

AMERICAN NEWSPAPER COMMENTMR. WILLKIE ON PEACE AIMS

The New York Herald Tribune states:- Mr. Willkie made it plain that he is deliberately trying to provoke the widest possible discussion now, not about the details of a peace settlement but about fundamental peace aims and the basic elements of post-war solutions. He entertains a passionate belief that this immense struggle is a peoples and not merely a leaders' war. He believes that the peoples themselves must discuss and discover and define their common purposes in the conflict or else all will 'run the risk of having worked and sacrificed and suffered to win a war for no purpose'. He believes that if the victory of 1918 was in large measure wasted it was because the peoples who won it had too largely failed to forge such a common purpose in the fires of the struggle; and he is concerned that this time that error should not be repeated. So at Toronto on Wednesday he reiterated to his Canadian audience these convictions which he has already set plainly before his own countrymen.

It is discussion which he is trying to provoke and not that kind of nagging criticism which is so easy and so unhelpful among the partners of a great alliance. We must, he holds, guard against using the great moral forces of the war 'for the maintenance of the old international order. We must educate ourselves to accept the economic changes which must take place'. With unity rather than division as the guiding motive, the kind of debate to which Mr. Willkie summons the United Nations can only strengthen our hopes of ultimately conquering a free and tolerable world.

+ + +

THE RUSSIAN COUNTER-ATTACK

The New York Times says:- The Russian counter-attack that began five days ago at Stalingrad has now developed into a great battle that flares into fierce action at points a thousand miles apart. ... When we contrast the present situation with that prevailing at this season of 1941 the result is immensely cheering. ... In the communiques that tell the story of the Russian gains one factor is especially significant. This is the sudden sharp increase in the number of Germans taken prisoner. Yesterday's communique reported 51,000 on a single section of the front. Figures of this kind must inevitably raise the question whether the morale of the German armies in Russia is not beginning to deteriorate.

+ + +

A PEOPLES' WAR

From the Kansas City Times: The popular ovation accorded Wendell Willkie when he spoke on Wednesday night in Toronto was particularly remarkable in contrast to some of the fairly bitter criticism directed at the speaker from various Canadian sources in the last few days. This criticism was the immediate result of Mr. Willkie's comment on an address by Prime Minister Churchill in which the latter declared that he did not intend to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire and that the world might as well know 'we mean to hold our own'. Willkie found in these words an apparent defence of the old imperialistic order and said so in no uncertain language. To Mr. Willkie the Churchill address seemed a negation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

His strictures produced more or less of an explosion in Canada but Mr. Willkie would not be silenced. From the account of his speech in Toronto he does not appear to have made any specific reference to the British Empire. But he did return to his favourite theme - that this war is either a grand coalition of peoples fighting a common war for liberation or it is nothing. And when he ended the 17,500 Canadians in his audience gave him another great round of applause that matched their enthusiastic reception for him when he arrived in the hall. ... spokesmen for imperialistic policies everywhere and not simply in the British Empire would do well to note the response of these Canadians to Mr. Willkie's advocacy of a new and freer order.

+ + +

/continued



#### COLONEL LLEWELLIN'S APPOINTMENT

The Washington Post states:- the appointment of Colonel J.J. Llewellyn, former minister of aircraft production, as British minister to Washington in charge of supply underlines the importance which now attaches to combined planning of production with Britain. Such a consummation was promised more than six months ago with the establishment of combined boards in Washington. But the promises have not been fulfilled.

The announced object when the machinery was first set up was to dovetail the two productive systems so that Britain and America would specialise in the war goods which they were better equipped to produce. As an example it was even said that the time would come when Britain would build the fighters for the United Nations and the United States the bombers. Nothing even approaching such a division of labour however has come to pass and for several reasons. One is that the production plans entailing a long period of tooling up ahead of actual production cannot be scrapped overnight. Another is that it is asking a great deal of human nature to expect one country to develop half a war economy on the assumption that the other half will be developed simultaneously in another country. A case in point is shipbuilding. Ideally we are in the best situation to make all the ships for the United Nations. Our methods thanks to pioneers like Mr. Kaiser are so modern that we can build ships quicker than the British. But we have advantages aside from our more modern methods. Unlike Britain no blackout inhibits work in the shipyards at night while also unlike Britain we have no shortage of labour at least not on the scale obtaining in Britain where manpower is now strained to the limit.

This particular problem is pointed up by the British continued takings of American steel. Steel is going to Britain mainly for the purpose of being turned into ships. Yet the maintenance of this trade means a waste of shipping space. For the steel has to make two trips; one as raw material and another in the vessels which have to come back to America for supplies. This it is understood was the argument against shipping steel to Britain used by an American steel mission which was recently sent to Britain. It is likewise understood that in theory the British agreed. Presumably this is one of the problems with which Colonel Llewellyn will have to wrestle. Can such excellent pooling theory be translated into practice? That probably depends upon the confidence or otherwise of the British in both our strategic and production planning. If our global strategy may be changed according to the tempo of the war then the British would be justifiably nervous that their shipbuilding requirements might be sidetracked. It is a fact for instance that supplies were diverted to the Pacific for the extended Solomon operations. Of course Britain being an island nation and dependent upon shipping to keep her going would be giving a hostage to a very perilous fortune if she dropped shipbuilding altogether without a guarantee of supplies from this side.

This is merely one example of what the pooling of production means. There are other items in which pooling would involve the delegation of production for the United Nations to Britain. Perhaps the fact that the United Nations are now fighting as a coalition and fighting offensively may remove objections to real pooling based upon fears of changing national programmes in the light of national emergencies.

U.S. OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION