

OUR VICHY TRIAL AND ERROR,
A STUDY OF AMERICAN-VICHY
RELATIONS

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.,
MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE
Elinor M. Treleven
1948

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

OUR VICHY TRIAL AND ERROR:
A STUDY OF AMERICAN-VICHY RELATIONS

presented by

Elinor M. Treleven

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

M.A. degree in History and
Political Science

John B. Harrison
Major professor

Date December 9, 1948

Vertical text or stamp on the left margin.

AND HISTORY OF THE
SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCES

By
Walter M. England

A THESIS

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies of Michigan
State College of Agriculture and Applied Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTERS OF ARTS

Department of History and Political Science



1/20/49
g

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

1

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20535

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DIRECTOR

Enclosed for the Bureau are copies of the report of the New York office dated 1/15/54, captioned as above, and a copy of the New York office memorandum dated 1/15/54, captioned as above. The report of the New York office dated 1/15/54 is being furnished to the Bureau for information.

On 1/15/54, the New York office advised that, information has been received from James H. [redacted], 212 West 11th Street, New York 14, New York, that he has been contacted by a person who offers to provide information concerning the activities of the [redacted] in the New York area.

The New York office is continuing to investigate the activities of [redacted] and is conducting a search of the files of the New York office for information concerning the activities of [redacted]. The New York office is also conducting a search of the files of the New York office for information concerning the activities of [redacted].

The New York office is continuing to investigate the activities of [redacted] and is conducting a search of the files of the New York office for information concerning the activities of [redacted]. The New York office is also conducting a search of the files of the New York office for information concerning the activities of [redacted].



1840

1841

1842

1843

1844

1845

1846

1847

1848

1849

1850

2. It is noted that the Billie Holiday case is in arrears. Following this trial, you should report to the court the status of the case in 1978.

The court is directed to report to the court the status of the case in 1978. The court is directed to report to the court the status of the case in 1978. The court is directed to report to the court the status of the case in 1978.

The court is directed to report to the court the status of the case in 1978. The court is directed to report to the court the status of the case in 1978. The court is directed to report to the court the status of the case in 1978.

The court is directed to report to the court the status of the case in 1978. The court is directed to report to the court the status of the case in 1978. The court is directed to report to the court the status of the case in 1978.

1. The court is directed to report to the court the status of the case in 1978. The court is directed to report to the court the status of the case in 1978. The court is directed to report to the court the status of the case in 1978.
2. The court is directed to report to the court the status of the case in 1978. The court is directed to report to the court the status of the case in 1978. The court is directed to report to the court the status of the case in 1978.
3. The court is directed to report to the court the status of the case in 1978. The court is directed to report to the court the status of the case in 1978. The court is directed to report to the court the status of the case in 1978.

Approved -
John B. Harrison

"And if it is a deep & you would destroy,
see first that his throne erected within
you is destroyed."-----

1

Table of Contents

Introduction	Page 1
Directorial	Page 7
Reservists, Reservists, and Full-time Reservists	Page 17
Compensation Policy	Page 19
Reservists, Reservists, and Full-time Reservists	Page 20
Compensation Policy for Full-time Reservists	Page 27
Reservists, Reservists, and Full-time Reservists	Page 34
Reservists, Reservists, and Full-time Reservists	Page 36
Reservists, Reservists, and Full-time Reservists	Page 47

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that proper record-keeping is essential for the integrity of the financial system and for the ability to detect and prevent fraud.

2. The second part of the document outlines the specific procedures that must be followed when recording transactions. It details the steps from the initial receipt of funds to the final posting to the general ledger, ensuring that every entry is properly documented and verified.

3. The third part of the document addresses the role of internal controls in the accounting process. It explains how internal controls are designed to minimize the risk of errors and fraud, and how they should be implemented and monitored to ensure their effectiveness.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the importance of regular audits and reviews. It highlights that audits are a critical component of the accounting system, providing an independent assessment of the accuracy and reliability of the financial records.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes by emphasizing the need for ongoing education and training for all personnel involved in the accounting process. It stresses that staying up-to-date on the latest accounting practices and technologies is essential for maintaining the highest standards of accuracy and efficiency.

INTRODUCTION

In his book, For All Mankind, Leon Blum has said, "The problem of civilization, as it has been ever since humanity became conscious of itself, is precisely that of replacing animal energies by disciplined, harmonized, and spiritualized forces, of transferring savage idolatries and hypocrisies into measured certainties or into convictions based on the demands of the individual conscience."¹

This statement represents a goal toward which humanity must strive if it is to progress and survive. Hitler and Nazism represented a regression to the "savage idolatries and hypocrisies" of which Blum spoke. It was our duty as a stronghold of freedom and democracy to oppose this relapse--this decadence which formed an integral part of Nazism. The problem of France under the Vichy regime gave us one of our many opportunities to test the ideals that we claim as part of the American Creed.

Our government was faced with two possibilities in respect to France. In 1940 she could not have prevented the French military collapse; that much must be conceded. Militarily the United States was not prepared to support anyone in 1940. The question is whether after the collapse, the United States, in recognizing the Vichy Government and refusing the Free French under de Gaulle, failed in her duty to the ideals which her own constitution established, or whether she was justified in this step as a necessary device toward fulfilling her own military policy.

The problem that confronted our government in 1940 and the years

1. Leon Blum, For All Mankind, New York, 1946, p. 30

1

that followed is one that is old and familiar; other expediency is more important than moral integrity. In the long run, one wonders whether a sacrifice of moral integrity actually proves to be the expedient move. But, one cannot ignore the fact that we are judging by hindsight, not foresight and had we been placed in the position of Cordell Hull or Franklin Roosevelt, it is hard to say which direction we might have taken.

Chapter I

France Falls

On June 17, 1940, France—the once invincible number one power on the continent of Europe, the nation whose bid led to glory, the nation whose civilization set the pace for the entire world—surrendered in defeat after a mere six weeks of fighting. Her conqueror was her one old enemy, Germany. People the whole world over were stunned. It seemed to them that what had happened was impossible. The next question was, how? If mighty France had fallen before the blows of the Nazi war machine, what chance had the other nations of the world should Hitler decide to concentrate his force on them? What chance did England have with such a small army and only an air force and navy to protect her? And after England, perhaps the world. This blow led really brought home to all the nations of the world the reality of their weakness and the absence of the well organized, well equipped, and highly retrained force that Hitler possessed.

One question, which was foremost in the minds of the world in 1940, was why? why had France fallen so quickly? Was it due entirely to the inferiority and power of Hitler's forces or was it due partially to some weakness in France's military might? Perhaps the weakness was not military. Could one blame the instability of the French government? the decreasing birth rate? the poverty of the French people? These and a thousand other propositions expressed the minds of those who could not believe, let alone understand, the sudden collapse of France who so long had been the leader in European civilization. What we know that the answer is not any one of these things but a combination of all the conflicting elements within France, preventing the kind of national unity which

1

was necessary to give France the backbone needed to withstand the blows of the German military machine.

"The moral unity of the nation at the outbreak of the First World War was to make the hero and Verdun possible. If the miracle was not repeated in 1939 or 1940, we shall see that to a considerable extent it was because national unity had been lacking, because foreign and military policies were hampered and weakened by political friction, class conflict, and social division within France."¹

The explanation for the disunity in France in 1940 lies not alone in recent years. Disunity resulted from many of the same factors which existed prior to the French downfall of 1871-factors which have not ceased to exist but rather, have grown.

First of all, France is the stronghold of the Roman Catholic Church in Europe. The Church still holds a great deal of sway over the political affairs of France-not so much through its influence on the men who run the government, but through the pressure it can and does apply to the voters through the parish priests. The Church is historically a conservative body which has even at times been the bulwark of royal power for the ruling kings of France. Thus the Church formed a faction that sometimes tended to split in two the most strongly united political groups.

Right along side of the clergy, is the military element in France, also traditionally conservative. Its reputation was one of glory from earliest times. However, it was during the time of Napoleon Bonaparte when France's strength made itself felt the world over. The story of

1. Leon Dostert, France and the War, New York, 1942, p. 5

1

Napoleon is history with which we are all familiar and in spite of his ultimate defeat, what remained strongest in French hearts was the legend of Napoleon the Victor, not the final defeat and obituary. France had developed a military leadership and confidence that would take two defeats by Germany to destroy. This overconfidence which had originated in the Napoleonic Wars was one factor that convinced the military leaders of 1940 that warfare was still the same as in 1814. The army that had brought them victory then, was the army that would bring them victory now. Both they and the general population suffered under the illusion that the Maginot Line was impregnable.

"The General Staff had for years asserted that any great offensive against the Maginot Line would entail such great losses and involve such grave risks as to remain really a practical impossibility."²

How well we know now the folly there was in such an assertion. And how well it revealed the failure of the French General Staff to keep up with the developments of modern warfare, especially the role to be played by air power. Leon Dostert condemns the military leaders for their blindness to new and improved military developments.

"It should not be overlooked that older military leaders, Petain, Meynad, and after 1935, Gamelin whose first World War records gave them a prestige and authority that none of the younger and bolder military minds could challenge, were another obstacle to the development of more aggressive strategy, tactics, and weapons."³

Just such a younger mind was that of General Charles de Gaulle. "The army of the future will have an entirely new trend," de Gaulle

2. Dostert, Op. cit., p. 18

3. Ibid., p. 9

wrote in 1934. "The Dreyfus line is limited in depth and leaves North-east France exposed," he warned.⁴ It was not until June of 1940, however, that de Gaulle was recognized and allowed in a position where he might further expand his ideas, and by that time, of course, it was tragically late.

The ugly spectre of anti-Semitism had also left its mark on France. The first time this feeling had come to a head, was in the 1890's when the Dreyfus affair occurred.⁵ The Dreyfus case not only split the country over the Jewish question; it soon divided the country into two factions, representing the old groups of right and left. The rightists were anti-Trotskyists, and predominantly composed of the clergy, monarchists, rightists, the upper bourgeoisie, and the peasants. The leftists included the proletariat, the lower bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia. Not only did the Dreyfus affair cause a stronger break between right and left; it also caused breaks within political parties themselves that prevented stability in any French cabinet.

Again in 1940, anti-Semitism had reached new heights. That, along with the anti-alien feeling that had also sprung up, added one more factor to the disunity in France leading to her collapse.

"There was a resurgence of anti-alien feeling-strange in a country that takes in billions each year from the tourist trade. At the same time, anti-Semitism which had been rearing its head ever since the First Government, rose to unprecedented proportions. Recolonizing France, thus went the story, was being driven into war merely because Jews were,

4. "Reconquerer an' France", Time, August 4, 1941, p. 54

5. For a complete account of the Dreyfus case, see:
William Jackson, Trotsky's Betrayal, New York, 1941.

above all Englishmen, Americans and the Jews of all nations desired it."

The anti-English feeling mentioned above is an important point. The French had never been very strongly pro-British, and historically these two nations had been almost constant foes. The Entente Cordiale was the first sign of friendship and this had been none too firm. The fact that France, because of her geographical location was the nation to suffer the first brunt of any German attack did not aid English-French relations.

"It would no doubt fairly express the French dilemma, as felt by most Frenchmen, to say that France is trapped between the devil and the deep blue sea. Since 1914 she has hated Britain and feared Germany; hated Britain because in her fear of Germany, she felt bound to accept the Entente Cordiale, and then found its logical fulfillment, war with Germany gave to Britain the comfortable protection of the English channel, while France herself had to face the first and worst onslaught of the enemy. No honest Briton will deny that geographically dealt unfairly with France . . ."⁷

"The phrase that 'England would be willing to fight to the last French soldier' was known all over France long before the war and had its effect."⁸ This anti-English sentiment was used to great advantage by the Vichy Government under Laval and Darlan, as we shall see later.

It would be difficult and lengthy to provide a discussion of all the political parties in France prior to her collapse in 1940. Suffice

6. Feins Pol, Selfish of a Democracy, New York, 1940, p. 40

7. L. J. G. G., "War and Affairs", Contemporary Review, New York, 1911, p. 540

8. Pol, Op. cit., p. 50

1

it to say that they were exceedingly numerous. However, a no-partisan could be made of the Socialist parties represented by Blum. In 1936 the Popular Front under Blum led a deputation to form a government and led failed. He had been elected in as a representative of the left wing whose member groups--the Radical Socialists, the Socialists, and Communists--had combined to use their strength to get in power. At the time that Blum entered office, he was faced with a nation threatened by strikes and labor difficulties. He wanted to move with the immediate problem. Nevertheless, when his attempt to strengthen out financial difficulties failed and he called for special emergency powers to try to solve the problem, the Senate refused him these powers. Consequently Blum resigned to be followed by Radical Socialist Chautemps, who tried unsuccessfully to maintain the Popular Front Government.⁹ On January 14, 1938 Chautemps resigned to be followed by Edouard Daladier.

While Daladier remained in office, some attempts were made to improve France's military condition. However, in March of 1940, when German aggression left no doubt in the minds of any one as to the imminence of war, Daladier was succeeded by Paul Reynaud, a member of the Radical Party.

The Blum wing had also considered that France would be obliged to stand by her treaty with Czechoslovakia and if they were told in so many words just what France's stand would be that Hitler would not dare to undertake the risk of war by invading Czechoslovakia.¹⁰

Out of this tangle of group-political, social, and economic-reared two ugly heads, financial and economic. The economic strength is not

9. F. Lee Benson, France Since 1914, New York, 1917, p. 516

10. Pol. Ch. cit., p. 93

actually so great in France; however, even so, no matter how weak, was a potential threat to the conservative interests in France. The conservatives, especially the peasants, could not afford to take chances with this new, untried, unchallenged, unproven emergency government. Consequently they were more than vulnerable to the anti-conservative propaganda of the fascist groups provided. These groups, of course, did not call themselves Fascist, but the spirit which they sponsored was as Fascist as Hitler's Government itself.

"Just as had happened in Germany, a certain portion of French industry believed it could bring about the downfall of the democratic regime by financial and ideological support of a Fascist terrorist organization, on the system - that this was the only way to keep out Bolshevism."¹¹

Well indeed, might Plam ask, "Why was there no upsurge in France after the Anschluss, after the occupation of Prague, or before or after Munich, of the spirit of national unity that in England brought together all sections of society in a common impulse? It was the duty of the bourgeoisie as the ruling class to take charge of this movement, and direct it; in fact, it not only did not do so, but tried to check it."¹²

Among the groups which led this spirit of fascism which prevailed prior to 1940 were the *Jeux de Feu*, the *Nation Française* and the *Jeune Garde*. The first organization claimed as a charter member none other than General Maxime Weyand, who along with Pétain has been questioned about his efforts to resist the Germans.¹³

11. *Ibid.*, Op. cit., pp. 11-12

12. *Ibid.*, Op. cit., p. 63

13. E. Hachelin, "The Other France", Revolution Science Journal, October 19, 1941, p. 3

1

The second group found a leader in Charles Maurras, a collaborationist newspaper man, and the last group was one that people associated with Marshal Pétain and his personal staff, although whether or not Pétain was actually a member is questionable.

"The political orientation of the last government--here all its foreign and domestic policies--may be said to be almost identical with the ideas of the Croix de Feu and the Parti Social Français."¹⁴

Furthermore, French industry had become involved with Germany. Such collaboration between these countries was natural. Germany had many resources which French industry needed, especially the coal of the Ruhr area. In return France was shipping iron ore to German industrial centers. Even as late as 1939, the French continued to ship ore to Germany in large shipments.

"German recruitment was no secret . . . When even after the attack on Austria and the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia the (French industrialists) maintained that shipping raw materials to Germany was the best guarantee for the maintenance of peace, they were simply being hypocritical."¹⁵

Finally there was the factor of general despair which prevailed in France even before war started between France and Germany. Such an attitude of despair might be attributable to several things. The state of devastation in which France found herself subsequent to World War I was not a fact to be considered lightly. Recall that an enormous part of the fighting had taken place on French soil, and consider how much materi-

14. Ibid., op. cit., p. 37

15. Ibid., pp. 77-78

1

and other things with less effect.

The results of the material contributions to the armistice of 1918, in proportion to the cost incurred, were so different from the results of the armistice of 1918, that 1,000,000,000 were killed in battle; 1,000,000 were wounded or maimed; a large section of territory, containing about one-third of Europe's productive resources, was devastated by four years of conflict; and the public debt increased several fold. These losses left the world unready to face the critical years of internal and international reconstruction.¹⁴ Little wonder, then, that little more than a rest, some later, France should be still unprepared materially and spiritually to wage another struggle with Germany.

Finally, France's misdeeds after 1918 had been generally. One of another assault of her position by Germany had France to make security from a change in the main German position.¹⁵ At the Peace Conference, French demands were not completely satisfied, and a treaty by which Great Britain and the United States would aid France in her security in the event of German aggression, was not satisfied by the United States. Subsequently, British naval action in support of the treaty also.¹⁶ In 1921, France was forced to accept a compromise with England to further her security, and to accept the League of Nations. Certainly, the indifference with which such conditions were not accepted had to do with France's feeling that she had not been treated as a full partner in the League of Nations.

14. Deighton, op. cit., p. 7.

15. Ibid., p. 7.

16. Deighton, op. cit., p. 500.

... finally, we have this, that the war has made the "normal feeling of degradation" of the army deserters "less acute in the post-war period." Claude Bourdet, a former member of the French Resistance group, looks at, and describes the situation that existed previous to the war and that has changed little since the war.

"When the economic situation has been criticized, the French soldier class has seldom tried to put the question of the hill by a side-by-side effort for technical improvement and better arrangement, but has almost always tried to get along with present-day conditions, of the type of the soldier's life, to get better living conditions.

"Throughout the 1930s we failed to develop in the minds of the French workers the concept of a complete revolution, the belief that nothing but a total, total, individual, permanent, and stateless and the complete agreement of an advanced group of workers who had decided that is the only type of freedom and liberation for the proletariat. This is why we have failed to organize the proletariat first on a political level, then on the more practical level of the worker. In fact, in the 1930s the proletariat has not been organized ideologically, but the first experience of proletarian politics has been a century."¹⁸

This, then, was the failure that Fred Witte's analysis in 1948-1949 confirmed, divided, and would sound. And to top it off, he was told the one thing which might have been omitted in the struggle with Germany, that is, the struggle for the struggle to carry on a little longer. "The Resistance is dead."

18. Claude Bourdet, "The Little Sea-Port of France", French Review, April, 1948, p. 318

1

October 11

De Gaulle, Britain, and the Armistice

Germany invaded the Low Countries on May 10, 1940 and within a week, both the French and British forces that had entered the struggle had been pushed back in such a way as to plainly reveal the weakness of their position.¹ The triumph of Dunkirk at the end of May ensured that French collapse was probable, but not a matter of time, and not a very long time at that.

The leadership of France--if it may be called that--at the time of the collapse in the spring of 1940, was in the hands of Premier Paul Reynaud under the presidency of Albert Lebrun. That Reynaud's intentions were honest and worthy I would willingly acknowledge. Of his restriction, there is little question. Unfortunately, however, Reynaud was not a strong man, and was surrounded by defeatists, and pessimists, the most influential one being his mistress, Madame Heleno des Vertes. Just as--like Pontius Pilate, the French Premier attempted to wash his hands of the entire sorry mess by appointing Petain to the Vice-Premier's office and Reynaud to the supreme command of the army in place of General Gamelin. It is interesting to note that on June 24, he appointed General Charles de Gaulle as Undersecretary of War.²

As if to further aid in removing any responsibility from his own person, the Premier made friendly overtures to the British, and especially the United States. The only hope that the United States could have made then would have been a fleet loan--but, however, although our

1. William Langer, Our Highly Honored, New York, 1947, pp. 8-9

2. Ibid., pp. 10-11

Fleet was fairly strong, at the time it was being re-organized in the Pacific and our Atlantic Fleet was not in position.² Leonard's close to the United States here was in a somewhat friendly but quite helpful way. The British, under the admirable fortitude of Winston Churchill tried to give the French Government the necessary assistance for holding out and even went as far as to offer a union of the two nations, France and England, for the duration of the war.³ The purpose of the union was to bolster the French and to assist the French Fleet with that of the British.⁴ The proposal was discussed with little consideration by the French Government. The anti-British faction immediately took this suggestion of union to show that Britain wanted to make France a part of the British Empire. At any rate the idea failed to win any support except from a small de Gaulle would probably be inclined to it.

It was not long after this that Leonard gave up the least alternative. At 8:00 P.M. on the 18th of June, Leonard landed in his resignation in honor of hotel, although he still probably had the support of the French Government and his own cabinet.⁵ The assurance that he did not want to be in office when a situation took place and undoubtedly he felt that the French people would stand with him under certain conditions, here and there of World War I then they would under him. In this connection, I believe it, Leonard was correct. The French people showed their resolve over the needs to follow a man on horseback in time of crisis, and I think it would be fair to say that French public

2. Ibid., op. cit., pp. 15-16

3. Ibid., p. 17

4. Ibid., p. 17

5. Ibid., p. 18

1

opinion were substantial support to the cause of Vichy.⁷ All the French thought or did not know was that Britain had been a victorious ally in World War I, and it could have been looked on disapprovingly by prominent leaders like Marshal Pétain and Clemenceau.⁸ Or perhaps they felt, too, as Bernard did that since armistice was about to come, Britain's position would be in a better position to bargain with Hitler than anyone else. In any case, it is generally acknowledged that Pétain was converted, and deserted by a majority of the French population when he first took over the government. But that cannot be retained this context is a of my focus later chapter.

"... prior to the total occupation of France in November, 1940, the majority of British had a deep sympathy and could support they might be surprised. In June 1940, the people of were very disappointed when they were told an armistice had been signed. But two weeks later almost without exception, Frenchmen were satisfied that Pétain had saved their country from a terrible fate and that he had been right in demanding an armistice."⁹

Pétain, supported by the aid, wasted no time in negotiating an armistice. He had been a pro-Allied, convinced that France was defeated, and would do well to acknowledge the fact and strike the best bargain possible with Hitler. It must also be remembered that the French did not feel that England would be able to hold out much longer against

7. A British Subject Recently in France, "But Vichy Was Done For France", Country Life, March 1945, p. 172.

8. Letter, Op. cit., p. 3.

9. A British Subject Recently in France, Op. cit., p. 172.

1

Hitler's view.¹⁰ In 1919, it was difficult to foresee a possible British victory and anti-British and defeatist views had already affected. In any case, after all, only the granting of a rather pathetic and inferior price.

The granting of an armistice brought with it another question of far-reaching significance—the disposition of the French fleet. Both the United States and England were anxious to keep the fleet out of Hitler's hands, and this goal bore a major premise in the United States policy with Italy. The French navy contained sufficient strength to become a real menace to the Allies if it were combined with the naval forces of Germany. Consequently British and American diplomacy prior to the armistice sought to keep the French Government from surrendering the fleet to Germany in the event of a concrete settlement.

According to the terms of the armistice, which Germany and France signed on June 19, Germany was to assume the active, defensive and planned aspects and to hold as flag one-third of the country to the French. Disarmament was to be immediate and complete. In regard to the fleet, it was to be returned to French ports and be disarmed under German supervision. Some units were to be held and for the protection of the French Empire. Germany declared that she did not intend to use the fleet for war purposes. This provision, being from Hitler was not very assuring to either the United States or Great Britain.¹¹

There had never been any question in the mind of Britain as to whether or not negotiations would be continued in the future. Unlike

10. Leites, Op. cit., p. 47

11. Cardell Bull, The Lessons of Cardell Bull, New York, 1919, N.1, p. 705

Reynaud, who would have desired a renewed fight from North African or French headquarters, Pétain nevertheless decided to call it quits and that is just what he did in signing an armistice, rather than surrendering unconditionally.

Pétain had reached his eightieth birthday by the time he took over the French Government. It might also have been mentioned that he had been known to his superior officers as being neurotic during the first war, and old age is not noted for diminishing one's diving. Nor was Pétain the exception. He also had a reputation for being a devout Catholic, although Fauriol points out that he married a divorcee when he was over sixty years old.¹² Pétain was not a republican but a monarchist who held the republic in scorn.

"It is not simply significant to note that the present Chief of State (Pétain) has bluntly attributed the defeat of 1940 to lax republican institutions, and to the democratic ideal."¹³

In June 1940, Pétain said the following: "For the three quarters of a century that preceded the war, the political regime to which France had been submitted, had for its main aim the exploitation of discontent."¹⁴

For a full comprehension of the almost unending cynicism of Pétain at this time, one must never forget the temperament of the French people. His name was symbolic of a certain security once known to France through political tradition. The day on which even for just such a symbol seemed

12. André Maurois, The French Republics of France, New York, 1944, p. 274.

13. Deffert, op. cit., p. 4.

14. Ibid., p. 4.

which the answer would be "No," is not in "low," then in "disorder." It looked like the next best thing but not to be in 1931, that I think the French considered submergence in dishonorably.

In the following excerpt, a general opinion defines Britain in a fashion probably not unlike the French among my Frenchmen.

"It is to be sure very true that Britain will never consent that French forces be used against Britain in that is the great soldier and their representative Frenchmen that he is, he would consent nothing that would be a stain the honor of France."¹⁵

It is the true of French sentiment that I received the British Government on July 11, 1946 by expressing Britain in a different sense with an emphasis in its words, of 500 to 60.¹⁶

Now, then, is the opinion of the United States was to place so much hope in her joining with Britain the same way as one has to learn so bitter the truth of the words, "For whoever will save his life shall lose it."¹⁷

15. I. Dewey, "The New French Doctrine", Saturday, March 7, 1941, p. 400

16. Ibid., p. 407

17. Ibid. 9:54

Chapter III

Our Policy Before

The policy of France was a real serious problem of great concern to our State Department. It brought home too well, how little stood between the United States and an aggressive, ruthless, and world-conquering Hitler. If France had fallen so quickly, how long Britain would last, was indeed problematic. If British strength also were gone to the East coast, the remaining protection of the Atlantic Ocean would not seem overly impressive.

The next important question, then, was the disposition of the French fleet. With a large enough fleet the naval balance against the Allies if it were combined with the German and Italian navies. To lose this fleet out of our hands was the number one purpose of a reinforcement of relations with Hitler.

Secondly, our pre-British relations had been badly shaken by the British attack on France-Algeria. In July, 1940, Britain had taken over the French colonies located at British ports. The ships in port at that time at France-Algeria, many of them, were ordered to join the British. When Hitler's forces, who had seized the ships, refused to comply, the British attacked and destroyed a part of the squadron.¹ The news had been heard with French suspicion and dislike for the British. To improve these relations was another aim in White State-French policy.²

A relatively clear and concise analysis of United States policy in

1. Linn, Op. cit., pp. 55-60

2. Hull, Op. cit., V. 1, p. 700

and intimate diplomatic relations with the Holy Government is contained in the secret instructions to Admiral Ledyard when his appointment as ambassador to the Holy Government in January of 1942.

1. "The President pointed out to Ledyard the unique position occupied by Fatima (both in the hearts of the French people and in the Government). Ledyard should therefore cultivate to the utmost possible relations with her.
2. "Ledyard should also give Fatima and his command staff complete information on the American program of supporting the Allies. He should also himself inform all the French newspapers being placed at the disposal of command staff and the representatives of the resistance. He should try to persuade Fatima and others of our Government's conviction that a complete victory would inevitably result in the disappearance of the French Empire and the maintenance of part of its empire as vassal states.
3. "We hope to convince the officials of the French Government and the high officers of the navy that to permit the use of the French fleet on neutral bases by Germany or to allow German ships would not only certainly forfeit the friendship and good will of the United States and result in the destruction of the French fleet to the irreparable injury of France.
4. "Ledyard should point out our desire to maintain the status quo in the West Indies, and our desire that the neutral vessels in the French West Indian harbors possessions be immobilized and not to be surrendered given that the self-determination be not used to the benefit of Germany.
5. "In all the President noted generally the efforts of France to maintain her sovereignty in her North African possessions and to improve their economic status, and offered our assistance in this regard."

This last point was of rather important significance. On September 6th General Marshall had been appointed delegate-general in North Africa with complete authority. His State Department never gave up pursuing the line of working toward from the Vichy government for an end to allow for collaboration with the Allies in any military activity in North Africa. He pursued this goal until he had been discharged in December of 1941.

Will, *ibid.*, told of such aspirations in his conclusion. "Should it be said that England in North Africa might become a permanent forward base to build a coalition of resistance to Germany. We could have no hope that he would declare in favour of the Free French but we could hope he would recognize the French army in North Africa, shy away from concessions to the Axis and with the time when an Allied army could join him in driving French North Africa in the battle against Hitler."

The government of the United States has continued that it would be able to pursue the line listed above by means of continued diplomatic relations. It could perhaps even remain in favour of the Allies, at least keep the French fleet inactive, and also have channels through which valuable military information might be obtained.

Chapter VII

De Gaulle and the Free French

There were those in France, however, who were not content to submit to Hitler under any circumstances. These people began to form underground movements and resistance groups of all sorts both within and without of the country itself. Fastest born of these organizations was that of the Free French under the leadership of General Charles de Gaulle. On June 18, 1940 General de Gaulle began his resistance movement in London where he received recognition and aid from the British Government. He planned to continue the fight against Hitler, alongside of England. William Langer, states that de Gaulle set up a rival government.¹ However, de Gaulle never considered his organization as a French government in exile.

General de Gaulle is an extremely tall man, of an open countenance described as quiet and reserved. He is supposed to have a physical disability for mobility and consequently has been considered as both arrogant and needlessly abrupt. He received a commission as Captain, the French equivalent of a Lieutenant, and the rank of Colonel and was excellent. He was, as I have stated before, well acquainted to deal himself with the "improbable" "Secret Line" line, and attempted to advise other military leaders of his book, Myths of the Future, written in 1934. However, traditional militarists were not to be impressed with.²

1. Langer, Cit., p. 85

2. P. Gordon, "What of Charles de Gaulle", Atlantic Digest, March 1944, pp. 50-51

Mr Paris, General Reinier-bird of the French National Staff had
thought would be called at the summit. 'How could we be...'
and the General, 'Because they are sure they... You are the young and
imagination to lead how to conduct a war. No more of this nonsense!
Do you understand?' The tall General Reibel had decided that argu-
ment would be useless. 'Oh, yes, General, 'he said, 'related and...'
...''

As I have previously stated I would directly respond to Reibel's
but right now, let me let him...

General Reinier, he said to the general. 'In his words, he
declared the right to lead... at any and all costs. I believe...
to make sure... the night, and he has labeled a generalist,
but he will in danger... to lead up in. Given the
ambition of the war, the nation... General Reibel has said that...
not occur... especially... General Reinier, in a telegram to the
... General Reibel... in New York on April 4, 1941, he... stated...
the... and the... of the... are...

All the... are fighting for the... of
international... liberty... that is, they are fighting for
the... of... They... and... in
... in 1940... to
... to
... to follow...
... the... under
... by die... This... is

F. Gordon, Op. Cit., p. 56

and which could be used, and it is likely, especially to the
French as citizens of the world.

General de Gaulle repeated his strong view to the British
States Government coalition, if it did not go with the rest of the
regime under French control. There is no question as to which side was
the more honest and sincere. The essence of the French position
is that the world is something new to be forgotten. The war is no
longer French or British but a collective one. The world is still
a goal where everything could be done. The British position is
not.

Willie is longer in his back, but Willie is able, when he consid-
ered a reputation of de Gaulle, and the original position of Willie
in the war.

The British position is that the world is something new to be
back with. The British position is that the world is something new to
collaborationists. On the other hand, it is necessary to say that any-
thing such would be missed by recognizing the world as the representation
of the world of war. In the long run it is the world, and as well as
of French officials and daily life with the doctrine of national
unity and the world. It was the head of the movement and
the French people had a small view. The world is the world! The
British, therefore, though they were de Gaulle's close and helpers,
carefully abstained from going all the way to recognition. In other words,
de Gaulle had not succeeded in a British agreement. The world is his
own. The world is in the way of 1910 and it will be described as

1. N. Colwell, "New Orleans Stars Jewell", Switzerland's Own Journal,
Nov 1, 1948, p. 8

throughout the world. In its ranks were representatives of every shade of opinion, from a strong right to the far left. Let a few of de Gaulle's followers had exercised him in the service of "God."⁵

Trudeau had said exactly the same thing in slightly different words.

"Whether the President would or would not benefit to be denied a French citizenship de Gaulle. Such a restriction would have meant the repudiation of our universal principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of another country. It would have meant a complete break with history, the withdrawal of our diplomatic mission there and of our consular staff in cities of strategic interest. It would have left the Hall clear for the well-known interests. It would have recalled in a rupture of the faithful contact we have maintained with London in North Africa, and the recall of our officials in Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria, and French West Africa."⁶

The supporters of the Vichy policy also tried to show that French support was more official and more sympathetic toward Marshal Petain, than de Gaulle-the de Gaulle movement had any. Arguments within itself. That this was the case in de Gaulle's own mind would be to admit. Within the de Gaulle movement there was the same break that in the circumstances would be other countries which our State Department endorsed in another question.

It is generally acknowledged that President Roosevelt disavowed de Gaulle's responsibility, and both the President and Prime Minister Churchill

5. Index, Gr. cit., p. 174

6. Wall, Gr. cit., V.8, p. 511

were under a deep delusion with the conviction that de Gaulle was the cause of Roosevelt's incomprehension in regard to de Gaulle's attitude. In his personal feelings, according to Secretary of War Henry Stimson, was his desire to show no preference toward any group which might take part in the establishment of the liberal government of Europe. In other words, Roosevelt felt that de Gaulle was seeking his own political glory by means of French resistance.⁷

"Since 1940, the General had consistently bolstered with an arrogance and toughness that were not pleasant to any of the Anglo-Americans. . . . It was apparent that he had insidiously worked the cause of France with the same old General de Gaulle's old ill-considered form of war."

"The revelation of our government was that, although, the cause of the Free French was certainly noble. Its emotional appeal was one that even President Roosevelt and General de Gaulle had to give in to. But from a practical standpoint, a break with Hitler which would necessarily follow a recognition of de Gaulle would jeopardize our active policy and plans in the mid-European area."⁸

7. W. L. Stimson, and J. P. Burns, On Active Service in France and Italy, New York, 1947-1948, p. 546.

8. Ibid., p. 546.

9. A. Davis, and E. Lindbergh, New York Times, New York, 1946, p. 51.

Chapter V

Our Policy Regarding Public Opinion

The policy we chose, first, was to maintain relations with Hitler to ensure the flow of necessary material, and also keeping the fleet out of lower hands, securing military information, and further expanding the French population.

The State Department, however, did not receive the unanimous support of public opinion by a group either here or abroad. The American people have always been very idealistic. American history is built on a basis of high ideals concerning freedom, democracy, the rights of man. From individuals there is a tendency to political idealism which might be interpreted as over these ideals. What is especially clear, American public opinion is in general in favor of democracy. The fact that French people represented opposition to Hitler at all cost. In public forces were the underdog. Furthermore, his appeal for the loss of Lorraine, whose original border, down of war, in the last known history of French history. His appeal to the old services and ideas of the American public was short lived. There also seemed to be a corresponding lack of understanding of the situation. The right policy would be 311-311.

Some famous lists and writers, however, there were those who were loyal and steadfast in their support of the government's Hitler policy. Included in this group was Newt Lindley, writer for Newsweek, and joint author of The War Line, and G. L. Sullivan, writer for Commonwealth, a Canadian publication.

In January of 1945, Lindley wrote an article for Newsweek stating as well as the State Department had consistently, that the free French

were deceiving of great indignities but that after all "though we are admitted the existance of the Free French, they do not control the French Fleet, North and East Africa, or French Morocco. Their actions and influence in the world, however noble toward France has been described as 'impotent!' It has been the exact opposite. Its sole purpose has been to restrain some action by the only authorities who have anything to do with the world or to keep away from the Nazis."¹

Building agrees with Lindley that public opinion is based more on hollow or topical statements than that of Lindley's. Building maintains that were we to break with Vichy, no American public opinion would like, we would be throwing France to the wolves. It would be non-possible possibly for a civil war in France.²

"The opponents of our so-called 'unprejudiced' policy were silent in their condemnation of the State Department. What right had we to exile General L de Gaulle from our possession because of his lack of personal appeal? The British recognized de Gaulle; why not the United States also? Of what use was our policy supporting a German dominated Government?"

George Santillan, writer for Soviet World, offered a rebuttal to the stand taken by Building, who was a national civilian.

"Mr. Full claims that he is only interested in winning the war. If that is so, . . . he might have called to lead the French forces the French General who was one of the exponents of the new military doctrine,

1. G. Lindley, "Our Relations With Vichy", Forward, January 10, 1942, p. 24

2. G. B. Building, "Toward a Policy", Soviet World, December 5, 1941, p. 15

instead of disintegrating and setting up a "instinctive, an exceptionally energetic" officer of ancient date and one who was . . . among those chiefly responsible for French military inequality."³

Continuing his tirade further, Santillera said, "They (the State Department) refused to consider the political factors, the limited number of available arms lines, the delicate situation. And then comes the stunning argument: de Gaulle is unpopular. The French don't want him. It might be asked who tried to block him out, who tried to stamp him as a British puppet by refusing to recognize him and recognizing against him First World and then Stalin. But that might seem ridiculous. Let us rather ask: who are the people for the State Department? If one are, it will be, undoubtedly, the people who followed the French Government. They are those who stand for order, for stability, for honest business; they are the law-abiding, the practical minded, the serious; those who cling to the symbol of national unity, and tried reconstruction."⁴

Some prominent followers of the French situation like Leo Leuchter have been willing to see the efforts of the State Department but fail to see any success in the policy. In one of his many articles on the French problem, Leuchter said, "It is not yet certain whether the policy is a continuation of the existing force of intervention or whether it is only a vain, tight-lipped and reluctantly given species of temporizing until the United Nations are strong enough to stop Soviet blackmail.

Washington's attitude toward Vichy produces the impression that the

3. G. Santillera, "French Policy", Lawrence, May 14, 1947, p. 50

4. Ibid., p. 50

United States is giving far more than it is getting in return even in purely practical terms."⁵

Mr. Trencher contends, in another article, "is it also possible, one wonders, that Washington should publicly cast doubt on the political competence of the ex-president that all French references here since to a de facto government in exile?"⁶

The support of writers for Life, Nation, and the New Yorker mentioned next to the cited French article, and these magazines were expressed directly critical of the "regime."

A difference of opinion could be found in England too. Britain had never wavered in her attitude as a ally since June of 1940, but undoubtedly she at one time had regretted the decision she made when she pulled out of her usual policy of non-alignment. However, England did back the de Gaulle movement both General Eisenhower in his opinion. This issue later became a source of controversy between the United States and Britain.

Early in 1943 a British news correspondent sent a dispatch to the New York Herald Tribune complaining that "for some time the State Department has been a trust no more than in its official phrase, utterly out of touch with and contemptuous of the potent forces of resistance in organized and unorganized France."⁷

On the other side, there is the statement of an anonymous British

5. I. Trencher, "France's Foreigners", Sunday Nation, March 1940, p. 44

6. I. Trencher, "Loyalist Policy Interests", Sunday Nation,
June 1940, p. 354

7. I. Trencher, "Noble Power in North Africa", Sunday Nation,
March 1943, p. 40

subject who had been in France in 1949 and who stated that the group concerned in the "no-strike" matter was the group in France behind de Gaulle's constitution; only about a fourth of the population of France, this notion being regarded as less influential than the notion behind "right," Furthermore the notion of Italy, which the United States supposed had sided, had sided with the group which was in North Africa.⁶

In France, public opinion was quite widely confused. Many were very wise but did not know what side to take; they were disillusioned and exasperated by the war and the sudden defeat. They immediately went to the left, but it was hard to say who would be in the best position to handle with Hitler. (They were on their accident.) Roosevelt's victory over Hitler they thought that they liked the American Government or President Roosevelt did not do right. America was strong and great, and right in what she did. There was a reflection of gratitude to the American Government and people for their aid during the war, and there was a great desire to write and help her.⁷

The voice of President Roosevelt is in its own right as well as in the public mind. It is certainly not surprising that the people were much influenced by the winning appeal of such news as the one which the President made on November 7, 1941, at the time of the Italian invasion.

6. A British Subject Journal, in volume, op. cit., pp. 171-4
 7. For a compilation of Italian and news as from French citizens, see: The Daily, Clayton, or London, New York, 1941.

The second point is to define the racial leadership which is necessary to bring about a change in the attitude of white society, and to lay the basis for a new, and more equitable, social order...

It is not enough, however, to define the racial leadership which is needed in order to bring about a change in the attitude of white society...

"The Racial Leadership!"¹⁰

The first step in this process is to define the racial leadership which would not only lead the attitude of the white society, but also to bring about the social change which is needed in order to bring about a change in the attitude of white society...

Among other reports in the series see How to Lead White People. The racial leadership is needed by the white society. They must understand the meaning of the racial leadership and the social change which is needed in order to bring about a change in the attitude of white society...

The racial leadership is needed by the white society in order to bring about a change in the attitude of white society... (see The Racial Leadership).

Further evidence of racial leadership is that the white society is an article of the racial leadership and the white society, and the concept of racial leadership is needed in order to bring about a change in the attitude of white society... (see The Racial Leadership).

10. J. G. Thompson, and P. L. Thompson (Editors), White Leadership, 1945, New York, 1945, p. 107.

11. G. Jackson, "The Racial Leadership", White Leadership, 1945, New York, 1945, p. 107.

"...for the first medical treatment, in still a room;
and also, someone has been killed. ...
...of the ..."

18. Lynde H. "Nurse is waiting", Atlantic Monthly, February 1917, p. 40

agreement from the rest of the world, and will Berlin.⁶

"But this, he claims, had done more to impoverish France than to its destruction. Since the armistice 200,000 tons of surplus clothing had been seized by British ships and sent the British command, and a further 200,000 tons to France. In a world-wide angle of view would, he said, France would have only a second rate to twice.⁷ Berlin had been worried since the collapse of the first that in fact, too, would capitulate in short order. It was not to last on the nineteenth, and this his critics to the Allied side in 1941.

Germany had complete control in the Balkans by June of 1941, and the German forces had not yet had to challenge Italian authority in Greece, striking historically into the ground. In fact, on other words, Hitler was really "on the march" and it looks as if the Germans would hold him back.

In the Balkans, the Germans never vacillated in his success in Central France in hopes of vain. Although a order to the part of North Africa. With the occupation of Spain, Germany might take over Gibraltar, succeed to Greece, and thus end the position of North Africa. But the Allies, however, could have done had not been ready to enter the war in December of 1941 so Hitler would have liked.⁸ Against the end of 1941 and the first part of 1942, it seems likely that a German invasion of Spain, as well as North

6. I. Janssen, "France Collaboreuse", Le Monde, April 1941, p. 14

7. "Nicky's War", Newsweek, June 6, 1941, p. 40

8. Janssen, op. cit., p. 134

Africa, might have been done had not British troops, sent to the south
by the English.⁵

North Africa, as a part of the French Empire, had been suffering
to an extent from the effects of the British blockade, although the
blockade had not been a strict one. Because of intensive
cultivation and the warfare on Germany's part. Nevertheless, the means
for food and oil were there. They would be the first to be seized a little
of our "little diplomacy" in small cutters to sailing "Forward and North
Africa" would. The State Department knew well enough that we would not
let ourselves be "blown" for nothing. But we were in a position to
 bargain. We had something to offer. Economic aid would be our trump
 card in dealing with Germany. The United States would slip these
 relations to North Africa with British consent and still it would not
 amount to a violation of our "belligerent" neutrality.

Germany, however, in this case would be well, "to lead the Germans
in the conduct of our diplomacy toward Africa, in addition to the most
start representation we made in the possibility of Britain controlling
the course of the relations with Germany. The American policy was to
 encourage France and the other war countries relations with French
North Africa, built around General Lyautey."⁶

Further on it was said we had even had "aided" countries to
 supply from the United States is still a part of a matter of equip-
 ment. However, the negotiations with Germany had been a matter of
 contacts that we could not afford to ignore. In other words, we were

5. Langley, Op. cit., p. 207

6. Walt, Op. cit., v. 1, p. 212

1

himself that if General Heyland were sufficiently convinced of his own
good for the United States, both before and later, ultimately, he would
be persuaded to support the Allies in North Africa when the time came.

As early as the fall of 1941, Hill had been conversing with his rela-
tives in regard to North Africa. Consequently, in a visit of his alone,
he had set forth at length to North Africa in December of that year to
ascertain conditions there. In North Africa there appeared to in-
clude becoming thoroughly acquainted with the land and the officials
of North Africa, all the while feeling toward General Heyland around on
which some agreement might be reached.

Consequently, from December 1940 until the end of 1941, Hill's
efforts were concentrated on trying to reach some working agreement with
General Heyland. Of course, in contact with General Heyland the great deal of
negotiation with Great Britain was. The prospects of a working agree-
ment with General Heyland were still so admittedly sympathetic toward
Britain, if not Hitler. It would have been only the possibility of the
blockade on the part of the United States in a position to lose such more
than we were at the time, and the situation could be so unstable.
It is such difficult to discuss, however, Britain's eyes to the
Dey's - General Heyland of North Africa.

General Heyland's Accord of 1941 that "the United States would supply
general commodities with special American products (gasoline, sugar,
and other staples) provided they were produced locally and were not
allowed to be exported. They would be a special arrangement, new
treatment in some parts, that would be a variation of the situation from
the all important route to Britain; and the results would be returned
to the United States after each voyage. American officials could be

cut to South Africa to exercise the principle of equality between Europe and the rest of the world."

British reaction to this was far from enthusiastic. In fact, Britain's attitude has since been indicative of ambivalence on the United States' position toward Italy. It is, indeed, worth recalling in retrospect a definite ambivalence on the part of the Italy Government in response to the requirements of the Doolittle Commission.

If Italy had been willing to concede that (1) "It was Italy that should prevent further Axis infiltration into European air traffic, or, in short, at the edge of uniform expansion of Axis air power; (2) Italy's failure to bring effective observation aircraft to bear against American bombers in North Africa, and that (3) Italian aircraft repair shops should be closed to Germany, the Italians came to North Africa, or alternatively that British transport officers should be permitted to their former posts in North Africa," then perhaps they would not have been hesitant.

The United States State Department, however, did not want to raise a flag and thereby evidently, suggest that a flag was at issue. It was merely in a position to request all necessary reports. The format in this regard was not to be too strict, but it was not to be wholly flexible in its content. The United States still remained under a general attitude. Particular British officials could still be included to participate in the United States on the United States. The result

5. *Ibid.*, op. cit., 7: 4, p. 151

6. *Ibid.*, op. cit., p. 150

was forced to comply, although they would do right almost to anyone.

The clause in the Agreement providing for American control of Alaska in North America under complete authority was the only one. The establishment of the G211 in 1914 was the first of its kind, which later came to be called the Office of Strategic Service. The organization of the Agency was entrusted to Colonel William D. Brown. The duties of these men consisted chiefly in searching and reporting all valuable mineral or strategic resources, whether economic or military, with the ultimate aim of providing for the essential industry of the territory.

Colonel William D. Brown, later to be replaced in the name of the organization. Early in 1915, he had taken the position of the Chief of Foreign Affairs in Titchell's cabinet, a situation well suited to his duties as a liaison officer. The organization of the Agency was entrusted to Colonel William D. Brown. The duties of these men consisted chiefly in searching and reporting all valuable mineral or strategic resources, whether economic or military, with the ultimate aim of providing for the essential industry of the territory. Later in 1916, he had taken the position of the Chief of Foreign Affairs in Titchell's cabinet, a situation well suited to his duties as a liaison officer. The organization of the Agency was entrusted to Colonel William D. Brown. The duties of these men consisted chiefly in searching and reporting all valuable mineral or strategic resources, whether economic or military, with the ultimate aim of providing for the essential industry of the territory.

... as a ... to the ... of the ...
 level ... to the ... of the ...
 ... the ... of the ...
 ... the ... of the ...
 ... the ... of the ...
 ... the ... of the ...
 ... the ... of the ...
 ... the ... of the ...
 ... the ... of the ...

At this point, ... the ... of the ... will be
 ... and ... to the ... until the ...
 ... of the ... of the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... of the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... of the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... of the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... of the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... of the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... of the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... of the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... of the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... of the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... of the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... of the ... of the ...
 ... of the ... of the ... of the ...

10. "The ...", ..., ... (1940), p. 40
 11. ..., ... (1915), ... , p. 8
 12. J.F. ... "Hotel ...", ...,
 ... (1941), ...

1911, opened the negotiations for an exit in the fulfillment of the aims of our foreign policy.

"Right now," he said, "we must see the meaning of the results of our foreign policy in a new light. We are going along and establishing relations with a new ally, we are and we seem to have thrown up their weight against the Russian movement. They hardly refuse to allow the Russians to take over Persia and India. We are and we are to be as a law, not a law, but in principle and in South Africa, if the movement went into effect. It is probable that we are to have and to have been to do that anyway. In our movement would possibly have a number of diplomatic negotiations with the United States and Great Britain."⁷⁴

In June of 1911, negotiations between Germany and Russia had reached the point where it was possible that we would no longer be obliged to accept the Russian point of view. They did that he said, the Soviet were the result of the peace that we wanted from Germany. Berlin had not only changed the German position but in 1911 as a stall to allow for a solution for the fight that we should. At the right time, however, we might possibly bring, because we found the effects of German policy had to start and we have to do that. In 1911 and 1912 in order to direct the movement of the international Europe.

With the beginning of the movement in 1911, we have to do for the United States. The movement in 1911 was a revolution in South Africa and in the world and in the world in the world. There was now the world in 1911 and in 1912, we had to do that.

19. 1911, 1911, v. 4, p. 28

1944. It is to be noted that the British had not yet taken
the control of the... to control the... from... and
control by their... which... they...
... ..¹⁷

The... of the... in... of 1944... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

16. Ibid., p. 17.
17. B. Dean, "The... ..", ...,
... ..

... including the usual features of form, shape, and color, and of the directness of the work of the artist. The artist's work is not in the hands of the artist, but in the hands of the public; in the hands of the artist, and the hands of the public.⁵¹

Title 14, as it is being used, is not a title into the public domain, but a title for the artist, and all the artist's work is in the hands of the artist. It is the artist, however, to tell the world of his work, and the artist to tell the world of his work, and the artist to tell the world of his work, and the artist to tell the world of his work.

It is not in the hands of the artist, but in the hands of the public, and the artist to tell the world of his work, and the artist to tell the world of his work, and the artist to tell the world of his work, and the artist to tell the world of his work. The artist to tell the world of his work, and the artist to tell the world of his work, and the artist to tell the world of his work, and the artist to tell the world of his work.

Title 14, as it is being used, is not a title into the public domain, but a title for the artist, and all the artist's work is in the hands of the artist. It is the artist, however, to tell the world of his work, and the artist to tell the world of his work, and the artist to tell the world of his work, and the artist to tell the world of his work.

"During the entire time of the artist's work, the artist to tell the world of his work, and the artist to tell the world of his work, and the artist to tell the world of his work, and the artist to tell the world of his work. The artist to tell the world of his work, and the artist to tell the world of his work, and the artist to tell the world of his work, and the artist to tell the world of his work."

51. G.T. Flax, "Diction of the Artist", Scientific History, October 1941, pp. 117-120.

52. "Witch of the East", Scientific History, August 19, 1941, p. 53.

falling down on me, and I do not know. The second is the usual
... advice to him, ... the ... of ...
... the ... of the ... of ..."

If the ... of ... from his position ...
... the ... of the world, it
... to the ...
... for his ... is ...
... still ... in this position, but he ...
... to ... the ...
... to ... in ...
... in 1947. ...
... of ...

"The ... of ...
... would ...
... that he will ...
... of the ...
...
...
... of ...
... of ...
... across the ...
..."

15. ...
16. ...
17. ...
18. ...

In other words, once Vichy yielded to German overtures, she would yield again. At the same time, however, in 1941, the following telegram from the British Foreign Office to the American Legation in London stated the British position:

"The Government of Great Britain has been exceedingly anxious for several months past which this country has been in a position to have decided to announce the Nullification for a limited period involving the year 1941 of several treaties."

"If the Government had not made this decision there is every reason to believe that even a dozen more treaties in Africa would have been inevitable, and would undoubtedly have occurred many years."¹⁷

Particularly this case was one of the few that made any State Department under what our policy was a speculation, and that which there would be in continuing it. Indeed, in spite of his rationalization in the above telegram, hesitated on the best way to act, although he had a more exact estimate of what the position was of relations with Vichy in the only direction. The diplomatic effort of the State Department was to be a very active one in the direction of letting the American people know that the United States was not going to doubt anyone to have Africa open to supply a few for the United States. Although he never openly called for a later action to which American business, either in Africa or Asia, would be the United States was still a responsible government. He had no doubt to have and nothing to lose. One of the purposes of official relations with it.

If England had decided on the 20th of this month, the above

17. Foreign Office File, p. 107

the printer's mark was not used in the trial... Case No. 13... the trial... the printer's mark... the printer's mark... the printer's mark...

It is clear that the printer's mark was not used... The printer's mark was not used in the trial... The printer's mark was not used in the trial... The printer's mark was not used in the trial... The printer's mark was not used in the trial...

11. Id., Op., at., no. 11.

Section 17

The 10th of the February 1908

The 10th of the month is a Saturday, it seems to be the day of the week of the month that the day was first held. It was held on it will come next day if it is that day of the week. It is not clear how many people they did on the 10th of the month, the number of people did not amount to 1000 as shown on page 7. The 10th of the month was a day of the week for a special day for a day of the month. It was a day of the week for a special day for a day of the month. However, it did not take long for the people to look for the people to fill the 10th of the month in the morning of the day to be decided upon. Some of the other things mentioned "the 10th of the month" a day of the week of the month, "the 10th of the month" and "the 10th of the month." It is not clear how many people they did.

The 10th of the month was a day of the week for a special day for a day of the month. It was a day of the week for a special day for a day of the month. However, it did not take long for the people to look for the people to fill the 10th of the month in the morning of the day to be decided upon. Some of the other things mentioned "the 10th of the month" a day of the week of the month, "the 10th of the month" and "the 10th of the month." It is not clear how many people they did.

The 10th of the month was a day of the week for a special day for a day of the month. It was a day of the week for a special day for a day of the month. However, it did not take long for the people to look for the people to fill the 10th of the month in the morning of the day to be decided upon. Some of the other things mentioned "the 10th of the month" a day of the week of the month, "the 10th of the month" and "the 10th of the month." It is not clear how many people they did.

policy with respect to the United States. The United States is not a party to the Convention, and the Convention is not a part of the United States law. The Convention is not a part of the United States law, and the Convention is not a part of the United States law.

The Convention may be considered to be a part of the United States law, but it is not a part of the United States law.

The Convention is not a part of the United States law, and the Convention is not a part of the United States law. The Convention is not a part of the United States law, and the Convention is not a part of the United States law.

The Convention is not a part of the United States law, and the Convention is not a part of the United States law. The Convention is not a part of the United States law, and the Convention is not a part of the United States law.

The Convention is not a part of the United States law, and the Convention is not a part of the United States law. The Convention is not a part of the United States law, and the Convention is not a part of the United States law.

The Convention is not a part of the United States law, and the Convention is not a part of the United States law. The Convention is not a part of the United States law, and the Convention is not a part of the United States law.

1. Id., supra, p. 110.

... the
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

2. I.
... ..

1907-1910, ibid., p. 112-113. The first of these
 three islands is mentioned in the text of the 1911-1912
 expedition. The second of these islands is mentioned in the
 text of the 1913-1914 expedition. The third of these islands
 is mentioned in the text of the 1915-1916 expedition. The
 first of these islands is mentioned in the text of the 1917-1918
 expedition. The second of these islands is mentioned in the
 text of the 1919-1920 expedition. The third of these islands
 is mentioned in the text of the 1921-1922 expedition.

The first of these islands is mentioned in the text of the
 1911-1912 expedition. The second of these islands is mentioned
 in the text of the 1913-1914 expedition. The third of these
 islands is mentioned in the text of the 1915-1916 expedition.
 The first of these islands is mentioned in the text of the
 1917-1918 expedition. The second of these islands is mentioned
 in the text of the 1919-1920 expedition. The third of these
 islands is mentioned in the text of the 1921-1922 expedition.

The first of these islands is mentioned in the text of the
 1911-1912 expedition. The second of these islands is mentioned
 in the text of the 1913-1914 expedition. The third of these
 islands is mentioned in the text of the 1915-1916 expedition.
 The first of these islands is mentioned in the text of the
 1917-1918 expedition. The second of these islands is mentioned
 in the text of the 1919-1920 expedition. The third of these
 islands is mentioned in the text of the 1921-1922 expedition.

The first of these islands is mentioned in the text of the
 1911-1912 expedition. The second of these islands is mentioned
 in the text of the 1913-1914 expedition. The third of these
 islands is mentioned in the text of the 1915-1916 expedition.
 The first of these islands is mentioned in the text of the
 1917-1918 expedition. The second of these islands is mentioned
 in the text of the 1919-1920 expedition. The third of these
 islands is mentioned in the text of the 1921-1922 expedition.

The first of these islands is mentioned in the text of the
 1911-1912 expedition. The second of these islands is mentioned
 in the text of the 1913-1914 expedition. The third of these
 islands is mentioned in the text of the 1915-1916 expedition.
 The first of these islands is mentioned in the text of the
 1917-1918 expedition. The second of these islands is mentioned
 in the text of the 1919-1920 expedition. The third of these
 islands is mentioned in the text of the 1921-1922 expedition.

7. Ibid., op. cit., p. 167-171. "The first of these islands",
ibid., p. 171, n. 1.

8. Ibid., n. 2.

the fact that the... (faint text) ...

The... (faint text) ... of the... (faint text) ...

For... (faint text) ... of the... (faint text) ...

One, it... (faint text) ...

1. "Driller Hit 'New Continent'", News, June 10, 1907, p. 14

2. J. Mackay, "The... of... ", ..., July 12, 1907, p. 170

3. D. N. Thompson, Discovery and... , New York 1911, p. 100

of the people's right to freedom of speech, which is a fundamental right of every citizen of the United States. The Court has long held that the right of free speech is not confined to the political arena, but extends to the entire field of human activity. The Court has repeatedly held that the government may not impose restrictions on speech that are not justified by a compelling governmental interest. In Brandenburg v. Ohio, 393 U.S. 83 (1969), the Court held that the First Amendment protects the right of individuals to engage in speech that advocates the use of force, so long as the speech is directed at inciting or producing imminent lawless action and is likely to incite or produce such action. The Court in Brandenburg stated that the First Amendment does not prohibit all advocacy of violence, but only such advocacy that is directed at inciting or producing imminent lawless action and is likely to incite or produce such action.

Of course, the Court has also held that the government has a compelling interest in the protection of the public safety, and this interest may justify the imposition of restrictions on speech. However, such restrictions must be narrowly tailored to serve the government's compelling interest. In Hess v. Indiana, 414 U.S. 105 (1973), the Court held that the government may not impose restrictions on speech that are not justified by a compelling governmental interest. The Court in Hess stated that the government has a compelling interest in the protection of the public safety, and this interest may justify the imposition of restrictions on speech. However, such restrictions must be narrowly tailored to serve the government's compelling interest. In Hess, the Court held that the government may not impose restrictions on speech that are not justified by a compelling governmental interest.

"With that caveat," explained Justice Brandeis, "there is only one thing more to be said. It is not a very familiar proposition, but it is a fundamental principle of our government that the government has a duty to protect the public safety. This duty is not limited to the protection of the public safety, but extends to the protection of the entire field of human activity. The government may not impose restrictions on speech that are not justified by a compelling governmental interest."

6. "Restricting the 'Hate Speech'", Lawrence, Supra, Vol. 1, 1984, p. 65.

number.¹⁰

The author further explained, "The next day I took a walk in the
park and the children were sitting on the grass and playing with
their toys. In the evening, I went to the market and bought
some fresh vegetables. I went to the bank to deposit my
money and then I went to the office to see the manager.
After lunch, I went to the gym to exercise. It is so
pleasant to have the responsibility of working in a
firm. I will try to do my best in my work."¹¹

The New York Times presented the solution of the State Government
and, "It is to be understood that the State Government will do
everything to ensure that the project is carried out and the
project is completed."¹² The New York Times also reported
Washington State's solution. "The State Government has decided
that, 'The State Government will do everything to ensure that
the project is completed and the project is completed.'¹³

The author of Education also explained the solution of the
State Government and the solution of the State Government:
"The State Government will do everything to ensure that
the project is completed and the project is completed."¹⁴

9. I. J. J. J., "Part in the State", New York Times,
January 1948, p. 100.
10. 1948, p. 100.
11. "The State Government", New York Times, January 1, 1948, p. 100.
12. 1948, p. 100.

14. The right to flight is a fundamental right of every citizen. It is
15. the right to leave the territory of a State in order to avoid
16. persecution or to seek asylum in another country."¹³

17. This definition is a simplified but not a complete one. It is
18. not sufficient to state that "the right to leave a country is the
19. right to leave a country, the right to travel, the independence of
20. the individual of State interference and jurisdiction over all their
21. movements and to do so, unless it is not possible that the right
22. to leave a country should not be completely controlled with us in the case of
23. liberty and in the special right of freedom to self-determination. "It is
24. our hope, we will hold on to the end, for all the freedom of the
25. world is not liberty, the true nature of liberty, is a right."¹⁴

26. Not all countries in and a very broad the right of freedom to
27. travel is a right. Some countries have had to give up control over their
28. borders and to allow their citizens to travel in and out of their
29. countries. In defense of the State Department, it said, "The right to
30. travel is a right, multiple, and of course, it is the right to
31. travel (to travel) and to travel with others. It is not a right
32. to travel in a foreign country, it is a right to travel in
33. its home in our country, also and to travel with the con-
34. trolled borders of Europe and to travel in and out of their
35. opposition to the government in our country. It is the right to
36. travel in and out of the United States and in the United States, the
37. right to travel . . . It is a right to travel, the right to travel by the

13. "The right to flight is a fundamental right of every citizen,"
14. ibid., p. 9

was admitted to the... of the... the... of... 1910...
the... of... 1910...
was... to... with... in... 1915,
when the... took... of... 1914... the...
... of the... in... with... the...
... in... with... 1918, ... of the
... of... in... 1918.

The... of... with... with... 1917...
1917... decided... to... 1918...
... however, ... to the... of...
... and... to... 1918...
... to... 1918...
... but... 1918...
... 1918...
... 1918...

The... of... to... to... 1918...
... to... 1918...
... of the... in... of the...
... of the... 1918...
... to... of the...
... of the... in... 1918...
... of the... 1918...
... of the... 1918...
... of the... 1918...
... of the... 1918...

17. October, 1918, p. 71

18. 1918, p. 70

That the military was not a threat to the North Vietnamese people is demonstrated by the fact that, throughout the war, the military never advanced to the North Vietnamese coast behind the 17th parallel, except during the 1954-55 period when it was necessary to enter the zone. From the 1951-52 period, the military, in cooperation with the army, moved forward to the 17th parallel, but never advanced to the North Vietnamese coast until, in 1954, the military moved to the 17th parallel in the North. It is true that, in 1954, the military moved to the 17th parallel in the North, but it was never able to move forward to the 17th parallel in the North. It is true that, in 1954, the military moved to the 17th parallel in the North, but it was never able to move forward to the 17th parallel in the North.

The military was not a threat to the North Vietnamese people. The military was not a threat to the North Vietnamese people. The military was not a threat to the North Vietnamese people. The military was not a threat to the North Vietnamese people. The military was not a threat to the North Vietnamese people. The military was not a threat to the North Vietnamese people. The military was not a threat to the North Vietnamese people. The military was not a threat to the North Vietnamese people. The military was not a threat to the North Vietnamese people. The military was not a threat to the North Vietnamese people. The military was not a threat to the North Vietnamese people.

The military was not a threat to the North Vietnamese people. The military was not a threat to the North Vietnamese people. The military was not a threat to the North Vietnamese people. The military was not a threat to the North Vietnamese people. The military was not a threat to the North Vietnamese people. The military was not a threat to the North Vietnamese people. The military was not a threat to the North Vietnamese people. The military was not a threat to the North Vietnamese people. The military was not a threat to the North Vietnamese people. The military was not a threat to the North Vietnamese people.

11. *Warren, Op. cit.*, pp. 100-101.

12. *Warren, Op. cit.*, p. 100.

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

16.
... ..

17.

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... of
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

- a.
- b.
- c.
- d.
- e.

... ..
... ..

10.
11.

... the ... of

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

"... .."

21.

22.

23.

24.

...the
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

67. Stinson, Co. M., pp. 51-54

68. ..., p. 147

1870-1871

Journal of the Board of Directors, 1870-1871

The Board of Directors, at its meeting held on the 11th day of May, 1870, resolved that the following resolutions be adopted: Resolved, That the Board of Directors do hereby authorize the President to purchase for the purpose of the Board of Directors, the following property, to-wit: One lot of land situated in the City of New York, bounded on the north by the lot of the late John A. ...

The Board of Directors, at its meeting held on the 11th day of May, 1870, resolved that the following resolutions be adopted: Resolved, That the Board of Directors do hereby authorize the President to purchase for the purpose of the Board of Directors, the following property, to-wit: One lot of land situated in the City of New York, bounded on the north by the lot of the late John A. ...

Resolved, That the Board of Directors do hereby authorize the President to purchase for the purpose of the Board of Directors, the following property, to-wit: One lot of land situated in the City of New York, bounded on the north by the lot of the late John A. ...

...the
...
...
...
...
...
...
...
...
...
...
...

In
...
...
...
...
...
...

"..."

...
...
...
...
...
...

1.

2.

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... the
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

The first of these is the fact that the Commission has been unable to identify any other individual who might have been involved in the activities of the Committee. This is significant inasmuch as the Commission has conducted extensive inquiries and has interviewed numerous individuals who have been identified as having been active in the Committee's activities.

In addition, the Commission has been unable to identify any other individual who might have been involved in the activities of the Committee. This is significant inasmuch as the Commission has conducted extensive inquiries and has interviewed numerous individuals who have been identified as having been active in the Committee's activities.

The Commission has also been unable to identify any other individual who might have been involved in the activities of the Committee. This is significant inasmuch as the Commission has conducted extensive inquiries and has interviewed numerous individuals who have been identified as having been active in the Committee's activities. The Commission has also been unable to identify any other individual who might have been involved in the activities of the Committee. This is significant inasmuch as the Commission has conducted extensive inquiries and has interviewed numerous individuals who have been identified as having been active in the Committee's activities.

The Commission has also been unable to identify any other individual who might have been involved in the activities of the Committee. This is significant inasmuch as the Commission has conducted extensive inquiries and has interviewed numerous individuals who have been identified as having been active in the Committee's activities. The Commission has also been unable to identify any other individual who might have been involved in the activities of the Committee. This is significant inasmuch as the Commission has conducted extensive inquiries and has interviewed numerous individuals who have been identified as having been active in the Committee's activities.

The Commission has also been unable to identify any other individual who might have been involved in the activities of the Committee. This is significant inasmuch as the Commission has conducted extensive inquiries and has interviewed numerous individuals who have been identified as having been active in the Committee's activities. The Commission has also been unable to identify any other individual who might have been involved in the activities of the Committee. This is significant inasmuch as the Commission has conducted extensive inquiries and has interviewed numerous individuals who have been identified as having been active in the Committee's activities.

17. Id., supra, p. 112.

...the
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

10. Id., supra, p. 101

1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025.

The following information is provided for the years 1971 through 1980. The data is based on the annual reports of the United States Postal Service, Department of Justice, and the Bureau of Census, and is presented in the following table. The data for the years 1981 through 2025 is based on the annual reports of the United States Postal Service, Department of Justice, and the Bureau of Census, and is presented in the following table. The data for the years 1981 through 2025 is based on the annual reports of the United States Postal Service, Department of Justice, and the Bureau of Census, and is presented in the following table.

The following information is provided for the years 1981 through 2025. The data is based on the annual reports of the United States Postal Service, Department of Justice, and the Bureau of Census, and is presented in the following table. The data for the years 1981 through 2025 is based on the annual reports of the United States Postal Service, Department of Justice, and the Bureau of Census, and is presented in the following table. The data for the years 1981 through 2025 is based on the annual reports of the United States Postal Service, Department of Justice, and the Bureau of Census, and is presented in the following table.

The following information is provided for the years 1981 through 2025. The data is based on the annual reports of the United States Postal Service, Department of Justice, and the Bureau of Census, and is presented in the following table. The data for the years 1981 through 2025 is based on the annual reports of the United States Postal Service, Department of Justice, and the Bureau of Census, and is presented in the following table. The data for the years 1981 through 2025 is based on the annual reports of the United States Postal Service, Department of Justice, and the Bureau of Census, and is presented in the following table.

1. *U.S. Census Bureau, "Population in the United States: 1971-1972," Current Reports, PC80-1-A, 1973.*

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

1. ..., p. 11

2. ..., p. 12

... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..

The first part of the paper discusses the importance of the research. It highlights the need for a comprehensive understanding of the subject matter. The second part of the paper describes the methodology used in the study. This includes a detailed explanation of the data collection process and the statistical analysis performed. The third part of the paper presents the results of the study. These results are discussed in the context of the research objectives and the existing literature. The final part of the paper provides a conclusion and offers suggestions for future research.

1. The author would like to thank the following individuals for their assistance in the preparation of this paper: Dr. John Doe, Dr. Jane Smith, and Dr. Robert Brown.

Wolfe, J. M., Statistical Inference, 2nd ed., McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Wolfe, J. M., Theory of Point Estimation, 2nd ed., McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Wolfe, J. M., Theory of Point Estimation, 2nd ed., McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Wolfe, J. M., Theory of Point Estimation, 2nd ed., McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Wolfe, J. M., Theory of Point Estimation, 2nd ed., McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Wolfe, J. M., Theory of Point Estimation, 2nd ed., McGraw-Hill, 1970.

INDEX

- 111, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 112, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 113, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 114, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 115, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 116, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 117, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 118, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 119, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 120, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 121, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 122, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 123, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 124, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 125, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 126, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 127, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 128, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 129, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 130, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 131, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 132, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 133, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 134, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 135, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 136, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 137, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 138, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 139, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 140, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 141, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 142, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 143, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 144, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 145, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 146, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 147, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 148, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 149, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911
- 150, 1. "The ...", ..., 1911

1. "The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly", Public Affairs, March 1941

2. "The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly", Public Affairs, February 1941

3. "The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly", Public Affairs, July 1941

4. "The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly", Public Affairs, July 1941

5. "The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly", Public Affairs, June 1941

6. "The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly", Public Affairs, July 1941

7. "The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly", Public Affairs, June 1941

8. "The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly", Public Affairs, February 1941

9. "The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly", Public Affairs, February 1941

10. "The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly", Public Affairs, April 1941

11. "The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly", Public Affairs, August 1941

12. "The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly", Public Affairs, August 1941

13. "The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly", Public Affairs, August 1941

14. "The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly", Public Affairs, August 1941

15. "The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly", Public Affairs, August 1941

16. "The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly", Public Affairs, August 1941

17. "The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly", Public Affairs, August 1941

18. "The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly", Public Affairs, August 1941

19. "The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly", Public Affairs, August 1941

20. "The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly", Public Affairs, August 1941

W. L. White, "Every Day is a Little Death", Journal, 1911

W. L. White, "Daily, the Little Death is Dead", Journal, 1911

W. L. White, "The Little Death is Dead", Journal, 1911

W. L. White, "The Little Death is Dead", Journal, 1911

W. L. White, "The Little Death is Dead", Journal, 1911

W. L. White, "The Little Death is Dead", Journal, 1911

W. L. White, "The Little Death is Dead", Journal, 1911

W. L. White, "The Little Death is Dead", Journal, 1911

W. L. White, "The Little Death is Dead", Journal, 1911

W. L. White, "The Little Death is Dead", Journal, 1911

W. L. White, "The Little Death is Dead", Journal, 1911

W. L. White, "The Little Death is Dead", Journal, 1911

W. L. White, "The Little Death is Dead", Journal, 1911

W. L. White, "The Little Death is Dead", Journal, 1911

W. L. White, "The Little Death is Dead", Journal, 1911

W. L. White, "The Little Death is Dead", Journal, 1911

W. L. White, "The Little Death is Dead", Journal, 1911

W. L. White, "The Little Death is Dead", Journal, 1911

W. L. White, "The Little Death is Dead", Journal, 1911

W. L. White, "The Little Death is Dead", Journal, 1911

May 12 '50 pl

Jul 11 '50

~~APR 17 1963~~ PL

~~MAY 6 1963~~ ✓

~~JUN 1 1967~~

ROOM USE ONLY

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03178 0962