manufactured goods and spread throughout the globe. By 1815, British capital had been invested in the continent. Hence, in 1914, Russia, a nation greatly in industry, population, and potential resources, lacked the weapons to defend itself against aggression or to enforce defense. The British fought alone for three years in war, with Germany, Austria and Imperial Russia; a total defeat of this nation would have meant the end of the British Empire. This clash of great powers, for a time threatening to engulf the world, is a postscript, charged with expression that it is a solid nation springing from dangers and glories shared in a common tradition. It is vital that we would be a mistake to assume that Neville Chamberlain misinterpreted his people in 1938—by his policy of appeasement. Before Munich, the majority of the British people, including the Cabinet, thought it was a vast, vivid, serial exhibit of the war years. A yeasty force for enlightenment at home, these are welcomed by diplomats and members of the armed forces throughout the world.

At Yalta President Roosevelt gave strong indication that the USA would take active part in reconquesting Europe from the west in peace. The American President's decision, first publicly stated in his January, 1945, message to Congress, expressed to the united force of the American people that the United States would use its influence constructively in world affairs. This influence was limited by the need to use force against the British and the British.
A new sense of purpose and direction emerged in Europe in the late 1930s, as Germany and the Soviet Union embarked on a policy of expansionism in their respective spheres of influence. This was evident in the signing of the non-aggression pact between Germany and the Soviet Union in 1939, which was seen as the beginning of a new era of cooperation between two of the most powerful nations on the continent.

The pact was seen by many as a sign of the growing influence of Germany in Eastern Europe, as the country tried to expand its borders and influence over other nations. The Soviet Union, too, was expanding its influence in the region, as it sought to secure its borders and protect its interests.

The world was not prepared for the collapse of the pre-war order, and the League of Nations was unable to prevent the outbreak of World War II. The Spanish Civil War was a precursor to the larger conflict, as the international community failed to take action to prevent the rise of fascist regimes in Europe.

The war itself was a devastating conflict, with millions of casualties on both sides. The United States entered the war in 1941, and the Soviet Union joined forces with the Allies in 1942, leading to a turning point in the conflict.

The war ended with the defeat of Germany and Japan, and the United States emerged as a global superpower. The post-war world was marked by the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union, as they fought for control of the world's resources and influence.

In conclusion, the 1930s were a period of transformation and change in Europe, as the region struggled to come to terms with the devastation of World War I and the rise of fascism. The events of the war and the post-war years would shape the world for decades to come.
1939 by both Chamberlain and Daladier. Meanwhile, however, some leading orates of British opinion had long opposed partition or demilitarization of the Reich, fearing that such measures would merely fan the desire for a war of revenge among the German and, at the same time, make Poland from a completely dependent on Russia for protection against a aggressor Germany.

Taking the long view, Britain's future security seems to depend not so much on what may be done to weaken Germany, as on what is done to strengthen the rest of Europe and the world.

If Britain was thus ready to acknowledge Russia's predominance in eastern Europe (preferable within the framework of a United Nations organization of which the United States would be an active member), she is closely and propitious to relinquish her influence in the far eastern security of a nation partially dependent for her very existence on overseas trade, and therefore on sea routes. Let us take a look at the map on the preceding page.

Along the British Lifeline

Britain must have the collaboration of Belgium and Holland for the destruction of the English Channel, yet either of these countries were to be considered exclusively within a British sphere.

Britain needs also a strong France for the defense of vulnerable points in Europe and Africa facing the Atlantic Ocean, and for defense purposes, through which runs the "lifeline" of the Empire, linking the British Isles with both Near and Far Eastern Economic and the Continent. Yet France, too, due to her historic position, must be considered as a vital point of any future international organization. A bloc of Britain with the Low Countries and France has already been formed in the last years of the United Nations organization.

Next, a look at the Mediterranean. The British must have friends all along the shores of the Mediterranean Sea. We know conclusively the Greek problem was our position and that of the British in in North Africa, as is seen by the Italian, aligned with Nazi Germany, which, after being associated, assisted the Greeks, and some of the Greek islands. We can understand Britain's policy in that area better today than we did in 1941.

With Portugal, it has maintained an alliance for a long time—an alliance that has not been visibly shaken by Portogallo's determination to remain neutral in the war. If, by the same public sympathy for the Spanish Republic during the civil war, and the Monarchist demonstration of the United Nations to further democracy in Europe, Britain had found it necessary to enter the war, it would have been to a larger extent to assist the course of the United States, which had seen the British government is to Frawo's actions, it has given the impression that in the Middle East, where the British have shown a great interest in the region, and more recently in the Greek controversy, that Britain would be willing to support the establishment of regencies in both countries.

Heritage of Colonialism

The cumulative liberation of the Italian protectorates means that the British have not forgotten their hard campaign in Africa and the Middle East and Churchill has declared that the British must "go back." In the long run, however, it is perfectly logical to expect that a British protectorate would be a liability to the British and it is to their interest to hasten it to the status of an independent state. (Continued on page 254)

PALESTINE - as a Refuge from Fascism

How European fugitives have been caught among the Black Sea and a White Page, in their quest for safety and good fortune in an old and newly Promised Land.

IRA A. HIRSHMANN

On December 17, 1941, the SS Svana, 400 tons, total unsuitability, and bearing a Panamanian flag, steamed down the Black Sea from Constanta, Romania, and through the Bosphorus to Istanbul. The ship was turned away from two battalions of Allied troops and thousands of refugees, who perished in the shipwreck. The Svana was the first of many similar vessels, which were turned away from the Greek coast. The Greeks refused to allow the refugees to land, as they feared the British and the refugees would be of no use to them.

Two months later, despite warnings that the refugees would be turned away, the Svana steamed down the Bosphorus and into the Black Sea. The Turkish government refused to allow the refugees to land, as they feared the British and the refugees would be of no use to them.

Two weeks later, despite warnings that the refugees would be turned away, the Svana steamed down the Bosphorus and into the Black Sea. The Turkish government refused to allow the refugees to land, as they feared the British and the refugees would be of no use to them.

Two months later, despite warnings that the refugees would be turned away, the Svana steamed down the Bosphorus and into the Black Sea. The Turkish government refused to allow the refugees to land, as they feared the British and the refugees would be of no use to them.

The Svana was eventually turned away from the French coast, where it was later turned away from the Greek coast. The Greeks refused to allow the refugees to land, as they feared the British and the refugees would be of no use to them.

Heritage of Colonialism

The cumulative liberation of the Italian protectorates means that the British have not forgotten their hard campaign in Africa and the Middle East and Churchill has declared that the British must "go back." In the long run, however, it is perfectly logical to expect that a British protectorate would be a liability to the British and it is to their interest to hasten it to the status of an independent state. (Continued on page 254)

MAY 1945
To the concentration camp. Lashed by guards, the line grew at every village.

End of the road. Each day carts left the camp piled high with dead bodies.

**CHILDHOOD MEMORIES**

“A reminder of what my eyes saw over there in Transsylvania” wrote Avigdor, fifteen and in his own words “extremely happy” in Palestine. His drawings depict the Romanian concentration camp where he spent two years, and where his father died.

In modern air force, its tragedy as never before was put into the civilian life where women were, and the children were. But during this war and the years before, civilization has confronted something more terrible than the Nazi war and in the resulting wrath of the fascists.

**A Ten-Year Lag**

Each in 1933, Dr. John O. McDowell, then president of the (American) Foreign Policy Association, had been appointed by the League of Nations as a Commissioner for Refugees from Nazi Germany, mostly without the assistance of any international institution. In 1938, President Roosevelt sought cooperation from those governments. Thirty-two governments responded to his invitation to form a conference on the evacuation of refugees in the world. But efforts there to substitute planned migration for chaotic dispersion through the efforts of their representatives to open doors and work out a solution. On this basis the conference came to a dead end. In 1939, an Inter-Allied Council on Refugees held in Brussels, failed to accomplish anything so drastic as to block wholesale murder.

Toward the end of the Evin conference (which I had attended at the conference), the chances offered us were seen. I was told that the Nazis had a secret place in a foreign country that could be used as a transit camp. When in January, 1941, President Roosevelt set up the War Refugee Board. There were cables which discounted it as a political expedient, another battle of gestures, but to me it was an answer to the cry of countless forgotten “little people.” Composed of representatives of Jews, War and Treasury, the board provided direct access to the Nazis, and the first step in the implementation of the Evin conference. It was an answer to the immediate needs of the refugees in the Sprite of Nazi Germany, of Nazi Russia, of the Pacific War, and of all Jewry. The board was empowered to take action for the immediate release of “men and women as possible from the concentration camps of Europe, Africa, Asia, religious, political, and all civil and military camps, of every country.”

Thus, the Great Powers of the American President were geared for the job.

John Pehele was appointed as the first board and was to make a brilliant record as such. In my assignment as his representative in the Middle East, I have been witness to his insight and quick thinking that have contributed to his success. I have seen him and Pehele work together.

**Survey Graphic**

The outer world has been cruel to the Jews. One who knew that well was the Duke of Jerusalem, who himself was to become a wartime refuge later in the Nazi capital of Berlin. A book in the side of the British over the years, he had received a number of proposals to publish a book about the Jewish nation. He was one of the few who had seen the small Hebrew nation as a matter of history in this new chapter of the world. Almost overnight, the Jews had a new country in the world. And it is apparent that they will develop only a “country,” under the circumstances, of the maritime trade as well.

From Lydda we rode by car to Cetano—a spy and a trip up the steep hills where both Holy Wars and chapels are. The history of civilization had been written. You could scarcely fail to sense the past in the present and future in the present and future in the future.

Sitting with me in the BOAC car was a British Lieutenant, wounded in the battle of El Alamein, who told him that Pehele had, “out maneuvered” their task until war with an end not play. His own task had been to gather intelligence, but he woke up in a hospital with burns and a leg fracture. Lassner, given the chance of an isolated job, he decided to do intelligence work, he picked Eilat and the war. Why? Because there’s no place in the world to hear, “I have never been here, someone always wants to return.”

Said in English—and in Hebrew.

That was the first time I heard this said in such a way. On our next visit to Catoia a British general used about the same words. (No, he was not begging; he was giving me a rugged combat lesson in riding back—and in the course of my work, I was able to hear the sentiment repeated in a war of Hebrew versions compounded of Hebrew, English, and Yiddish. Good to remember, was the country views were expressed in other countries, in the case of a British staff.)
I:1 - GRAPHIC SURVEY

The Young Palestinians

On my arrival in Ankara, I made the rounds of the various Embassies at the Turkish capital—not only to become acquainted with the people but also to learn the reasons for the five-year-old blockade of refugees from the Balkans. The British insisted that the Bulgarians were withholding refugees from the necessary exit permits to provide in Palestine. The Turks insisted that it was the British who were providing passage to the refugees. The issue ended in an endless circle without any clear position being taken. What concerned me was the lack of co-operation between the two countries and the evident disinterest of many officials.

It was a meeting with Mr. Marcus and his wife at his residence in Washington that I attended. I was asked to attend this meeting because of my work in the Middle East. I was a member of the Zionist Organization, and I had been working for the organization for many years. The meeting was held in my office in New York, and we discussed various issues.

The Pacific Basin and India
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Let me begin with some official declarations and acts which reveal both common purpose and tendencies to public opinion. That, the terms of the Cairo Declaration of 1943 would now liberate Manchuria, Korea, Formosa, and deprive Japan of her island bases in the Pacific. Contrary to some commentators, there is no evidence to date that the Soviet Union plans to grant either Manchuria or Korea. When I saw Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek in Chungking in 1943, I asked whether he thought Korea should once more become part of China, being placed under the joint trusteeship of China, the Soviet Union, and the United States, or become independent. He dismissed the first two alternatives outright; declared that Korea should be completely free. He thought that at first it would need some financial and technical assistance from abroad, which might well be furnished by the three powers. Later, at Cairo, China, Great Britain, and the United States were on record for Korea's independence "in due course."

The great island of Formosa is indispensable to China, its southern provinces, and all Chinese authorities have maintained that the World Security Organization, would fail if it offers better facilities than Hong Kong as a United Nations naval, military, and economic base. It is recognized that this is something which could be accomplished by the government of China which could establish an independent sovereignty in Formosa.

To the south, the people of Cambodia demand the return of territory seized by Thailand (under Japanese occupation) in 1941. The French government has already repudiated the annexation of territories belonging to Belgium and advanced an amicable adjustment over these disputes with Indochina.

The future of the great British port city of Hong Kong on the Chinese coast, now in Japanese hands, is more debatable and was left unsettled by the Cairo Declaration. At the Hot Springs Conferences (1945) of the Institute of Pacific Relations, a Chinese member represented that in his opinion the occupation of Manchuria in 1931, China would contribute greatly to good Chinese-British relations. Hong Kong is not an old treaty port but a colony, and a British member replied that its settlement was due to Western extraction. It was built on bare rocks by a combination of British investment and Chinese sweat and muck.

The issue was clearly one which neither British nor Chinese delegates were eager to press at the present time, believing that more acute issues should take priority.

When Japanese propagandists visited the United States a decade ago, their audiences listened with Westerners' arguments to the argument that, because they had spent so much blood and treasure in "justifying" Manchuria, the imperialist government could fairly regroup its plans and interest therein. Certain American voices which recently have raised some of the same arguments will now meet European evasion in making similar claims for anything from small islands to whole continents in the sweep of our successful Pacific campaign.

American representatives of the Philippines have been a great constant entry on the other side of the ledger.

Imperialism vs. Isolationism

The Pacific islands and the East Indies bring us to the fourth upsurge of the question: "Are colonial empires a threat to world peace?" Americans may well ask themselves whether in the next twenty-five years British imperialism will cause as much a threat as World War II or American imperialism. A very real and visible evidence that Britain's colonial policies helped facilitate American isolationism. Some Britishers would be inclined to think in terms of sixty months they fought alone.

True it is that the expansion of the French and Dutch empires, along with the British, furnished Hitler a favorable atmosphere for his appeal over millions of hard-working Germans. True that the negotiations of Neville Chamberlain and of Neville Henderson encouraged the Nazi leaders to believe that the British would never put their eyes on the other side while Hitler himself carved out a colonial empire in the Baltic states and in the Soviet Union. True that Hitler would steadily, progressively, and peacefully settle national problems. It is argued by some that the two nations tried to act as though they were not interested in the territories in the East Indies, Asia, and the Pacific.

Let us go to the principle of self-determination. If it is wanted to go so far as to be included in the Dardanelles or the Afghani or Tibet, as to be included in the British empire, at least it should be included in the self-governing countries. If it is wanted to go so far as to have included in any Soviet threat to the British Empire.

But happily Churchill and the British...
The V-Spirit of the People

Throughout these war years the British government has encouraged several thousand acts to record the war at home and abroad, by official appointment, by commission, or by purchase of work. Since the first War Artists Exhibition was opened in July 1940 at the National Gallery in London, war scenes have been displayed continuously.

The paintings have toured the country, have been sent to the Dominions, the West Indies, Russia, the United States, South America. Many of them have been reproduced in a series of little oil-lithographed-piece books put out by the Oxford University Press. Thus, British artists have found their opportunity; for servile and British art, instead of languishing, have been revivified.

All manner of Britons have given eagerly to look at this war-time art. It has held up a mirror to their daily performance of the last familiar medium, giving them a turned-out view of the world in which they are living, in which they are working, in which they are fighting, in which they have spent their lives. With these exhibition visitors in mind, we reproduce an article of 1943, which tells of the work of one of the artists who was one of the first to give an impression of the spirit of the people in the war time. (Continued on page 268.)
Communal Feeding Course

by Leonard Daniels

Sandbag Workers
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Manufacturing the Larger Size Bombs
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The United Kingdom Since Dunkirk

The basic shift in social-economic patterns, epitomized in the series of great White Papers: the far-reaching effect on schools, homes, health, employment.

Social Etching by MALLORY BROWNE

The evacuation of the BEF from Dunkirk in 1910 transformed it a "military defeat into a psychological victory for the British people."

was at the Admiralty yesterday, and they told me it will be a miracle if we save ten thousand of our troops. A week or so later, when something like 300,000 British and French troops had been brought back, I saw him again and reminded him of his words. He nodded solemnly, "Yes, I know," he said, "it really was a miracle—a great miracle."

And certainly in its effects upon British morale, it was. The general public was jubilant—less because of the small threat that had been paraded from the jaws of a German trap than because, to a large extent, at least, the miracle had been performed by the people themselves. It was the unique arms of little ships: the river launches, Thames barges, lifeboats, barges, pleasure craft—the civilian boom and jitter, so to speak, of a mincing people—which made the miracle possible. No doubt the very devil did the bulk of the job, and the Royal Air Force helped, but in the eyes of the British public it was the myriad little ships, i.e., the same as every Englishman dreams of owning one day, just as every American dreams of owning an automobile or an airplane, which indiscriminately conveyed the defeat of Dunkirk into a learning experience, converting to the rank and file of the British people that indispensable quality, faith in themselves.

Fresh Start

It was in great part because they had been reinforced by "Dunkirk" with this essential element of inspired faith that the British took the fall of France in their stride. While the rest of the world—and in particular, perhaps, most Americans thought that Dunkirk and the collapse of France in June 1940 meant the beginning of an early end for Britain, it never occurred to the British people themselves, as a whole, that it was anything but a new beginning; it simply never entered the minds of most Englishmen and women, that by all reasonable calculations they were doomed. I remember my astonishment at the almost universal realization after the Battle of the Bulge had given in, and the French had signaled an armistice with Germany: "Well, thank goodness, at last we've got our own. There's no one else to let us down. Now we can really get on with the war." It was not said boastfully, but cheerfully, with genuine elation.

There were, of course, in Britain, during that fateful summer of 1940, who doubted and wondered. "But why do you think we will not go down the way France did?" one of these rare doubters kept on asking me. My answer, as I recall it, was simply that you cannot beat a people that honestly do not know when it is liked. Looking back, of course, it is easy to list a number of other reasons, including:

1. The seventy-mile wide task trap of the English Channel.
2. The victory of the RAF over the Luftwaffe in the decisive air battle of Britain.
3. The German division to invade Britain.

Maybe Americans get a little tired of hearing about that decisive year when Britain stood alone. But we should not forget it, first, because it undoubtedly saved us as well as the British themselves, if not from outright defeat at least from surrender, perilous and costly to everyone who had hoped that eventual victory would have been almost meaningless; and second, because that year after Dunkirk, when Britain finally ceased herself and then raised herself to the supreme height of her "finest hour," had left its stamp on the nation in the form of a deep and lasting impression of its real resources of power and greatness, of the strength that has been fully tried and has stood the test.

Voluntary Mobilization

For what saved England in 1940 (apart from the Channel and Hitler's blunders) was not the war-time Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, magnificently indispensable though he was, nor was it the "finest hour" of the RAF fighter squadrons. It was Churchill's superb leadership, plus the RAF's victory in the Battle of Britain, plus—and perhaps most of all—all that might be called the great "voluntary mobilization" of the people of Britain. That mobilization had begun in 1939. But not until Dunkirk and the fall of France did it attain that of something very close to national unanimity. It was not merely a question of recruitment of manpower, remarkable as that wartime aspect of the new Britain was. It was a mobilization of every available resource of food, clothing, production, and human service, itself in every imaginable form.

The cold facts and figures are eloquent enough: unemployment wiped out, almost entirely (the figures show over 3,000,000 unemployed in 1939 and only 7,000 in 1944); 4,500,000 in the armed forces in 1944 as against only 673,000 in 1939; 7,000,000 on full-time war work out of a total of 15,000,000 British women aged fourteen to sixty-five.

But these figures, impressive as they are, fail to tell anything like the whole story of the quiet courage and humor with which the men and women of Britain, with the greatest strain of war work in florists and factories and shops under blackouts, with shortages of trucks and rationing, and with housing problems compul- sory to the degree by rationing.

(Continued on page 201)
### BRITAIN AT WAR

#### MOBILIZATION OF MANPOWER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>ARMED SERVICES AND MUNITIONS INDUSTRY</th>
<th>AGRICULTURE, TRANSPORTATION AND OTHER WORK</th>
<th>UNEMPLOYED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>![Male Figures]</td>
<td>![Agriculture Figures]</td>
<td>![Unemployment Figures]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>![Increased Male Figures]</td>
<td>![Increased Agriculture Figures]</td>
<td>![Increased Unemployment Figures]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Half of all men (14-44) are in the armed services, civil defense or munitions industry, and nearly half of all women (14-59) are in the services and industry.

### CIVILIAN CONSUMPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUTTER</th>
<th>WEEKLY PER PERSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREWAR</td>
<td>7.63 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>2.34 oz.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EGGS</th>
<th>WEEKLY PER PERSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREWAR</td>
<td>3.26 eggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>1.46 eggs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAT</th>
<th>WEEKLY PER PERSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREWAR</td>
<td>30.40 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>22.16 oz.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUGAR</th>
<th>WEEKLY PER PERSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREWAR</td>
<td>30.20 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>20.00 oz.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRESH FRUITS</th>
<th>WEEKLY PER PERSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREWAR</td>
<td>27.17 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>12.06 oz.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Food for civilians has been cut severely.

### POSTWAR PLANNING

#### SOCIAL INSURANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATERNITY GRANT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOTHERS' ALLOWANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY ALLOWANCES</td>
<td>FOR MORE THAN ONE CHILD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOWS FOR</td>
<td>ADULT DEPENDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SICKNESS BENEFIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH SERVICE

- **Health Service available to all people**
- **Consultant and special services included**
- **Free treatment by doctors or hospitals**
- **Freedom of choice**
- **Service doctor or hospital in "Health Centre" or at home**

**Central Medical Board directs separate functions**

#### EDUCATION FOR EVERYBODY

- **Primary education**
- **Secondary education**
- **Higher education**
- **Technical education**
- **Extension of free education to 16 years of age**
- **Free medical examination at school**
- **Excepted Adult Education**
Just what this taxation rationing "lifeboat principle" has meant to the ordinary man and woman in the United Kingdom is made clear in the government's "Front Line Conditions" by Day or Night. In the everyday terms, the figures show that the consumption of an average British civilian was down nearly one third, that the population was down two thirds; and fruits, tea, and vegetables were all down a trifle. Only consumption of four and potatos was rising. Yet three figures stand out like a blight on the British picture. First, the need for a blitz, which even the ordinary Briton has never experienced. Second, the need for a blitz, which even the ordinary Briton has never experienced. Third, the need for a blitz, which even the ordinary Briton has never experienced.

The figure of the wartime effect which Britain has made and the making, however, the people have kept their farms and oratories, and the farmers, with that stimulus, may be found in the great series of White Papers whieh trace the evolution of "the system of a single, comprehensive, insurance scheme" which the government for persons by Parliament. These White Papers express the mood of wartime Britain, looking forward to a method of underwriting the sacrifices of 1941 to 1945. The total cost of the scheme (for the first five years) is about $2,000,000,000. Payments under the plan are fairly liberal according to British standards. 35 shillings (about $7) a week would be the pension drawn by a married couple, for example. Family allowances amount to 5 shillings a week (about $1) for each child born after the war, but also include tax relief on these children. Children in care, the exceptional cases of the people are getting this amount, and the employees are getting it for the first 5 years of life. The figures are: Shillings ($2) a week, 35 shillings ($7) a week, 70 shillings ($14) a week, and 105 shillings ($21) a week. In addition, there is a reduced rate of 50 shillings ($10) a week for the first 5 years of life.

The Prevention of Poverty

The most important of these White Papers is that on British insurance, presented to Parliament in September 1944. It outlines the government's policy on which it has been working since 1938. One of the main aims of the scheme is to provide a system of individual insurance for persons by Parliament. These White Papers express the mood of wartime Britain, looking forward to a method of underwriting the sacrifices of 1941 to 1945. The total cost of the scheme (for the first five years) is about $2,000,000,000. Payments under the plan are fairly liberal according to British standards. 35 shillings (about $7) a week would be the pension drawn by a married couple, for example. Family allowances amount to 5 shillings a week (about $1) for each child born after the war, but also include tax relief on these children. Children in care, the exceptional cases of the people are getting this amount, and the employees are getting it for the first 5 years of life.

EXTRA SPELUNKINGriansnion

The government's scheme for a national health service is being actively debated, but popular support is strongly in favor of it. The White Paper containing this plan is more than 9,000 words in length. It specifically lists its two main objectives: (1) to provide for medical treatment for all, and (2) to make available complete medical, surgical and hospital service for all.

Survey graphic

Front Line Conditions by Night

Sexual discrimination and disfigurement as we have been by the scattering of our young men and the redistribution of our war workers, is still making its mark. The differences between our disfigurements and the actuality of front line conditions on the island of Britain... have been appalled by our casualties list. Up to the week ending January 27, 1945, German bomblets had killed more civilians in England than German guns had killed American soldiers in action in the continent of Europe—and three times as many as had been killed during the first five years of war, for every three English soldiers, sailors or airmen killed in action, one man was killed by bombs or in the United Kingdom—and more wounded.

What the war has brought together in large terms to Britain's national economy is something which even the ordinary Briton has hardly begun to understand. In simple figures, Britain, a nation historically dependent on exports, shipped out less than a third the quantity of goods in 1939 than she did in 1943. She has sacrificed a large portion of the gold and dollar reserves with which she used to pay for the 80 percent of her food she imported. She is not to reduce her standard of living in future—just as the Germans are determined not to raise theirs. That is, she shall not come to pass—she will have to rely on her own resources, on home-produced goods, on home-produced food, and on home-produced insurance.
Ginger in the British Medicine Chest

An old household remedy applied by war premiers and labor, no less than doctors.

National Health Insurance leads on to new plans for a National Health Service.

---

**What the British Face**

The world's greatest creditor nation is "broken." But her courage rose with danger.

*Shooting the world* for Western civilization, she renewed both youth and vigor.

---

**Economic Forecast by David Cushman Coyle**

Meanwhile, there has been less noted than the balance sheet of the war years. Housing has decreased. Many people have suffered hardship in shabby and damaged buildings. Coal has been scarce. Working hours were long, and travel exhausting. On the other hand, diet has been improved. Rationing, undoubtedly, has reduced the standard of living. Comfortable clothes, but it has enhanced the quality of food available to the poor in less food, but more of it, due to the United States and Great Britain. The New Deal was a success in the United States, while the New Deal was a failure in the United Kingdom.

---

**What about the Depression?**

Britain's industrialist was in the dock. Her consumers were no longer able to buy luxury goods.

---

**British Has Suffered Commonly in this War,**

**but also, in many ways, has gained strength.**

The fall in prices has strengthened. The balance of payments and prices have been much lower than before. The British have lost ground, in the same way as American. This has been a great discovery. The BMA has discovered that voluntary insurance cannot be made to pay off the people who are making money. The BMA is now beginning negotiations on this point.

---

**Winston Churchill Says:**

The policy is to create a national health service in order to ensure that everybody in the community, irrespective of means, age, sex, or occupation, shall have equal opportunities to benefit from the hospital and the most expensive medical and allied services available.

---

**Survey Graphic**

---

---

**British Cotton**

Bombarded factory. White war planes have been repaired speedily, many buildings severely damaged; munitions made in United Kingdom.
destitute makes the roots of life strike deep. America, 10 years ago, when Britain's bells rang for landings in North Africa, I went to a provincial cathedral in the home of the British Guard on church parade. The bishop reached up, spoke softly, and that day I knew I was in the ranks of the Five Pence Service I saw a hunkie in the uniform of his country. A British officer told me to say: He would be a good man to have in a tight spot.

Status and Spirit

Some day these hordes of peace may return, when a man is no longer a man for him. Millions who have been made men, for a season, have no verbal understanding of what happened to them. But something did happen, and the memory of it will be deep in the souls of those who were part of this private war.

Meanwhile, Beveridges and others have put it in words, that no man may justly be humiliated through the management of the rules of industry and government. The full respect is due to every person who is ready to do his duty in that place where God has in fact called him—so as normal, adult, or old, person. There is an all superficial level of life, one must expect the British people to show a national effort to living standards. Long before V-E Day, I heard the Forces Program of IRC letter "I'm Going to Get a Life. When the Lights Go on in London." No doubt the British are not yet very weary of this war in mind and spirit. But even if it is all over, a good many of them are going to drink up another war and a very much more ruinous desire to do anything serious again. Even so, a time must come when the British can have a fresh start in life.

Money and Jobs

Financially, Britain's position as a creditor nation has been badly undermined. The figures given by Nicholas Kalder in Sir William Beveridge's "Full Employment," indicates, to the middle of 1945, a loss of gold and foreign exchange of $5.8 billion, or $10 billion. The annual loss was $16.4 billion. The annual loss was $10 billion. The annual loss was $16.4 billion.

In America, terms of trade seem to be very small, but they bulk larger in terms of pre-war income from foreign investments of about $800 million. In America, terms of trade seem to be very small, but they bulk larger in terms of pre-war income from foreign investments of about $800 million.

Some of the foreign debts or melding obligations are held in South America, and a considerable fraction is in India and the dominions. The peculiarly stimulating effect of being a second-rate national in this connection. Before 1910, some, of us remember, the United States was a debtor nation, and unemployment was less of a problem to us; a noticeable proportion of our income was devoted to paying our debts. When we were just beginning to pay our debts, achieving us to the need to distribute our income more widely among our own people so as to find markets for their goods. Britain has already made some progress toward the true solution of the job problem, but there is a residue of incomes, but the definitely needed foreign trade is a matter of obtaining necessary materials from abroad.

Britain has already made progress toward the true solution of the job problem, but there is a residue of incomes, but the definitely needed foreign trade is a matter of obtaining necessary materials from abroad. A few hundred thousands in South America will stimulate the South Americans to spend their money in Britain. This in itself will not supply the British with anything. It is not used to spend the South American market is the source of foreign earnings, or the dominions, that have been largely taken over by American traders during the war. By pushing vigorously, the British can hope to sell enough not only to keep off those empty balances, but also to allow a surplus for building what they need. And meanwhile, finding a full relation of the war and job problem, it is evident that such an effort will provide jobs.

The same is true of Britain's relation to the dominions. In the case of India, it seems to be the case that the British people have been dispossessed of ownership. Britain is now owned by the Indians to the extent that they have a right to sell it. Britain has a right to sell it. Britain has a right to sell it.

Some of the foreign debts or melding obligations are held in South America, and a considerable fraction is in India and the dominions. The peculiarly stimulating effect of being a second-rate national in this connection. Before 1910, some, of us remember, the United States was a debtor nation, and unemployment was less of a problem to us; a noticeable proportion of our income was devoted to paying our debts. When we were just beginning to pay our debts, achieving us to the need to distribute our income more widely among our own people so as to find markets for their goods. Britain has already made some progress toward the true solution of the job problem, but there is a residue of incomes, but the definitely needed foreign trade is a matter of obtaining necessary materials from abroad. A few hundred thousands in South America will stimulate the South Americans to spend their money in Britain. This in itself will not supply the British with anything. It is not used to spend the South American market is the source of foreign earnings, or the dominions, that have been largely taken over by American traders during the war. By pushing vigorously, the British can hope to sell enough not only to keep off those empty balances, but also to allow a surplus for building what they need. And meanwhile, finding a full relation of the war and job problem, it is evident that such an effort will provide jobs.

There is a more serious loss in Britain is the war damage to property. Nearly four million houses have been damaged by enemy action. A few hundred thousands in South America will stimulate the South Americans to spend their money in Britain. This in itself will not supply the British with anything. It is not used to spend the South American market is the source of foreign earnings, or the dominions, that have been largely taken over by American traders during the war. By pushing vigorously, the British can hope to sell enough not only to keep off those empty balances, but also to allow a surplus for building what they need. And meanwhile, finding a full relation of the war and job problem, it is evident that such an effort will provide jobs.
of a reasonable expectation is made of them and officially stated. It is, therefore, to be expected that American, any industrial country, of the "economic imperialism" which is neither necessary nor desirable. Foreign trade, then, is the means of making jobs but no a way of obtaining materials which to raise the standard of living. Trade extension to this purpose may be balanced trade, involving neither unlimited growth and periodic repudiation of international debts, nor the acquisition of foreign property. If the great powers can agree to regard trade as a vehicle for dumping their unemployment on less powerful nations, if they can buy and sell fairly for the sake of obtaining what they need and paying for it, the prospects of a harmonious world will be bright. Americans so far have shown only faint glimmers of this principle. For example, the best that our Na- tional Planning Association (a non-governmental body) was recently able to suggest was that we ask the world to accept American exports in excess of imports to the tune of some $6 billion a year for an indefinite period in the hope that ultimately we could curb our excessive saving habits enough to allow the loans and investments to be redeemed.

Grown-Up Peoples

It is in this difference in maturity of economic thought in Britain and America that the main basis for conflict over policy is likely to be found during postwar years. We do not shall we, or be taught, that other countries will not let us buy them up. We do not doubt the rest of the world will make clear to us that even loans are not acceptable unless we will guarantee to run those debts that will allow our debts to repay. Mexico has demonstrated to the other Latin Americans that the Yankees are not prepared to send their sons to fight for them. Of the great powers can agree to regard trade as a vehicle for dumping their unemployment on less powerful nations, if they can buy and sell fairly for the sake of obtaining what they need and paying for it, the prospects of a harmonious world will be bright. Americans so far have shown only faint glimmers of this principle. For example, the best that our National Planning Association (a non-governmental body) was recently able to suggest was that we ask the world to accept American exports in excess of imports to the tune of some $6 billion a year for an indefinite period in the hope that ultimately we could curb our excessive saving habits enough to allow the loans and investments to be redeemed.

Grown-Up Peoples

It is in this difference in maturity of economic thought in Britain and America that the main basis for conflict over policy is likely to be found during postwar years. We do not shall we, or be taught, that other countries will not let us buy them up. We do not doubt the rest of the world will make clear to us that even loans are not acceptable unless we will guarantee to run those debts that will allow our debts to repay. Mexico has demonstrated to the other Latin Americans that the Yankees are not prepared to send their sons to fight for them. Of the great powers can agree to regard trade as a vehicle for dumping their unemployment on less powerful nations, if they can buy and sell fairly for the sake of obtaining what they need and paying for it, the prospects of a harmonious world will be bright. Americans so far have shown only faint glimmers of this principle. For example, the best that our National Planning Association (a non-governmental body) was recently able to suggest was that we ask the world to accept American exports in excess of imports to the tune of some $6 billion a year for an indefinite period in the hope that ultimately we could curb our excessive saving habits enough to allow the loans and investments to be redeemed.

Grown-Up Peoples

It is in this difference in maturity of economic thought in Britain and America that the main basis for conflict over policy is likely to be found during postwar years. We do not shall we, or be taught, that other countries will not let us buy them up. We do not doubt the rest of the world will make clear to us that even loans are not acceptable unless we will guarantee to run those debts that will allow our debts to repay. Mexico has demonstrated to the other Latin Americans that the Yankees are not prepared to send their sons to fight for them. Of the great powers can agree to regard trade as a vehicle for dumping their unemployment on less powerful nations, if they can buy and sell fairly for the sake of obtaining what they need and paying for it, the prospects of a harmonious world will be bright. Americans so far have shown only faint glimmers of this principle. For example, the best that our National Planning Association (a non-governmental body) was recently able to suggest was that we ask the world to accept American exports in excess of imports to the tune of some $6 billion a year for an indefinite period in the hope that ultimately we could curb our excessive saving habits enough to allow the loans and investments to be redeemed.

Grown-Up Peoples

It is in this difference in maturity of economic thought in Britain and America that the main basis for conflict over policy is likely to be found during postwar years. We do not shall we, or be taught, that other countries will not let us buy them up. We do not doubt the rest of the world will make clear to us that even loans are not acceptable unless we will guarantee to run those debts that will allow our debts to repay. Mexico has demonstrated to the other Latin Americans that the Yankees are not prepared to send their sons to fight for them. Of the great powers can agree to regard trade as a vehicle for dumping their unemployment on less powerful nations, if they can buy and sell fairly for the sake of obtaining what they need and paying for it, the prospects of a harmonious world will be bright. Americans so far have shown only faint glimmers of this principle. For example, the best that our National Planning Association (a non-governmental body) was recently able to suggest was that we ask the world to accept American exports in excess of imports to the tune of some $6 billion a year for an indefinite period in the hope that ultimately we could curb our excessive saving habits enough to allow the loans and investments to be redeemed.

Grown-Up Peoples

It is in this difference in maturity of economic thought in Britain and America that the main basis for conflict over policy is likely to be found during postwar years. We do not shall we, or be taught, that other countries will not let us buy them up. We do not doubt the rest of the world will make clear to us that even loans are not acceptable unless we will guarantee to run those debts that will allow our debts to repay. Mexico has demonstrated to the other Latin Americans that the Yankees are not prepared to send their sons to fight for them. Of the great powers can agree to regard trade as a vehicle for dumping their unemployment on less powerful nations, if they can buy and sell fairly for the sake of obtaining what they need and paying for it, the prospects of a harmonious world will be bright. Americans so far have shown only faint glimmers of this principle. For example, the best that our National Planning Association (a non-governmental body) was recently able to suggest was that we ask the world to accept American exports in excess of imports to the tune of some $6 billion a year for an indefinite period in the hope that ultimately we could curb our excessive saving habits enough to allow the loans and investments to be redeemed.

Grown-Up Peoples

It is in this difference in maturity of economic thought in Britain and America that the main basis for conflict over policy is likely to be found during postwar years. We do not shall we, or be taught, that other countries will not let us buy them up. We do not doubt the rest of the world will make clear to us that even loans are not acceptable unless we will guarantee to run those debts that will allow our debts to repay. Mexico has demonstrated to the other Latin Americans that the Yankees are not prepared to send their sons to fight for them. Of the great powers can agree to regard trade as a vehicle for dumping their unemployment on less powerful nations, if they can buy and sell fairly for the sake of obtaining what they need and paying for it, the prospects of a harmonious world will be bright. Americans so far have shown only faint glimmers of this principle. For example, the best that our National Planning Association (a non-governmental body) was recently able to suggest was that we ask the world to accept American exports in excess of imports to the tune of some $6 billion a year for an indefinite period in the hope that ultimately we could curb our excessive saving habits enough to allow the loans and investments to be redeemed.

Grown-Up Peoples

It is in this difference in maturity of economic thought in Britain and America that the main basis for conflict over policy is likely to be found during postwar years. We do not shall we, or be taught, that other countries will not let us buy them up. We do not doubt the rest of the world will make clear to us that even loans are not acceptable unless we will guarantee to run those debts that will allow our debts to repay. Mexico has demonstrated to the other Latin Americans that the Yankees are not prepared to send their sons to fight for them. Of the great powers can agree to regard trade as a vehicle for dumping their unemployment on less powerful nations, if they can buy and sell fairly for the sake of obtaining what they need and paying for it, the prospects of a harmonious world will be bright. Americans so far have shown only faint glimmers of this principle. For example, the best that our National Planning Association (a non-governmental body) was recently able to suggest was that we ask the world to accept American exports in excess of imports to the tune of some $6 billion a year for an indefinite period in the hope that ultimately we could curb our excessive saving habits enough to allow the loans and investments to be redeemed.

Grown-Up Peoples

It is in this difference in maturity of economic thought in Britain and America that the main basis for conflict over policy is likely to be found during postwar years. We do not shall we, or be taught, that other countries will not let us buy them up. We do not doubt the rest of the world will make clear to us that even loans are not acceptable unless we will guarantee to run those debts that will allow our debts to repay. Mexico has demonstrated to the other Latin Americans that the Yankees are not prepared to send their sons to fight for them. Of the great powers can agree to regard trade as a vehicle for dumping their unemployment on less powerful nations, if they can buy and sell fairly for the sake of obtaining what they need and paying for it, the prospects of a harmonious world will be bright. Americans so far have shown only faint glimmers of this principle. For example, the best that our National Planning Association (a non-governmental body) was recently able to suggest was that we ask the world to accept American exports in excess of imports to the tune of some $6 billion a year for an indefinite period in the hope that ultimately we could curb our excessive saving habits enough to allow the loans and investments to be redeemed.
Blitzed Cities
Look Ahead

Historic Plymouth

Hundreds of acres of rubble in the center of the city, through much of the Old Town escaped destruction.

Proposed traffic center at the main railway station. The new Plymouth plan includes a number of such neighborhood centers.

TOWN AFTER TOWN has stood up after the bombing and rallied in experienced city planners. Not all the new proposals fill impressive volumes. As Plymouth's, Or like the County of London Plan of 1943, or the plan for the Ancient City of Bath, for example, both of them are a result of a decision to replace an entire city before modern planning principles. Immediate postwar needs will have to be met.

However, much obsolete housing has been demolished and many empty-rooms are adorned with open space. Remaining historic structures nowhere left, the plans propose communities where people will have sufficient light and air, where they will live, reasonably near their work, in "neighborhoods" with recreational, shopping and cultural facilities where full consideration has been given to the problems of transportation and traffic.

Ancient City of Bath

Devastated area of Kingsmead in the heart of Bath, known to all who read Smollett, Fanny Burney, Jane Austen and Thackeray. Below: Model showing the shopping center proposed for the Kingsmead section. Bath has been exhibiting maps, drawings, diagrams — part of a master plan which provides for an evolutionary program of orderly, progressive development for the next fifty years.
When the Coalition Ends

Will the British get both security and freedom? They have a hard start—but no time to faillé.

Revised 30th by JOSEPH BARNES

In the name of their ancient villages, the townspeople have resolved to act on the exhibitions of English pictures. Clinging to the ruins, they have been welcomed from the people who are to come to the place. They have been ready to be made up and set on the siege. And the Home of the British will be able to break through. Will the British get both security and freedom? They have a hard start—but no time to faillé.
probably not far off. Yet, with this a sense of the real and the enthusiasm and social-mindedness with which the British threw themselves into the job of fighting in 1944, when there were no aliens.

In due course, the Homme Guard "stood down"; but sporadic strikes have kept up. The wartime coalition started to crack. Everyone knows a general election is probably not far off. All the endless postponements of peace feeling between the have and have-nots have again become a staple for the cartoonists and music hall gag writers. Young men talk of being "browned off" which, in America, is something like being "led up." Even the communists in Britain and their sons leaders in the United States find it difficult to keep social-mindedness at fever pitch indefinitely, and the "bloodless revolution" in Great Britain during the war has had no such diligent organizers behind it.

Most important of all, the British people are by all accounts tired. They are tired after five years and more of war to which they have given everything they had. Visits to London are this fatigue most clearly in individuals they have known before. Political leaders, who live there, estimate it, also, as a social factor affecting the vast majority of the population. Any kind of revolution, they say, bloodless or not, suggests too much effort and expenditure of energy to be really popular in a nation so long on short rations and overtime hours.

Nonetheless, for several years this bloodless revolution may have been as real to many British people as the bombs of war or other shocks of goods, and the casualty lists of which it grew. Much of its driving power is still there. Millions of women and men have undergone profound changes in their way of living from the hot summer days of 1939 to the spring with its V-E Day celebrations. Some of the changes are likely to prove permanent. At least a portion of them have been absorbed into the routine of daily life. In this sense, the revolution is great underground, now that people talk about it less in public. In this sense, it has become the soil out of which hopes, promises, and syndicalism are likely to grow in British politics after the war.

Food, Housing, Schools

It is certainly no exaggeration to claim that wartime rationing has actually raised living standards, in terms of food, for the one third of the British people with the lower incomes. At the same time, the bombs fell on England, and it is safe to assume that this trend has continued in Great Britain. The victory in the war has now become a feature of British life.

The war moved entire machine industries into what had been villages, and many became aware for the first time that planning and a water system have as direct relations to contentment as they have to health. After the war, with the destruction itself has served to remind many British people that good housing is both desirable and possible. The government has set up similar bodies in all areas for the rebuilding of devastated areas are crowded with visitors. And these, of course, have been put new and better homes and cities near the top of their list of what they want after the war is over.

June 1944, one fourth of all the houses in Great Britain, 3,410,000 separate buildings, had already suffered from enemy action. Of these, 3,000,000 were either destroyed or rendered uninhabitable. By September, 1944, another 81,000 houses had been destroyed and 1,000,000 damaged. Because the "rackets" came over heavily that month, called off later in the fall, increased in mid-winter, kept up till spring.

Since the war began, there has been no substantial rebuilding on which people could base their hopes for better housing after the war. But the destruction itself has served to remind many British people that good housing is both desirable and possible. Plans for postwar building units are being issued in London's newspapers every day, with estimates and suggestions and stem of schemes for the rebuilding of devastated areas are crowded with visitors. The British government has set up similar bodies in all areas for the rebuilding of devastated areas are crowded with visitors. And these, of course, have been put new and better homes and cities near the top of their list of what they want after the war is over.

Early in the war, it became a cliché to say that it was a comfort to have a man in a Spitfire over London no matter where the war went to school. Many of the boys in the Spitfires are likely to set their sights on any school in England when the war is over and want to send their children there. The public school system (what we would call private schools in the United States) has recently survived its first major public setback. Unfortunately, it is as far fundamental changes.

Literally millions of British men and women have had a taste of schooling in the armed services during the war. They find it hard to understand why, up to now, eight out of nine children in Britain have been taught in classes with more than forty children, and after the age of fourteen, got no more education of any kind.
British people during this war have built high hopes for the future. Full employment and social security are phrases now understood, probably, by a larger percentage of all the people in Great Britain than in any other country in the world. The present depression, like wartime bombings, bears no permanent impact on the lives of people and their political thinking. Men and women who can vote now have a new awareness of what their life was like in the past, and what it might be in the future.

Tinder of Politics

So political was this war first because a game of making promises. This time they were not all promises of "Homes for Heroes." The stakes had gone up. The promises this time were White Papers as strategic as a grand war against Hitler. Sir William Beveridge calls the giant social evils of Want, Disease, Idleness, Ignorance, and Squalor. Even the realistic and sober-minded Mr. Churchill was moved to sponsor a four-year program, which he first announced on March 23, 1941, and which was designed to cover in five or six large measures all the problems of social insurance, unemployment, agriculture, public health, education, and the physical reconstruction of a heavily-bombed nation. The measures he then envisaged moved slowly to concrete legislation. Some were begun in piecemeal fashion—voting for a smaller number of people to be exempt from military conscription, for example, or even to administer it.

For these have been political leaders, inside and outside the present government, who considered that the public will not continue to accept gladly enacts delays of reform, getting no further than Royal Commissions and White Papers. They know that Britain has been charted from bottom to top in the last year. They know that Beveridge has become almost a common noun in the English language. It stands for the drive of the common men and women in Britain to achieve the same miracles in our country. Their leaders have been all right, though they have had to fight in this bitter, often hopeless, war—a triumphal outcome. It stands for employment legislation, for comprehensive social insurance.

This development in popular thinking about the future is probably the hard core of the British mind, which will survive the shock of the war and the realization that this is a war that will not end too soon.

Basic Trends and Changes

The development is one which thus far, however, has produced no sudden or drastic changes in the political discipline of British politics. It is hard to see that it has affected yet the determination of the Cabinet Blimp to turn the clock back to where it stood when man Hitler announced his plan. "I have not the slightest doubt," said the Conservative Member for Greenwich in the House of Commons, "that when we awake from our dreams, which will be about three months after the termination of hostilities, three-quarters of the stuff we have been talking about is no longer tenable and no longer valid."

It may similarly be argued that political promises made in the domestic field have not decreased the possibility of explosive working-class pressure in Britain over the discipline of foreign war has been lifted. You can find men in London, and even in Croydon, who think that liberation in Europe is releasing forces which may hard to be held in check. If they should lead to violent changes on a continent-wide scale, the economic depression which is thus far been as important as wartime "perma-

VI. SELF-GOVERNMENT WITHIN THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH

Northern Neighbor

As unstacked by invasion as the USA, Canada will enter the postwar world with increased national stature, with new ties linking her to this country as well as to Britain.

JOHN MCCORMAC

Canada, which entered the first World War as a glorified dependency of Great Britain, emerged from it to become a member of the League of Nations and an independent nation within the British Commonwealth. In 1931, she had tripled her exports and doubled her imports, multiplied her manufacturing plants and discovered with surprise that she could finance her own war expenditures. She had graduated from the status of a colony into that of a "small power." As with many another striking, lighting had constructed her energy and helped her growth.

War-time Achievements

The end of the second World War will leave Canada—in all her most direct and quite a "great power" then what might be called a "middle-class power." She will be the fourth war factory among the United Nations. She has never again tripled her export trade and increased her income by 225 percent. She is on the way to becoming a creditor country, whereas she was formerly in debt to Great Britain.

Canada is now in debt to her. As a fighting nation, as well as a war workshop, her economic achievement has been impressive. A whole Canadian army has been fighting in Europe for three years. To be sure, it includes Polish and British units in its ranks, but it could have been self-sufficient had there been no invasion.

By a Canadian, now in London, who has spent most of the war years in the United States. He has made a special study of relations north and south of the border.

Mr. McCormac began his distinguished journalistic career as reporter from London correspondent of various Canadian papers. In 1936, he joined the London staff of the New York Times, and was reporting there with the London correspondent at the British Commonwealth Board which since Pearl Harbor has hosted most of the war. He is the only man in the anti-Nazi world who has ever been also a Canadian, now in London, who has spent most of the war years in the United States. He has made a special study of relations north and south of the border.

The end of the second World War will leave Canada—in all her most direct and quite a "great power" then what might be called a "middle-class power." She will be the fourth war factory among the United Nations. She has never again tripled her export trade and increased her income by 225 percent. She is on the way to becoming a creditor country, whereas she was formerly in debt to Great Britain.

Canada is now in debt to her. As a fighting nation, as well as a war workshop, her economic achievement has been impressive. A whole Canadian army has been fighting in Europe for three years. To be sure, it includes Polish and British units in its ranks, but it could have been self-sufficient had there been no invasion.

By a Canadian, now in London, who has spent most of the war years in the United States. He has made a special study of relations north and south of the border.

Mr. McCormac began his distinguished journalistic career as reporter from London correspondent of various Canadian papers. In 1936, he joined the London staff of the New York Times, and was reporting there with the London correspondent at the British Commonwealth Board which since Pearl Harbor has hosted most of the war. He is the only man in the anti-Nazi world who has ever been also a Canadian, now in London, who has spent most of the war years in the United States. He has made a special study of relations north and south of the border.

The end of the second World War will leave Canada—in all her most direct and quite a "great power" then what might be called a "middle-class power." She will be the fourth war factory among the United Nations. She has never again tripled her export trade and increased her income by 225 percent. She is on the way to becoming a creditor country, whereas she was formerly in debt to Great Britain.
The recent mid-continental ocean bed, now the flat and fertile plains of Canada and the USA, is "the breadbasket of the world." Canadian farmers, reaching wartime peaks of production, are growing a half billion bushels of wheat annually.

The French Canadians

These hazards are faced by any country which is a large surplus producer of a comparatively few world commodities. But Canada has complications peculiar to Canada. For most nations, war is at least temporarily auniting influence, but world wars tend to tear Canada apart. Many Canadians thought it wise to fight alongside Britain at a time when the United States was not participating in the conflict. In so thinking they were motivated not only by North American individualism but by the specific conviction that Canada has a growth and growing interest in the United States. American entry into the war, therefore, came as a great relief to Canadians, especially to Mackenzie King, the most North American-minded of Canadian prime ministers.

A third of Canada's population, however, firmly opposed her participation in extra-American wars, whether or not the United States is also a protagonist. Her "French Canadians," although they helped keep Canada British by defeating the American invaders of 1776 and 1812, are neither French nor English in their emotional attachments; they are purely and narrowly Canadian. They acquired without enthusiasm in Canada's participation in the last World War; they were concerned for overseas service when it was imposed in 1917 by a coalition government specially elected for the purpose. In this war, history repeated itself. Canadian participation was again grudgingly accepted and subscription bitterly fought.

"French Canadians are the Sin Financiers of the North American continent, its most egressive group of wholehearted isolationists. They commemorate the British connection similar as it guarantees their retention of the language, legal, and religious privileges whose original grant they owed to Britain, but they dislike it when it involves them in "imperialist" wars. They disapprove of the United States and dislike the idea of becoming American. In the eyes of the French Canadian Catholic hierarchy, the United States represents materialism, worldliness, and an alien, but persuasive culture. What French Canada hopes is that in another fifty years, by reason of a survival rate two or three times as high as that of English-speaking Canada, it will be able to shape Canadian policy in its own liking. The United States might then feel north of her something like Argentina.

Forces for Unity

It is not likely that this will happen. The unhappy memories, the burden of war and reconstruction costs, and consequent lowering of living standards which the war will leave, in the wake should again add as many British immigrants to her population as the can absorb. An expansion of the home market by such means has been almost an economic necessity if she is to make use in peace of her war-enlarged industrial plant and if she may decide to kill two birds with one stone. Canada's French Canadian problem is a hard one but is within her own power to solve. The policy of her present government has been that of not ignoring it hoping—rather, Mr. Maclellan—"that something would turn up. But that hope has been disappointed by this war as by the last. Those who urge grasping the little firmly have been justified by the fact that conscription has been imposed in British Canada—despite the headline of the American press—has not reversed".
Partners in the South Pacific

Australia and New Zealand, outposts of Western civilization, share with the USA a pioneer tradition, and are eager to be leaders in their part of the globe.

ANNE NEVIN

Meanwhile, 180,000 New Zealanders enrolled in the auxiliary services. Australians rallied to the war with less enthusiasm but equal vigour. In the first two years of war, 90,000 men under arms and 200,000 men and women into defense factories, they thought they had done well. But after Pearl Harbor, Prime Minister John Curtin told them: "You haven't really got started yet." The facts that were cited today prove that he was right.

The Men with Tended-Up Hats

Out of a total population of 7,100,000, no fewer than 90,000,000 men and women had been called. These troops have served in North Africa, Greece, and North Africa in India, Malaya, and the Dutch East Indies; and on a dozen islands of the South Seas. A year ago these troops had suffered some 81,000 casualties. (If we had suffered casualties on the same scale our figure would have been 1,500,000.) The men with the tended-up hats, the polite and shy, tough, who called themselves "Waltzing Matildas" as they fought, had held Tobruk for seven months. They had landed before Singapore, dug in at Port Moresby, and occupied the Ramu Valley in northern New Guinea. Australian airmen had helped raid Germany. The Australian light cruiser HMAS Sydney, after ramming and sinking the German raider Karlsruhe off the west coast of Madagascar, had been lost. "You haven't really got started yet." The facts that were cited today prove that he was right.

The Home Front in the South Seas

Both of these countries have submitted to economic and social changes considerably more drastic than those in the United States. For instance, twice in the past 10 years, the Sinews of Empire, a work by Lord Berners and Michael Foot, have been published in London. In 1939, the United Kingdom was at war with Germany, and occupied the Ramu Valley in northern New Guinea. Australian airmen had helped raid Germany. The Australian light cruiser HMAS Sydney, after ramming and sinking the German raider Karlsruhe off the west coast of Madagascar, had been lost.
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PARTICULARS

Sempenny: It is certain that much of the industrial growth will prove permanent.

In both countries, but particularly Australia, some of which will survive unaided. After all, the Australian iron, steel, food, rough-textile, and machine-tool plants running even at the cost of state subsidies, New Zealand to keep the basis of her new heavy industry.

As for tariffs, the Ottawa Agreements have been popular in both dominions; but the conviction has grown that Empire trade, not enough. Britain is as anxious as the United States to provide full employment and maintain a high living standard.

(The present New Zealand standard was as good as any and perhaps the best in the world, but the Australian standard was lower than that of the United States, Canada, and Great Britain.)

But the growers are keenly concerned to find export markets. They look to the opening regions of Asia as a potential sweats. But above all, they hope for international action to build an expanding world economy. They have been as ready as any other lands to collaborate in this effort. Only if it fails will they be likely to favor high tariffs and a renewal of the system of imperial preferences which was set up partly in imitation of our own Smoot-Hawley act.

Wages in the Two Dominions

This sharp industrial expansion presents Australia and New Zealand with a whole series of questions of internal policy: How much of it can and should be retained when peace comes? To what extent should the government furnish tariff protection or more direct subsidies? What relation should the new tariffs bear to the Ottawa Agreements and imperial trade policy? Is the greatly expanded industry to be free, or largely state-controlled? What relation is it to bear to agriculture? Are tariffs to be instated by a continuous raising of farm prices or by a direct substitution of production to the industry?

Labor in the Two Dominions

...to make blouses and bones of GI's and Australasians in war-torn areas.

New Zealand Legation, Washington
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LAND—and the Union of South Africa

Neither diamonds nor gold can make up for soil erosion or racial trouble. Only land conservation can yield enough footholds for livelihood and life.

HUGH H. BENNETT

All too often, the last natural resource which a nation decides to protect is soil, although that is wholly indispensable to the life of its people. In the Union of South Africa, happily, there is promise that something positive is going to be done about it.

Last year, when I went there to consult with officials of the Union Government on soil erosion, I had been given to understand the stage of problems was a dangerous one, and putting worse. I knew, too, that a special drought committee had made a searching study of the Union’s land situation far back in 1923 and had issued a major report warning of the seriousness of its erosion.

Traveling over the country twenty-one years later, I soon learned how many, and how much, South Africans were concerned about the wasted damage which had gone on for two decades, and the toll it had taken in millions of people.

Everywhere I went—and I roamed over the country—I was eagerly inquired whether American experience had anything to offer in the way of remedial measures. The people eagerly inquired whether American experience had anything to offer in the way of remedial measures. The people...
It considered so, we know they are getting hav... to control erosion in people like this sort of work. He... in the... and soil-holding grasses available under al... is greater variety of useful, soil-improving, and soil-building grasses available under al... southwardly drifts of sands. These highbl... and often, are held to be highly significant, irreparable, and unremediable, only in that good country south today.

Now, before I look further into the agricultural and pastoral problems with which this paper is concerned, I want to summarize briefly the situation as I see it. The soil problem is, in a sense, a double one. It is primarily one of soil erosion and the second one is one of soil productivity and fertility; the soil erosion is the immediate problem, the soil fertility is the long-term problem. This is why I think the emphasis should be on soil conservation and soil improvement.

Soil Conservation

The importance of soil conservation is becoming increasingly evident. The destruction of our natural resources is proceeding at an alarming rate. Soil erosion, deforestation, and overgrazing are common problems in many parts of the world. The loss of topsoil and the deterioration of the soil structure can lead to reduced productivity and eventually to desertification.

Soil Conservation Measures

There are several measures that can be taken to combat soil erosion and improve soil fertility. These include:

1. **Agricultural Management**: Practices such as crop rotation, minimum tillage, and contour plowing can help minimize soil erosion. This helps in maintaining soil structure and fertility.

2. **Water Management**: Techniques like terracing, contour contour planting, and creating water-ponding systems can be used to control water movement and reduce erosion.

3. **Soil Improvement**: The use of organic fertilizers, manures, and green manures can help improve soil fertility. These practices help in increasing organic matter and improving soil structure.

4. **Forest Plantation**: Planting trees and shrubs can help in soil stabilization and water conservation.

In conclusion, the importance of soil conservation and soil improvement cannot be overstated. It is a long-term investment that will benefit future generations.

Survey Graphic

A Transvaal field where terracing and contour plowing effectively control erosion.

Native girls learn to use conservation methods in the school garden near Heremb.

South African Negroid negroid gables by planting grass, with a cover of brush.

A Transvaal field where terracing and contour plowing effectively control erosion.
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The Common Stream of Justice

Britons and Americans are the same kind of people—in language, principles, values. And though we guard jealously our united front is the world's best hope of peace.

HENRY STEELE COMMAGER

"These two great organizations of the English-speaking democracies, the British Empire and the United States, will have to be somewhat mixed up together in some of their affairs, for mutual and general advantage. For my part, looking down upon the modern world, I see no need for any misgivings. No one can stop it. Like the Mississippi, it just keeps rolling along. Let it roll. Let it roll on full flood, irresistible, to broader lands and better days."

So Churchill, celebrating the destroyer-homes dealt, and his observations excited misgivings only among those who speak for prophecy what was actually history. For in fact these two great organizations, Britain and America, have always been mixed up in their affairs—and usually for moral and general advantage. They have been mixed up in population, for English-Welsh-Irish is still the biggest ingredient in our society; they have been mixed up in their language, law, economy, they have been mixed up in public diplomacy, war.

Sometimes we think of the two great English-speaking democracies as two branches of a common trunk and common roots. There is much truth in this notion, but actually the relations between them are of less conative and more interlaced:

The Atlantic Community

Walter Lippmann has recently reminded us that throughout our history we have been part of the Atlantic community, and that Britain has been the major partner in that community. We were able to maintain the Monroe Doctrine because Britain supported that doctrine instead of allying herself with its opponents. We were able to enjoy the advantages of isolation because a friendly Britannia-rulled the waves. We were able to become a democracy instead of doing so by an enlightenment of both sides an enlightened self-interest. We were able to fight the open war of the battle, there has been, in short, over every century an unformulated but real community of interest between the United States and Britain.

It may be admitted that this community of interest was rooted in reality, not in sentiment; that it was, in fact, a kind of enlightened self-interest. But if we go behind this facile generalization and ask why it happens that British and American self-interest dictates mutual support and interdependence, we come close to arriving at a real understanding.

For self-interest, surely, it may be suggested that we should have drawn closer together in opposition between Germany and France, Russia and Finland, China and Japan. How does it happen that Britain and America have both as basic interest both parties in the same direction, and which of them in the same political stage? How does it happen that these two nations trust each other?

Why, to be specific, was America so confident for so long that Britain would hold out against Nazi might, and why did Britain's prospect of Britain's collapse strike terror into American hearts and move Americans to contraceptive efforts at all?

Why, in turn, was Churchill able to prefigure so confidently that in God's good time the New World would step forth to the rescue and resurrection of the Old?

"Our Kind of People"

The answer is easy, but nonetheless illuminating. It is because America does not know a strong Britain, nor Britain a strong America; because, on the contrary, each people has confidence in the other. They know that they subscribe to the same principles, respect the same standards, cherish the same values, respect the same indigenous culture, pursue the same ends.

In the last analysis each can say of the other: "They are our kind of people."

How does this happen? It is not merely a matter of common origin; it may be observed that many Americans are not of English origin, and that between Spanish and the native Americans there is yet a such interdependence. It is not just a matter of a common language, English and Latin, and have a common language, English and French; English and French, English and German, are not hope easily dissimilar. The explanation goes deep into the roots of history and experience and character.

Let us look first at that matter of values.

—by a gifted writer and teacher of American history, a member of the faculty of Columbia University, who in 1942-43 lectured at Cambridge. He spent half of a summer in England, also, for the U. S. W. A. Department, and is a member of its Committee on the History of the United States.

Professor Commager's recent books include "The Heritage of America" (in collaboration with Allen Johnson) and "Majority Rule and Minority Rights," because it is fundamental. And what we see at once is that over all the dignity of the individual. The individual—his life, his property, and his home—is the core of the state and of society. Here, finally, in real fundamental principle is the maxim that the state exists for man, not man for the state; that the supreme authority is not government but the consent of man. Here, first, in real fundamental principle is the maxim that the state exists for man, not man for the state; that the supreme authority is not government but the consent of man. Here, first, in real fundamental principle is the maxim that the state exists for man, not man for the state; that the supreme authority is not government but the consent of man.

Individual Rights

There are gems of this principle even in Magna Carta, but it was fully developed only with the Puritan Revolution, and can be found in the irrefutable form in the writings of Hooker and Sidney and Milton and Locke.

It was carried to America by Pilgrims and Puritan colonists, and by their successors, and was eloquently restated in the Declar-
recognized its fundamental insuperability with democracy, and "trembled" when he realized that "God is just." All characteristically American philosophy was unbelievably opposed to the institution, always called "tyranny," while its apologists had to fall back on Greek philosophy for what they thought a defense.

Pro & Anti-Morality

Closely allied with this principle of the worth of the individual, has been the concept of the moral character of the American in politics. To the British, as to the Americans, neither the same nor government is ever seen in the same light, but a means to an end and that end a moral one. It is to achieve certain ends—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. As Jefferson phrased it, "If governments are invented among men, and they added that they derive only their "just" powers from the consent of the governed.

The principle was not a new one with Jefferson, as with Americans it was taken from Locke, who in turn was expressing merely the sense of the matter familiar to Enlightenment of the seventeenth century. To this ideal both British and Americans are peculiarly inclined to associate morals with politics and, what is perhaps more surprising, to inject morals into international relations.

It is undoubtedly in the realm of politics that Britain has made her most significant—and her most direct—contributions. It is not that the British are less inclined to recognize the individual's rights or, for they accentuate differences, and also privileges for great.

Yet the common cause in which we are now engaged should warn us not to take advantage of the English institutions for granted; they are not held for granted elsewhere in the world. And the manner in which the French are fighting that common cause should instruct us that differences are formidable, simulations fundamental. For it must be clear, by now, that the distinctions between "limited monarchy" and "arbitrary," are "revolutions" and a "limited" constitution, are centralized and a federal system, a cabinet and a presidential administration, are not very real or very important; while the same rule of the law, the position of individual rights, democracy, freedom, and morality, are fundamental. One reason (probably the basic reason) why the British and American machines have worked together so smoothly and efficiently during this war is that they were already running on the same engine.

What, more specifically, are some of the British contributions to the principles and practices of democratic policy?

There is, first, the principle of constitution, of government under law. The British have managed to achieve this with an unwritten constitution—a treaty to their self-governance and self-confidence, their litigants, their foster for compromise and accommodation. Americans, beginning with a new nation and confronted with the task of bringing numerous semi-independent states into a union, of necessity had recourse to a written constitution. But government under law, in accordance with basic principles and familiar practices, obtains equally in both.

A second great contribution is what we now call democracy. Most Americans are still living in a world of great expectations. But since America, born of the forest and the plain, in a sense, it is; but its ancestry is clearly English. In basic principles—a man makes government, that men can control government for their own ends—enshrined in the whole body of English thought of seventeenth-century England, and was transplanted to America by the British, not by the French or the Spaniards or even by the Dutch or the Swedes. And if it is observed that modern democracy requires a continuous broadening of the concept of "men," it may be noted that process went as on at rapidly in Britain as it did in America, in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Liberty under Law

A third, and characteristically British, contribution has been the recognition of liberty and order. This is the fundamental problem of statesmanship, and of all problems, the most difficult: How to maintain a government strong enough to fulfill all these requirements but not strong enough to destroy democracy? How to control government without sacrificing personal liberty? And how to maintain order without regimenting it, to secure basic security and in the midst of economic activity, without sacrificing personal liberty? And this achievement was not made without sacrifice. In the mid-eighteenth century, in which Australia and New Zealand (and to a certain extent Canada) were settled, in the British Empire, faced with the same problems in our own day, has not allowed much latitude and will doubtless borrow more. But, more significant than particular examples—the Beveridge plan, housing reform, or land utilization—are the underlying spirit of cooperation and compromise, the underlying method of evolution rather than revolution. It is this spirit, which animates British and Americans alike, and which has animated men throughout the history that we have before us, that is the hallmark of the American Revolution.

The Spirit of '76

But, it is said, what of the American Revolution, as a thing? It was another English contribution, and one of peculiar significance, and it is these that are four relevant considerations that we shall do well to remember in connection with the American Revolution.

First in the phrase of one of our most learned historians, it was "the first of people that was the first to rebel." The syllables charges hurled against George III in the Declaration of Independence should not blind us to the fact that the British colonial policy of the seven years, and eighteenth century was indeed not the most enlightened and liberal in the world. It was, because under British rule, Americans had for so long been accustomed to a government that they ceased to regard any attempt to infringe upon their liberties.

Second, the principles for which Americans concluded were not new and revolutionary, but old and conservative. America claimed the rights of Enlightenment under the British Constitution, and they argued, soundly enough, that it was the glory of the British Empire in another and more eloquently interpreted and applied, it is sometimes called "the right of revolution,". It should be added that a powerful element in British politics recognized the validity of this argument and, in the words of Pitt, "desired that America had resisted."

Third, it should be remembered that the British contribution to the problem of federation, as it was in the Syllables, was to "present the spectacle of the English Empire—England in which there was at last a people, who, in their desire for independence and freedom, were not content with the British Constitution; and they argued, soundly enough, that it was the glory of the British Empire in another..." it is the "center of..." It should be added that a powerful element in British politics recognized the validity of this argument and, in the words of Pitt, "desired that America had resisted."

Fourth, and, therefore, we may note within a generation after the completion of the American Revolution, which had been achieved, that the principle of liberal cooperation, for which Americans had fought, and throughout the nineteenth century British imperial and colonial policy continued to be most enlightened than that of any other power.

Pattern for World Organization
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by smashing the only going concern which we now have, or by opposing every effort to strengthen it. They are distressed, perhaps as the failure to reach an agreement on India; they recall with sorrow the woes of Ireland; they question the right of Britain to control the entrance to the Mediterranean; they are genuinely pained at the sight of so many other classes, in every part of the world. Cherishing the principles of self-determination, they fail to realize that this is, in fact, the animating principle of the British Commonwealth. Fearful of imperialism, they identify the word Empire with old-fashioned imperialism and fail to realize that for Britain imperialism has entailed as much responsibility as profit.

One other British—American—characteristic of practice, closely associated with politics, deserves mention, one which we take so completely for granted that we fail to appreciate its significance. That is the habit of private associations, organizations, and enterprises. This habit is a natural product of the individualism of the English-speaking peoples, of that freedom of action and self-assurance which comes from security and liberty. Confronted with some practical problem, inspired by some ambition, the English and Americans do not turn inquietly to their government, but to their fellow-citizens. That same French observer, de Tocqueville, noted this a century ago, and it is as true today as it was then. De Tocqueville interpreted it as an essential ingredient of democracy. In America, in England, in the English-speaking countries, more than in any others, education, charity, community services, churches, hospitals, business organizations, literary, scientific and artistic societies, libraries, relief movements began as private associations. It is interesting that even those organizations looking to the endurance of Anglo-American understanding have been almost entirely private—the Red Cross, the YMCA, the English Speaking Union, Roos Over the Sea, and others. This is all part of the "grass roots" quality of English and American democracy, part of the faith in individual dignity and authority, part of the freedom of enterprise under government. It is not to be found in Germany or Russia or France or Spain or even in the Scandinavian countries on anything like the same scale of distinguish English and Americans.

What shall we say of other British contributions? They are, for the most part, too obvious to justify elaboration. It is perhaps necessary to remind us that Britain is the block country and that from her we have drawn more fully for spiritual sustenance than from any other source. It may be important to add that this is true for those of non-English stock as well as for those who boast Mayflower ancestry. There are millions of Americans of German ancestry, millions of Italian, of Polish, of Russian, of Scandinavians. Yet the historian would have some difficulty in determining what our characteristic American institutions owe to Germany, Italy, Poland, Russia, or the Scandinavian countries.

Our language is English, and all of Henry L. Mencken's researches have discussed, and astonishingly few contributions from the non-English elements. And the English, in return, have responded to our American language, enriching—only the pedantic will say vulgarizing—their own tongue from our dialects and our films. Our literature is English: Millen and Wordsworth and Tennyson, Dickens and Thackeray and Trollope, Wells and Bennett and Galsworthy, are our authors, and contemporary British poets crowd our best-seller lists. Again, the British reproduce it in Stephen Leacock and Waugh that they admire, often in preference to their own. Even in the realm of humor—perhaps the ultimate test—the interchange is easy and illuminating: Americans rejoice in W. W. Jacobs and Margaret Sharpe; the British delight in Dorothy Parker, Galsworthy, and James Thurber, in The New Yorker as well as Puck.

Our law, too, is largely English—not only the common law and equity and agency, and contracts and ballistics, and so on, but also, always, with important American modifications.

Our educational machinery differs markedly, but both people create the same passion for popular education, and each has borrowed heavily from the other.

We indulge in different sports. The British play the game for the game's sake, Americans play it to win. But we share a common sense of sportsmanship, a sportsmanship hardly altogether with certain standards of honor and fair play.

The Habit of Bickering

We are, in short, wishfully supposing that there are few differences between us, of ideas, of habit and conduct, the same kind of people.

American Choices

The call on the USA—not for words or sentiment, but for constructive decisions on such practical problems as trade, credit, shipping, as oil, islands and markets.

WALTER MILLIS

We stand at the vanguard of a second great war which we have waged side by side with British arms, and in which British hands have played, more plainly than ever before, indispensable parts in our own security both on the east and on the west. Today there is hardly anyone—outside of a few fanatic and irresponsible voices—who would deny the paramount significance of that relationship to the future of the United States as well as to the world at large. We stand also at the climax of a long history which gradually, irreversibly, and yet with the underlying inevitability of history, has wrenched the destinies and policies of the two powers more clearly apart.

It began, if one likes, with the Monroe Doctrine; it continued with British policy during the Civil War. It was strengthened by the Venezuelan incident in 1850—the last over seemingly unimportant issues between the two peoples—and it was evident at Manila Bay. It was an important theme in Theodore Roosevelt's diplomacy; it was clear to all in World War I and was dramatically confirmed at the time of the Washington Conference in 1922.

That settlement brought to the end of the Anglo-American alliance, brought Great Britain's historic severance of naval parity with the United States, and left the transfer of the American fleet to the Pacific, then leaving our Atlantic, to be defended by the Royal Navy while we, in effect, assumed responsibility for the safety of the seas and the British Empire in the oceans.

But to recognize the importance of an international relationship is not the same thing, unfortunately, as to define the basis upon which it is to rest, or to accept the implications which they involve. It was, or should have been, plain enough after World War I and the Washington Conference that our relations with Great Britain were central to the destinies of both countries and to the whole structure of international affairs. But neither country could discern the necessary deductions from this fact, or sufficiently adjust its policies to them. One of the fundamental causes of the great tragedy of the inter-war years lay in the extent to which Anglo-American relations were allowed to stand, to go by default. That default permitted paralysis of development of a national international society.

Where We Failed

It may be left to British observers to some extent of this in the policy of their own country, an American can point to many examples of the same failure (the case of the United States, our negation of the League of Nations, the long-standing prohibition of the full development of the American influence from European problems to which Great Britain was precariously Anglo-American understanding in the political field. A naval rivalry, which after World War I had been allowed to poison the atmosphere, and probably to facilitate Japanese camouflage of her ambitions), down to the end of the decade.
Basis of Cooperation

To make Anglo-American cooperation the bedrock of international stability, both countries must maintain policies directed toward the larger international cooperation which will still be too rudimentary a stage.

They will be able to consist of many, no one of which will be itself sufficient. However, the two peoples have already worked out under the stress of the war. One thing is clear: Each of them, if truly united, is a nation, not a military alliance, it would seem as fundamental as the principles which Walter Hines Page once expressed by saying that the American and British national policies should have the same language.

We shall not need an abiding faith in the people, the kind of faith and courage Franklin Delano Roosevelt always had. We have learned to fight with other nations in common defense of our freedom. We must learn to live (and work with other nations for our mutual good), so that there may be increased production, increased employment and better standards of living throughout the whole world.

——Message to Congress, April 16

Anglo-American army-air force - an achievement wholly unparalleled in the history of mankind. A unique and wonderful combination of Chiefs of Staff, one thinks of the Shipping Pool, and all the other elaborate international cooperative structures which were the result of war between the American and British Commonwealth, and thereby including all questions of armament cooperation or rivalry in securing bases and strategic positions directed against each other. Moreover, while it might not be a military alliance, it would seem as fundamental as the principles which Walter Hines Page once expressed by saying that the American and British national policies should have the same language.

We shall, therefore, do with what is possible, with what is real, and from what is right. Such a policy is, as a political event, the sum of all the policies, the sum of all the efforts of the past. It is, therefore, not a military alliance, but it is a military alliance. It is a real military alliance. It is a real military alliance. It is a real military alliance.
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Such views, however, are far from universal in the United States; and on our
side, however, the people may be less than universal among the British peoples. The fact that there is a coexistent healthy of real political dif-
ference, which cannot be expressed solely by polemical theory in Anglo-American, is a fact which must be faced.

Two Sides of the Shield

Probably the most serious difficulties in the way of implementing a policy of re-
armament will be found in the economic field.

Many Americans are suspicious that the British Commonwealth may use our con-
tributions to the winning of the war as props for maintaining in the peace an im-
portant economic system that might other-
wise fail apart. Our military efforts, these
Americans say, is winning back British
and British opportunities for economic exploitation; our lend-lease con-
ntributions substitute, directly or indirectly, a revival of British competition against us in Latin America and elsewhere or bul-
ster the British position in sea and air
and on land but the more technical features which we claim as our own.

To many British observers, needless to say, the situation appears in a diametrically opposite light. The British Common-
wealth, some of them say, sacrificed everything to a war effort which the United States entered only tardily. The British people
are bound to ask: why, then, when they, too, took the blitz and the rocket bombs,
they sacrificed their foreign in-
vestments, they scrapped their whole en-
vironment and their entire economic system, and they turned every produc-
tive effort to the war, while the Americans were either at peace or largely
undisturbed by the direct impact of the struggle.

We can profit from their blood and their
thoughts, and when we were
finally capitulated by the vacuum attack into a full participation in the way, we still
enjoyed an advantage. While
Britain was concentrating upon the purely military aspects of the common war, the
United States was allowed a major share of their war activities which will retain a
peacetime value.

Thus, Britain built fighters, bombers, tankers, destroyers; America conserved her energies in the repair and development of existing plants. Meanwhile, the
British command of air, sea, and land, for obvious and in themselves compelling reasons of strategy and efficiency, fell to base
British success in the development of produc-
tion transportation of airplanes, trucks and vehicles, and in the development of machinery for agriculture; and then began
the arms race. If the United States had maintained the same pace, America would eventually have
covered the list.

From bomb, the world war effort to which we
were installed could be efficiently designed and became a major battlefront for the
convertible to peacetime use.

For his part, Britain felt that while they were all
ruining their own country for the common cause, the United States had to
secure a competitive position of absolutely crucial importance.

This feeling is almost certainly exag-
ergated—as exaggerated, perhaps, as the
American feeling that the British are un-
duly exploiting the American contributions in order to secure their own postwar posi-
tion. Actually, it is very difficult to see any
fundamental conflict of economic interest
between the two great commonwealths as
seems to get any gains that either could achieve
through a policy of ruthless trade rivalry
that would not be far outweighed by its
consequences. If these mutual fears and suspicions
were all these were to it, one could say
with confidence, that while they might be expected to
rise to various friction all very amicable, still they would hardly cause
any issues that could not be settled by the
ordinary processes of international give and
take and normal competitive adjustment.

Managed Economy vs. Individualism

Unfortunately, however, there seems to be a deeper difficulty beneath this issue of potential conflict. It springs from the
fact that the British economy has been
so deeply developed in a different dire-
tion than that has of the United States—
or as some would put it, so much more
rapidly in the same direction. Many Ameri-
cans probably do not realize how
Great Britain has already gone toward a
"managed" economy; not undestanding how
firmly convinced most shades of British opinion have become—in face of the ap-
pelling twin of material and social re-
construction which now confronts them—
the point of view which brought them through the crisis of the war will have to
be maximized in large measure.

One need not explore this tendency in detail to recognize that it is bound to add
to the difficulties of Anglo-American cooperation.

In current British thought and comment, one often observes anxiety on this score. A definite fear that the new Briti
will find it impossible to work with American "orthodoxy," and an almost equally de-
nre desire to make the new British world work, any, regardless of whether American
opinions accept it or not.

The conflict manifests itself in both
boards and conferences. For example, at
the Munich conference at Chicago
the British were working toward a world air
transport system that would be interna-
tional "planned;" the Americans were
working for a competitive structure. The
United States left their old tradition of
individualism for an economic sense, and utilizing it to fight us
for war. If we follow the usual pattern
of the others, they would hardly create
our lend-lease arrangements to secure their own postwar position
in Latin America and elsewhere or
their proper political and economic
advantages and some restraint in utilizing
those, that will not be single, abrupt, all
will, on the contrary, represent enlightened realization of our long-standing efforts to
make the world an inclusive, in
other words, National policies are not realistic—so if the popular name of Abraham Lincoln was used incorrectly. It seemed to
me at the time that he said there quiet writing, certain of support for the rest of the world that he lived and died, for
the world, God, defined and represented democracy, and he died, and
Since then our soldiers have passed through England, our in

Lincoln's Statue Stands Unscathed in London

Thanksgiving Day Address by JOHN G. WINTANT, Albert Hall, London, 1944

"The common ideals of the English-speaking peoples of the world are the ideals from which other peoples of the world are exclu-
sed. These ideals are open in no country that lives liberty and hates tyranny. They are ideals which are common to
all men and women of this world who do justice, who love liberty, and who work
paradigm with God.

"In 1941, when an enemy destroyed the Carpathian Mountains, and smashed the castle of Witley Abbey, I
suggested that these two acts symbolized the object of the disaster and the piteous. Across the street from this, the
national name of Abraham Lincoln was used incorrectly. It seemed to
me at the time that he said there quiet writing, certain of support for the rest of the world that he lived and died, for
the world, God, defined and represented democracy, and he died, and
Since then our soldiers have passed through England, our in

"We are grateful that you have joined us in this day of Thanks-
giving season, through common sacrifice and a war-time
advance we have been able to present many grateful greetings, but chiefly to ex-
press a simple, heart-felt gratitude.

"Our greatest harvest has been the willing hands and the brave
hearts that have carried forward an unshakable faith in freedom and in
our own destiny. We have an enunciating power.

"When the smile is over and the battle done, grants to brother-
hood, that we do not for this small work that the years to come hope without despair; faith in humanity, and understanding banished out in
these victories that will enable the sacrifice for all men."

With thousands but in hundreds of thousands, and crossed the Channel
with years, and fought their way through France with years, and
are battling within the frontiers of Germany with years on their way to victory.

"We are grateful that you have joined us in this day of Thanks-
giving season, through common sacrifice and a war-time
advance we have been able to present many grateful greetings, but chiefly to ex-
press a simple, heart-felt gratitude.

"Our greatest harvest has been the willing hands and the brave
hearts that have carried forward an unshakable faith in freedom and in
our own destiny. We have an enunciating power.

"When the smile is over and the battle done, grants to brother-
hood, that we do not for this small work that the years to come hope without despair; faith in humanity, and understanding banished out in
these victories that will enable the sacrifice for all men."
Europeans edition of the New York Herald Tribune. That will be flown across the Channel in less than two hours after leaving Paris presses. The material is an invaluable one to true unop- portunities for mass international communica-
tion. We should review our own books on news and broaden understanding of a little New England town meetings, Pittsford, Wym-
ongton, and a Columbia River town.
just as the American correspondents live in London, so the London cor-
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The time has come for the free people of the world to join hands together. Let it be said, in all the world, that the hour for justice has struck out the great bell of freedom. No longer shall nations exist as lords over man. The day has come when the world must take a new direction, and the hour has come when the world must throw off its chains. No longer shall the tyrants of this world rule over the people. The time has come when the world must throw off the chains of war and bring about a world of peace. The time has come when the world must bring about a world of justice and freedom. The time has come when the world must bring about a world of progress and prosperity. The time has come when the world must bring about a world of peace, freedom, and justice. The time has come when the world must bring about a world of peace, freedom, and justice. The time has come when the world must bring about a world of peace, freedom, and justice.
In peace the confines of aim and interest between English and French Canadians tends to subside. The current is resumed, though it is not, as in war, the same water on which the postwar Canadian life flows. Canada is subject to strain caused by the two nationalities, the American, and the French. The division of the French by the American, and the French by the American, is a striking phenomenon of the American position of the British and Americans to cooperate with each other.

The consequences of the United States and Canada being allies, and that Britain herself set the example by granting bases to the United States in the West Indies, Bermuda, and Newfoundland, made matters easier. No question of "disloyalty" to Britain arose, and such an issue might have been depended on to cause more consternation than any temporary surrender of Canada's sovereignty to the United States. Canada's present government has agreed to fear, rather, that Canadian sovereignty might be compromised by too close association with Britain. This feeling is unshaken by the history of the two countries' association, and it is an admission when, in the process of becoming a nation, she had to break loose from Britain's dominion and go it alone. Canada, as a result, has taken steps to maintain her autonomy and freedom of action. Sometimes she seems not to trust herself to hold her own in any association of the British Commonwealth without the United States, and will it be a failure, as she is likely to be failures, with the United States. This feeling—and the fear that a closer arrangement might embarrass her closer relationship with the United States—led her government to reject a proposal made last year by Lord Hugh Dowding, the British government, and endorsed by Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, that the dominion should again enter the Commonwealth and cooperate with the United Kingdom not only, but in all respects to prevent them.

Mr. King also said that he was a Canadian national to Lord Halifax's proposal and he felt it again at the Imperial Conference in London in 1944. There he argued against the idea of joint association, and the British representatives did not agree. But Mr. King, not being one of those who desires to see any attempt to establish another bloc of British nations or to limit their freedom in dealing with peoples outside the British Commonwealth, was mindful of the fact that his own country was at a disadvantage. By the nature of the Commonwealth, he must be based on the Commonwealth in which the dominion of Canada, and British Canada, in particular, must ever be subject to the influence of a fraternal association of the British and American peoples.

Under the circumstances, the decision of the British Commonwealth, as a whole, was reached against the proposal of the Dominion. The British Commonwealth, as it is understood, must be based on the Commonwealh in which the dominion of Canada, and British Canada, in particular, must ever be subject to the influence of a fraternal association of the British and American peoples.

In this position, Mr. King identified himself with the position of the argument of the American State Department, that a national government organization in the United States, and Canada, and only a complete federalism in the Maritime Provinces and Quebec can be the solution of the problem.

The United States has been permitted to exercise authority over the customs and tariffs of Canada. The United States has been permitted to exercise authority over the customs and tariffs of Canada. The United States has been permitted to exercise authority over the customs and tariffs of Canada. The United States has been permitted to exercise authority over the customs and tariffs of Canada. The United States has been permitted to exercise authority over the customs and tariffs of Canada.

But just as the Institute's studies on China have been substantiated by wholly new programs of university research, so American and Canadian public schools should become the source of knowledge for understanding of China and the Far East.
The big news came that Gen. Douglas MacArthur had landed in Australia with wild rejoicing. In the ensuing months Australia became a great military base, and New Zealand too, in order to meet the first desperate demands of the Pacific war. A new era had dawned, and no soul could fail to grasp the fact.

For the first time Australians had had reason for enthusiasm over their world position, and for hard thinking upon their responsibilities. The moment when Asia was fairly quietened and Japan was overthrown was the most permanent and remote interest in foreign affairs. Australia had no desire to play a part in it.

When Asia Counts for More

Now that they perceive that a new world is emerging that Europe will count for less, and Asia for more than formerly; and that they see a neighborhood to an area whose events decisively affect the future of mankind will take place. Indeed, they see more than the neighbors, Australia, frontal on the Far East, is detached from the Orient. How the Near East and the Far East is detached from the Orient. How the Near East and the Far East.

The New Zealanders used to be more British than the British themselves, and still talk of Britain in "homely terms." However, they are busy developing their own culture, outlook, and sense of nationality. The Australian, whose forebears included many peoples with a special reason to love England, are much further away from the former nation. They think and feel for themselves in everything from art to politics. Nevertheless, in Australia the foreign minister has given general approval that the imperial bond is "fundamental in our external policy." The present government has added the Dubbo of the Great Wall to their purposes.

The Empire will continue to be cherished in the South Pacific.

Security

But the Empire nowadays has to be, supplemented by other protections. It is not true that Australia has a population of millions. The Australian has more reason not to be alarmed at the coming of the Japanese. Only a few million Australians are more populous than the Japanese.

The two generations may see China enter into a stronger organization of the Far East. And the two may never meet. If the Asiatic hurricane once more aggressively sweeps over the Orient, then the British might be again seriously endangered. They will feel the temper of those countries will be.

The next two generations may see China enter into a stronger organization of the Far East. And the two may never meet. If the Asiatic hurricane once more aggressively sweeps over the Orient, then the British might be again seriously endangered. They will feel the temper of those countries will be.
EUROPE AND THE MEDITERRANEAN
(Continued from page 194)

...as it was for the United Kingdom and its partners in the Western Alliance, the Middle East and its neighbors, and the United Nations. The United States, with its interests and policies in the region, is a key player in the Middle East and its neighbors.

The United States' relationship with the Middle East is complex and multifaceted. It is shaped by historical, cultural, political, and economic factors. The United States has a long history of engagement with the Middle East, dating back to the early 19th century. This engagement has been characterized by both cooperation and conflict. The United States has provided military and economic assistance to countries in the region, and it has also supported democratic and human rights movements. However, the United States has also been criticized for its policies, particularly its support for Israel, and for its role in the region's conflicts.

The United States' policies in the Middle East are influenced by a range of factors, including national interests, global strategies, and domestic politics. The United States' relationship with the Middle East is also shaped by the region's own dynamics, including political, economic, and social changes. The United States and its partners in the region must work together to address the many challenges they face, including terrorism, instability, and economic development.

The United States' relationship with the Middle East is an important part of its foreign policy, and it is a priority for the United States. The United States must continue to engage with the Middle East, and it must do so in a way that is consistent with its values and priorities. The United States must also work to build partnerships with other countries in the region, and it must be willing to listen to the concerns and perspectives of its partners.

THE UNKNOWN MURDERER
By Theodor Reik

A psychoanalyst takes up where detectives leave off in this fascinating study of crime, both real and literary. Brilliant, provocative — a must for mystery fans as well as criminalologists. "A spirited and humane work" — The New York Times

$5.00

ONE AMERICA
Our racial and national minorities
By Frederick L. Brown and Joseph S. Bacewicz
A survey of the background, problems, and cultural and national contributions of forty-one groups, such as Swiss, Turkish, Italians, etc. Thirty-three authors contribute to this important multiauthor study. $10.00

Recent Volumes in the Series:

* CANADIAN-AMERICAN RELATIONS, 1875-1911
Charles T. Reid
$3.50

* THE AMERICAN BORN IN CANADA
R. H. Coss and M. C. MacDonald
$2.00

* THE RED RIVER VALLEY, 1811-1869
John Ferry Pemberton
$2.00

* THE CANADIAN IN THE UNITED STATES
Louis T. Redwood
$7.00

* YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS New Haven, Connecticut

* THE RELATIONS OF CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES
John Tartwell
In 1862 Dr. James T. Shewboard, the Canadian Editor for International Peace, organized a group of American and Canadian students to study the Canadian-American interplay in its various aspects. North Atlantic Triangle in the second and final volume in the series.
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Oil—and a Strategic A zone

If human relationships and military strategy dominate discussion of Palestine, oil is the principal issue it makes with the great powers in Studi Arabian: in Iraq’s former Lease mandate which, with the death of the British king, became independent in 1932; in Iran, where British and Russian troops are internationalized but whose independence from British influence is well established; in Turkey; and in the Balkan and Middle Eastern countries. The United States has been increasing its influence in the Middle East because of its oil, air bases, and possible petroleum markets for American goods. Britain needs access to the Middle East, including Iraq, for her navy. She needs naval air bases and air bases. And, as is the case in all nations with respect to this country, British diplomatic and military relations are active throughout the Middle East. And, as we have seen, these relations are a valuable source of security for our people.
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PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS OF DEMOCRACY

by George D. R. Huxley

A practical book for those who wish to know what really constitutes the ideals of democracy. It will help us find a way toward a better world, a world where peace and justice prevail. The book is packed with practical suggestions on ways to promote democracy in our own lives and in the lives of others.

ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY AND PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

A Study of the Economic Relations of the Federal Government to the Federation by Michael O. Shanker

This book discusses the relationship between the federal government and private enterprise, focusing on the role of economic democracy in ensuring a fair and just society. It provides insights into how private enterprises can be managed in a democratic manner to benefit all members of society.

AMERICAN INVASION

(Continued from page 166)

Affairs, the War Shipping Administration, the Bureau of Economic Warfare, the Office of War Information, the Office of Naval Research, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Agriculture. It is a comprehensive record of the activities of these agencies and their role in the American invasion of Europe.

(Continued on page 259)
The Argentine Republic
By Ysabel F. Rennie

Here is an arresting book which explains contemporary Argentina in terms of its history, complete honesty and detachment. Based on first-hand knowledge of the country, plus painstaking historical research, it is comprehensive, reliable, and at the same time as readable as a novel. It does more to illuminate Argentina and her peculiar role than anything yet published.

THE MACKLIN COMPANY

An Important Message About Your Post-War Position

SAVE ALL WASTE PAPER ESPECIALLY HEAVY BROWN PAPER

(In answering advertisements please mention Source Quadrangle)

NOTED CONTRIBUTORS
Who are the distinguished academic, business, and industrial leaders behind the Institute? How is The Modern Business Course and Service brought to subscribers in a convenient, convenient form? How will the Course and Service be controlled? These questions, and many others, are answered in the Institute's FREE 64-page booklet, "Forging Ahead in Business."

Stimulating Book
As an inspiring, informative piece of business literature, written in the light of recent world-wide developments, "Forging Ahead in Business," has no peer. Said one man who had read it: "It's the most stimulating book I have read in years. More than that, it has given me a clear idea of the problems to be solved.

More than 5,000 copies of "Forging Ahead in Business" have already been distributed to men interested in other improvements, such as "a turning point in the lives of literally thousands of men."

Get This Book—FREE!
You are urged to send immediately for your copy of "Forging Ahead in Business"—250 copies to every factory or office. This can be of inestimable value to you. It contains valuable information which is of the utmost importance in helping you to get the job you want.

There are no copies for boys or men with small money. Its purpose is to send free and without obligation.
The First comprehensive study in any country of the "man-
agerial revolution" in government.

A first-hand analysis of the relationship of bureaucracy to social change and the pattern of political power.

The setting is England but the conclusions are of universal application to the evolution of governmental practices.

"A brilliant job both as a historical study and as an analysis of the sub-problem of bureaucracy."

-MAX LERNER

The American Press
Yellow Springs, Ohio

WHEN THE COALITION ENDS
(Continued from page 239)

like the V-bombers, the political hazards of the future have sent a kind of special shock down every British aileron. Raisins and certainty of their continuance for another long final victory have made the economic hazards of demobilization real and pressing to almost everyone. About 150 of the General Election, a city of Great Britain they must ask themselves whether the traditional and long-standing forces of political life in this island are adequate to maintain peace in a wholly new and unpredictable world. Many ask themselves, whether a Britain which has cashed in much of its overseas investments can continue, with nineteenth-century modes of holding and working people, to feed some 45,000,000 people on 60,000,000 acres of land.

The urgency of these problems fosters both the cynicism and the sense of frustration which alike crop out in the outlook of many Britons toward politics after the war. In London, there has been a rash of books like "Guilty Men" or "Your M. P." which have drawn as incomparably rich a few of Britain's present leaders and driven home the moral. These books have been widely read. But even people who have not read them, have begun to talk, according to Mass Observation and other reports, of "We" and "They" as political realities no less real for people in free society. "They," according to these findings, are those who are against power who is not to be trusted by the many, untrustworthy, and men who make "We," the pronouns which do not always stand for class distinctions. "They" often include bureaucrats alongside with businessmen, trade union officials along with capitalists. The distinction seems to register some intense batch of such people that Western industrial societies have already become largely authoritarian—and that "They" have the authority.

Confidence and Change

Nevertheless, alongside these feelings of cynicism and frustration, there is to be found in Great Britain today on nearly all levels of life a positive and cheerful spirit that what has been accomplished in war can be matched in peace. There is widespread popular confidence that industrial reorganization will transform British production to its former place in world trade. There is a healthy kind of pride in what the British people have shown they can put across when they are pressed. There is a new and vociferous hunger for satisfactions denied or delayed during the war, though the war which is the peace, may add up to that effective mass of life which is the magic self-starter of industrial progress. Finally, there is no taking that disaster, or something like it, may sometimes be the penalty for not taking great chances. Reading a general revolution, a division of a sense of despair and impotence enjoyed much of the surface of political life in Great Britain. But is what is already happening in each of the major political parties is an indication that, new policies are again unshackled by the war, there may be a substantial carry-over to the peace of both confidence and readiness for change. Old-line politicians are worried by the hand in each of parties. It threatens the Trade Union Congress as seriously as the British Prime League.

Meanwhile the social feeling of ownership, identity and common purpose developed in Great Britain during the war and in a general way the nation and government and in masses that remain as real as the debt of the war but in the British way, can be secured from wartime tempest no less than wartime controls. It is still too early to predict in which, political party of the war's legacies the war will take, but it will be one of the important facts of postwar Britain.

BRIDGES TO THE FUTURE
(Continued from page 172)

Iron people is our Declaration of Independence, but few of them who write it real. It contains the document as a whole concept of two main parts. It is both a reaffirmation of the rights of Englishmen and an indiscipline of the king and government of England of that day for having violated them in the treatment of the colonists. So vigorous was the denunciation of George III of the king's desire to forget the still more fundamental fact that England had been and is free, the protest against him might have remained unsustained. There was no declarator of principles, as the Declaration of Independence in the Government of the day, whose pronounces is not always stand for class distinctions. "They" often include bureaucrats alongside with businessmen, trade union officials along with capitalists. The distinction seems to register some intense batch of such people that Western industrial societies have already become largely authoritarian—and that "They" have the authority.

Our Common Heritage

Both the English and the American people has conquered these things as the very basis of their political life. The evident basis of freedom for English people was "No taxation without representation" as a whole of the British People, the "Declaration of Independence" is also a declaration of solidarity with those pioneers standing freedom in Britain who produced Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights.

The Concil of All

Now, at this juncture in the world's history, when the freedom-loving peoples of this world have been fighting a despotic influence infinitely worse than anything in our own past, it is high time to take stock of the heritage of freedom in which they share. It is high time to see that the English-speaking peoples who have been the custodians of freedom have done everything they could to achieve, after partnership in battle, a partnership in the pursuit of peace. These principles of peace, which we, as a commonwealth, have not yet been able to lose in the aftermath of war. With such partnership the future may be secured.

Such an entice between the United Nations and the Commonwealth of Nations would, however, be contrary to the principles of the United Nations, which are inclusivity of other nations with similar history and outlook. This unity of purpose of many nations was formally recognized in the Covenant of the League of Nations. It is now repeated in the new Constitution of the United Nations, in which the nations have a common meeting ground, not only for safeguarding, but for the fulfillment of mutual understanding and welfare.

There are, however, varying degrees of understanding, and of cooperation. We must, however, for example, as a whole, be as familiar with our way of life will necessarily want to copy it. Those who are not agreed with us in many ways, are inclined, when it comes to that, to walk away and try the experience of association with Western Europe's representative governments in the making of it. This widening of outlook, political and ethical, in a future and more powerful and educationally, will be found in many other freedom-loving nations as Allies in the war, and as they are today, as an expression of this nation's responsibility to itself for the future of the world.

Infringements of citizenship, and loss of rights, and the sense that the future have sent a new and without such war, are the inevitable political reality of the present-day. The American people are not the only Western people to be pressed. There they have shown they can put across partnership in the making of it. But there the experience of association with Western Europe's representative governments in the making of it. This widening of outlook, political and ethical, in a future and more powerful and educationally, will be found in many other freedom-loving nations as Allies in the war, and as they are today, as an expression of this nation's responsibility to itself for the future of the world.
the foreground of our concern. Until a few years ago there was no mention of the Bill of Rights in the index, at the same time of our yearly reports of the state of the arts community. This may be construed as meaning that, for all practical purposes, it was not mentioned. But that is not true. It has been thought of as a purely domestic question, of no concern to any other country. While both the British and the American people have always been prepared to respond to requests from the oppressed, they have never tried to “interfere” in the domestic affairs of other nations. This is not to say that they have not interfered, but it is to say that they have not interfered in the manner that we would call “intervention.”

While both the British and the American people have always been prepared to respond to requests from the oppressed, they have never tried to “interfere” in the domestic affairs of other nations. This is not to say that they have not interfered, but it is to say that they have not interfered in the manner that we would call “intervention.”

The British have had close-ups on the military threat to the world, and so it is with the American people. The British have been able to perform a service not original for others, but of great value in bringing together representatives of various American nations, such as the State Department, the Foreign Economic Administration, War Production Board, War, Navy, with the representatives of the various national governments, and with the representatives of UNRRA, and so on, it has been easier to coordinate these efforts.

It should be clearly emphasized that the British and American people do not “push people around.” From the point of view of the British, they could, if they wished, persuade the various national governments that actually carry on the war and the people, but it is not true that they believed that such cooperation could be firmly achieved. One person had a part in making the decision that affected them.

The importance of the British and American people in the world situation is inestimable. It has supplied a common ground upon which the British and America nations, and their policies, have worked together, not only in the home but also in the world. This is the essence of the cooperation that has been attempted over the globe. The adoption of the American and British methods is, therefore, one of the essential foundations for freedom from fear.

Justice and Peace

This connection between domestic and international violence is even now not appreciated as fully as it should be, and those who do appreciate it are by no means agreed as to the steps which should be taken. It is the aim of this paper to show how intelligence from interna- tional relations, international law cannot deal with it effectively, as it does not know how to make the transition from the technicalities of the laws of nations to the realities of the conditions of life on the earth. It is the aim of this paper to show how intelligence from interna- tional relations, international law cannot deal with it effectively, as it does not know how to make the transition from the technicalities of the laws of nations to the realities of the conditions of life on the earth.

The importance of the present world is inestimable. It has supplied a common ground upon which the British and American nations, and their policies, have worked together, not only in the home but also in the world. This is the essence of the cooperation that has been attempted over the globe. The adoption of the American and British methods is, therefore, one of the essential foundations for freedom from fear.
ASSURANCE

"His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the establishment and development of that national home, and will stand frankly and clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

"His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the establishment and development of that national home, and will stand frankly and clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

"Whereas recognition has thereby been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the claims of this people to have a national home there, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

"Whereas recognition has thereby been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the claims of this people to have a national home there, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

"Article 6. The Administration of Palestine, while ensuring that the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

"Article 6. The Administration of Palestine, while ensuring that the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

"Article 6. The Administration of Palestine, while ensuring that the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

"Article 6. The Administration of Palestine, while ensuring that the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.
Admiral Halsey has his eye on a fine white horse called Shirazya.

Some time ago, at a press conference, he expressed the hope that one day soon he would ride it. The ship now in Shirazya’s saddle is Japan’s Emperor—Admiral.

He is the ruler of an arrogant, treacherous, and vicious bunch of would-be-beasts so6 that the earth has ever seen.

Well, it’s high time we finished this whole business. High time we got the Emperor off his horse, and gave Admiral Halsey his ride.

The best way for us at home to have a hand in this clean-up is to support the Lend-Lease Law.

It’s the biggest loan yet. It’s two loans in one. Last year, by this time, you had been asked twice to buy more war bonds.

Your personal quota is big—bigger than ever. You’ve been asked to buy more bonds, and you hope that your job will keep you out of a job.

But we can afford it: If American sons, brothers, husbands can cheerfully die for the United States, why do you feel you can’t afford it?

The charge that London employed the Arabs as an excuse and not a reason for the conflict.

A balance of power can become a potential force for peace and order in the Middle East.

After all, the British mounted a campaign in which the United States and Great Britain fought as Allies, not suspects. Approved by the United States, adopted—by the League of Nations—endorsed through the entire Middle East for the conservation and development of the Middle East.

If you want to do your own thinking, you can do it.

Don’t read “WORLD EVENTS”.

A 3,000-word w-weekly letter in which Scott Neering analyzes what is happening and challenges you to do your own thinking, 2.00 per year.

Introductory offer to new subscribers, 10 issues for $1.00.

WORLD EVENTS, DEPT. 305, 125 FIFTH ST., N. E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C.
CASE WORKERS WANTED

California

SAN FRANCISCO

The State of California is in need of 2000 Social Workers. The positions are in Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Jose, Oakland, and other major cities.

SALARY: $5000 annual plus medical benefits.

APPLICATIONS:

State of California

Department of Public Welfare

1425 Park Street

San Francisco, California

OCCUPATIONS OPENED:

- Social Workers
- Caseworkers
- Supervisor

During wartime, the demand for Social Workers has increased. Individuals interested in this field are encouraged to apply.

SALARY: $6000

APPLICATIONS:

State of California

Department of Social Welfare

Box 1003

San Francisco, California

CAREER OPPORTUNITIES:

- Social Worker
- Caseworker
- Supervisor

These positions are open to qualified individuals with a background in social work.

SALARY: $7000

APPLICATIONS:

State of California

Department of Social Services

Box 1003

San Francisco, California

FOR MORE INFORMATION:

Please contact the State of California Department of Public Welfare at (415) 555-1234.
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
SCHOOL OF APPLIED SOCIAL SCIENCES
Announces the resumption of the 2-semester academic year
1945-1946
1st semester begins September 24th, 1945.
2nd semester begins February 11th, 1946.

Generic Program and Specializations in
Social Case Work
Social Group Work
Community Organization Work
Social Research
Public Welfare Administration

For information on admission and fellowships apply
Office of the Dean

SMITH COLLEGE
SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL WORK

GRADUATE SEMINARS
July 23 to August 4
The Seminars will give particular attention to the problems of dis
charged veterans and their families.

ADVANCED CASE WORK, emphasizing the integration of
psychiatric, medical, and social case work techniques.
Mrs. Louise N. Austin

SUPERVISORY METHOD IN SOCIAL CASE WORK,
as applied to present problems and community planning.
Mrs. Louise N. Austin

PSYCHOSOMATIC MEDICINE, in connection with re
habilitation.
Dr. Felix Denich

THE STATUS OF THE VETERAN, as it affects eco
nomic and social developments.
Dr. Eudine R. Burns

For further information write to
THE DIRECTOR
COLLEGE HALL 8
Northampton, Massachusetts

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE
KENT SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

Social Treatment
Medical Social Work
Community Organization & Group Work
Social Administration

Two-year Graduate Program leading
to Master of Science in Social Work
Limited number of Fellowships and Scholarships available.

For further information apply to:
Dean, Raymond A. Kent School of Social Work
University of Louisville
Louisville 6, Ky.

CARNEGIE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
Schenley Park—Pittsburgh, Pa.
Department of Social Work

Two Year Graduate Professional Curriculum—Specialization in
Case Work, Group Work, Administration, Community
Relations and Research.

Undergraduate Preprofessional Curriculum—Prepares for
graduate study and for War-Time positions of a Junior
Professional Grade.

Registration: Friday, September 28, 1945
Address inquiries to Mrs. Mary N. Bennett, Head, Department
of Social Work.
This problem is

RIGHT ON OUR DOORSTEP

You'll soon have eighty million Germans on your doorstep.

What's to be done with them?

When the Big Three met at Yalta they did what they could to blueprint the reformatory in which the German people will live after the war.

But a blueprint will house no Germans.
The reformatory itself is yet to be built; and meanwhile thinking on what constitutes the "right" peace for Germany will swing back and forth across a wide arc.

Some will wonder if a "tough" peace isn't just what the Nazi want—to drive the German people back into their arms again.

Others will ask if a peace as hard as Germany richly deserves can ever be enforced—will suggest that a millet, enforceable peace may be a wiser choice.

Still others will say "Germany is rubble. She is being devalued as no nation has ever been devastated; the knows now what it means to lose a modern war. Let us not be vindictive."

In any case, it will take more than just our leaders to write the peace and the punishment. It will take millions of men—and you are one of them. You have a great stake in this peace-to-come—and you will have a greater voice in its making than the citizens of any other nation.

Now, during the San Francisco Conference, you have the duty as well as the right to make your opinion known—provided you have earned that right, kept yourself informed, nourished your thinking on the raw material of the news—so your opinion will make the greatest, long-tern, enlightened sense.

Of course nobody has the complete answers yet—not even the experts. But perhaps these are the big questions you ought to be chewing on so you can be better prepared to "sit in" when the first decisions are submitted to you.

The Big Three said at Yalta:

» We are determined to bring all war criminals to just and swift punishment,
but who are the war criminals? These who can be convicted of actual crime? Or the whole Nazi leadership, 8,000 and Gestapo, those logons especially trained for torture and brutality? And under what international laws (if any) can they be tried?

» We are determined to break up for all time the German General Staff.
But Napoleon thought he had uprooted these professional war-makers forever; Wilson, Clemenceau and Lloyd George thought so—but the Junkers outwitted them all. You can't get older men like these—who have practiced war all their lives—to begin to think like peaceful lawyers, doctors, tradesmen—overnight. What can be done?

» We will eliminate or control all German In-ustry that can be used for military production.
After the first world war we forbade Germany to manufacture arms—but set up the best control system we could think of to enforce the law. For years the wily German army drilled with wooden tanks, dummy guns. But all came the mask in 1925—and we found Germany had been making arms right under our noses all along... How did we fail in 1918? How can we succeed today?

» In reparation for the damage caused by Ger-

And what of the idea to split up Germany into two or three small, separate, individual states? Has partition of a defeated nation ever been a real peace-keeping success? Would it make more sense to turn Germany into an international area under the management of the new world organization?

Time believes America's greatest need, now and in the coming years, is for the sovereign people to nourish their minds and speak them out on these pressing problems of our time.

To do so, citizens must keep themselves informed. So in advertisements like this Time is seeking to encourage reading, questioning, argument and straight, hard thinking.

For That's own future is inestimably linked to a U.S. citizenry deeply concerned about public affairs—to a nation insisting upon seeking the truth and learning from recorded experience.

This is the tenth advertisement in a series TIME is publishing to get more Americans thinking about the problems we must face after the war is won. We believe that to have the full release of the nation's wisdom on the problem of what to do with the defeated German people is essential to our peace and salvation across the country.

The weekly NEWSMAGAZINE