

one of that fast-disappearing class of persons who love to see people squirm beneath their gaze. Her short, severe scrutiny of the passengers froze them in their seats, except for my would-be chum. He rose and offered her his seat. The loud and insulting retort, that followed such a manly gesture, will not be easily forgotten by those who rode the car that evening.

"Young man," she said, "I don't want your seat. I wouldn't sit in it now. The very idea of your using a seat on a Toronto streetcar when you should be Overseas fighting alongside my two sons! Sit down!

Stunned by such an unexpected barrage, he retook his seat; but it was very evident that his composure was badly shaken. A blush spread quickly over his face, then slowly disappeared. A deep wound had been inflicted; but no face registered approval of her victory. His eyes sought her face and remained riveted in a steady stare that bespoke some determination within him.

"Bay Street next!" shouted the operator.

He arose and touched her arm. "Pardon me Madam; but have your sons had a furlough since going Overseas?"

"No," she replied, "and what do you care about them?"

With a smile on his face he tapped his wooden leg and answered, "Well, tell them, if they have time on their first leave, to take a trip over to Dieppe and have a look around for Joe Day's left leg."

—Francis J. O'Keefe, '46

THE WAR AND AFTER

We have not yet won the war, not by any means. We have a long, hard road ahead, but we are undoubtedly winning and that makes it necessary to face the problems which victory will bring. Hitler and his generals must be very well aware that they can no longer hope to win military victory, but they are still hoping that somehow Germany may win the peace.

What does this mean? Suppose Germany withdrew her troops from all occupied countries and restored these same countries to their former independence. Let us even suppose that Germany got rid of Hitler and his gangster party. Would this mean that Germany has lost the war? Yes. Does it mean that Germany has lost the peace? No. In 1919 all the occupied countries were liberated and Germany rid herself of the Kaiser and established a republic. When this was accomplished the allies thought that they won not only the war but also the peace. They found they were wrong. They thought they had made the world safe for democracy. But on the contrary the world entered upon a period of twenty years during which the ideas of liberty and parliamentary government were overthrown by Nazism and Facism and Communism in one country after another and were threatened in almost every country in the Europe.

People thought that the Great War was fought to end wars. Yet, in twenty years we had on our hands a new and greater war, a war not only in Europe but also in Asia where Japan, encouraged by Germany, challenged the supposed decadent democracies of United States, Canada, New Zealand, Australia and Britain. In other words, though we won the last war, we lost the peace. We lost it mainly for one reason, because we failed to root out German militarism.

Our first task, then, on this occasion is to overthrow it now and forever, to crush it so that it can never rise again. The Prime Minister of Great Britain, Winston Churchill, clearly sees this task and has promised to destroy the Nazi party and Prussian militarism. The German army helped Hitler to power and decided to use his party to revive the military ambitions and power of Germany. Hitler and the army worked hand in hand and met with no opposition from the German people. Germany went forth on its path of aggression and conquest as a united nation. The German people have been bred in the idea of war and conquest for nearly two centuries.

This psychology of the German people, which seems unintelligible to us, is not just a question of the majority being forced to accept the doctrines of the ruling cast. German literature written by men of all walks of life,

philosophers, statesmen, generals, and historians, extols the glories of war and says it is the only means of German world domination. The sad result of this is that the German people believe in this philosophy.

This is what we are up against. Not a party nor an army, but a people whose ideas are poisoned. The idea of individual freedom has never struck root in Germany. In a people who have never learned to want freedom it will need many years to plant its seed and foster its slow growth. During the time it will take to do this it will be necessary to remain on guard if we want to protect our descendants against further German aggression. We must not win the war to lose the peace this time, and unless we destroy Prussian militarism our blood and toil will have been in vain. That is the thought which must steel the allied peace leaders at the end of the fighting. They cannot and must not listen to the plausible offers the Germans are sure to put forward or they will betray the cause of the generations to come.

—George Smith, '46

L. L. L.

The pressing need for such new and death-dealing implements of war as will bring an early death to the social monster, Nazism, has provided Latin-abolishers with a fresh pretext for branding the "lordly tongue of Rome" as an enemy to progress and an obstacle to the successful prosecution of this war. Latin, they seem to think, may at best serve as a harmless form of entertainment for linguists in times of peace and security, but should find no place in the curricula of the schools of a world-at-war.

This article does not intend to attempt to refute the calumnies uttered against the Latin language, nor does it purport to explain or even enumerate all the many benefits to be derived from a study of the literary masterpieces of ancient Rome; it aims at defending Latin against two of the principal charges laid against it; namely, that the