

If when the time comes to work out the details we fail to recapture the bold and expansive spirit which lay behind ^{these} the General Declarations, then we can look forward to economic and political frictions of a dangerous sort among the lead-trading countries. The problems are great and will require great solutions -- not of a temporizing, defensive sort but radical in their conception and expansive in their results. This will place a heavy strain on the understanding and the imagination of all the countries concerned. It is never easy for people to comprehend that their own selfish long-run interests may require them to take action which in the first instance looks generous to foreigners. But the dismal economic history of the decade before the war reflected the results of a short-sighted, uncooperative approach, while the magnificent achievements of the war itself reflect in large degree the cooperative efforts of the United Nations. As between these two possible approaches to our post-war problems I feel there can be but one choice.

From every point of view, it would be tragic if we passed from military warfare against the Axis to economic dissension among the United Nations. The avoidance of anything approaching this should, I suggest, be a first objective of economic policy in our three countries.

For that purpose, give and take, very literally, buy as well as sell, is necessary all round.

From what I have said - and there is much else along the same line that I could have said - you will have gathered that I am not one of those who view the future with any exaggerated optimism; or that I get much comfort out of that kind of advertising which shows a gaunt, deep-eyed, sunken-checked soldier looking out of a devastated landscape into a sunrise in which there seem to be floating pretty wives, lovely children, handsome homes, ice-cream cones, helicopters and nylon stockings. Let's not be dazzled by that kind of vision to the point of ignoring, and thereby falling into, the pitfalls and booby traps that are right ahead.

I do believe, however, that, once again, we are being given the chance to work together for something better than we have ever known. The horror and destruction of war, and the hard thinking they provoke, always gives us that chance. It is now strictly up to us.

By us I am thinking more particularly of the Anglo-Saxon peoples. I, for one, do not believe that Anglo-Saxons are the sole repositories of political virtue and international intelligence. I do not believe in any exclusive Anglo-Saxon form of international co-operation, which by being exclusive, would merely widen the circle of conflict without removing its possibility. But I do think that the Anglo-Saxon peoples can and should take the lead and point the way. If they can't get along together, there isn't really much chance for all peoples getting along together.

There are, moreover, special aids to Anglo-Saxon co-operation. These are supposed to make it much easier for us to become an example to the rest of the world. There is Magna-Charta and all that; Shakespeare and Walt Whitman; Westminster Abbey and colonial architecture; ~~William Pitt~~ Abraham Lincoln and Oliver Cromwell; Golf and the Davis Cup; Trans-Atlantic broadcasts and Universal Pictures. We always hear about these things. There are, of course, also some obstacles; "fists" as well as "hands" across the sea. The fact that we speak the same language in different ways is irritating, that we use the same language to explain different things is equally so. There is coca-cola vs. beer; baseball vs. cricket; congress vs. parliament; vest vs. waistcoat; lieutenant vs. "leftenant". Ties can chafe as well as bind. Superficial differences can obscure fundamental understandings, but superficial unities can also obscure important, deep-seated differences. So let's think carefully before we talk too glibly about English speaking co-operation.

When we Canadians think about this all important subject - English speaking co-operation - we think also of the part that Canada can play in promoting it.

That part is obscured rather than explained by over-indulgence in the usual after dinner cliches: "daughter I am in my mother's house"; the "hundred and twenty-five years' of peace" between Canada and the U. S.; the 3000 miles of undefended frontier; and above all, the glorified role of Canada as the tie that holds the Washington-London axis together; Canada the interpreter, the bridge, the link, the lynch-pin, or what you will.

Stripping aside all this efflorescent ~~verbiage~~ ^{verbiage}, however, the fact remains that Canada has both the opportunity and the incentive to promote the best relations between London and Washington; and more power to do so now than she ever had before.