

TEXT OF A SPEECH TO BE GIVEN BY MR. PETER HAYMAN, C.M.G.,  
DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF BRITISH INFORMATION SERVICES, NEW YORK,  
AT SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS, ON OCTOBER 15,  
1963, IN THE LECTURE SERIES ON EUROPE'S CONTRIBUTION TO  
AMERICAN CIVILISATION.

It is a great honour to be the first speaker in this intensely interesting series of lectures. I bring you the best wishes of my Ambassador, Sir David Ormsby Gore, who is a member of your honorary committee, and who is most disappointed that his engagements in Washington have prevented him from accepting your kind invitation to make this opening speech himself.

You have asked me, an Englishman - and I am an Englishman and not a Scotsman, an Irishman nor a Welshman - to speak in this, the very heart of New England. But I would like to emphasize at the outset that I speak as a member of just one country in a family of nations that is made up of North America and Western Europe equally, and forms together what we, sometimes, call the Christian West and sometimes the Atlantic Community.

Not all Americans, and not all of us Europeans, are conscious of our close and intimate family relationship.

Professor Dennis Brogan recalls buying a ticket once at Kansas railway station and the friendly ticket clerk saying to him . . . "You're from Europe, aren't you? Don't go back there - it's hell!" By way of contrast, I would refer to an experience of my own last year when, with the Dutch Minister in Washington and a senior State Department official, I lectured about Europe to an intensely interested and intelligent group, a thousand strong, in Fargo, North Dakota. Here were a Dutchman, an Englishman and an American, discussing the problems of Europe and the Atlantic community - family problems - in this rather remote part of your country.

Professor Brogan's experience was before the war. Mine was last year. In that space of time, I believe that there has been a far greater realisation in both America and in Europe of our common heritage.

All of us, Americans and Europeans, are gradually becoming aware of the fundamental unity of the Christian West and the danger and futility of looking inwards instead of outwards, or of seeking to cultivate our own cabbage patch instead of manning the common ramparts and furthering the common cause.

Now let me speak more narrowly about Britain's ties with America. I say "more narrowly", but links between my country and yours are so close and so numerous that it is impossible to do more than touch on some of them within the narrow confines of a half-hour speech.

I would, however, say this. The title of this lecture series is "Europe's contribution to American Civilisation". But, at least as regards your Anglo-Saxon cousins, this "contribution" is a two-way operation. We have been as much influenced by you as you are by us. To say anything else would be to put our relationship into quite the wrong perspective.

First a word about our historical relations. There have, of course, been some crises and some bitterness in these relations since the first English settlers landed by the tidewaters of the James River in 1607 and on the shores of New England in 1620, fought off the Indians, survived ague and famine, and founded the first permanent English plantations in the New World.

Not far from the James River, for instance, is the field of Yorktown and I remember vividly my schoolboy son kicking one of the recording machines thoughtfully provided all over the battlefield, as a cultivated American voice - far better than any guide to a British

/historical monument

historical monument - told of the surrender of the Redcoats to the Patriots in 1782. But even at the moment of our great crisis, the War of 1776, I dare to stand here - a few miles from Bunker Hill - and say that this war was as much a civil war between two ideas of the Anglo-Saxon race, as it was a War of Independence. Some of you may perhaps dissent but I believe that this was as much a conflict between Whigs and Tories in both countries as between Americans and Englishmen - between, for example, Chatham on the one hand and North on the other, or between Samuel Adams and men like Thomas Hutchinson, the famous Boston Tory. You may perhaps remember one particular battle in this war - that of "King's Mountain" on the state line between North and South Carolina, in which only one Englishman took part - Major Ferguson, who had been detached from Cornwallis' army. The contestants were, in fact, Whigs and Patriots on the one hand, and New York Tories and Virginian and Carolina "Loyalists" on the other. I am sorry to say that the Tories were defeated and Major Ferguson was killed.

The institutional differences between my country and yours, as they appear on the surface, are obvious. In the preamble to Jay's Treaty, concluded a few years after the United States gained her independence, there is a notable antithesis in the reference to "His Majesty" on the one hand and "the people of the United States" on the other.

There is the doctrine of the separation of powers with its careful checks and balances against the undue authority of the executive, which was the fundamental principle that the Founding Fathers incorporated in your Constitution. On the other hand, there is the British system of centralised control, in which so much of the Government continues to be carried out in the Queen's name.

Both systems have their roots in our common past. The Founding Fathers were surely the direct descendants of the Englishmen of 1688 who set out in the Glorious Revolution to curb the tyranny of the Stuarts. They saw in George III's rule, an attempt to recreate Stuart tyranny. On the other hand, the British system has its roots in the ancient powers of the Monarchy which had so often been used in the past to protect the people against the tyranny of the barons or later against the undue power of the Whig oligarchy.

But in the middle 1960's, when Government has become so complicated and so closely linked with the ordinary lives of both men and women in both countries, who shall say whether Mr. Macmillan's Government or Mr. Kennedy's Government exercises a more centralised control?

But despite these differences, the Anglo-Saxon democratic tradition has evolved steadily. When Lord Halifax was Ambassador here during the war, he declared that - "Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" was a common aim of both Britain and the United States. The historical relationship is not simply a question of the accident of our common tongue. The Founding Fathers were also the disciples of the English empiricists, and far beyond and behind their tradition and our tradition is the common inheritance of the Common Law of England, the one system of jurisprudence known to the civilised world, consciously built by precedent after precedent on the belief in the moral law of Christianity and of the common heritage of the West. In a world in which the phrase "guided democracy" has emerged to describe anything from President Sukarno's dictatorship in Indonesia to the satellite regimes of Eastern Europe, the United States and Britain with their common heritage represent, I believe, the most sophisticated democratic governments in the world.

How did political developments in both countries affect the other? The surging tide of Jeffersonian democracy in the first years of the 19th century had a counterpart in the Whig doctrines proclaimed by Charles James Fox, which were to lead on to the Great Reform Bill of 1832.

Indeed Jefferson and Fox, although so different in their personal lives, stand out as examples of the finest and most attractive Whig traditions of the 18th century. Again, Tom Paine's harsh dialectic arguments appealed to some Englishmen as well as to Americans, and the Federalist reaction in America had its parallel in the Tory voices of Edmund Burke and Pitt the Younger. Then, in the bursting years of the 19th century, British territorial expansion in the world ran alongside, but rarely counter to, American expansion throughout the North American continent.

On the social side, the common links are exemplified by the transatlantic journeys of practising Utopians like the Owens and the close communion which existed between men like Emerson and Carlyle. In 1853 Garrison, the Abolitionist, visited Wilberforce, the dying emancipator, and whatever sympathies some people in England may have had for the South in your Civil War, Garrison, Sumner and Mrs. Beecher Stowe drew much of their inspiration from the work of Wilberforce and his friends. "Uncle Tom's Cabin" is said to have run to a sale of 150,000 copies in its first year in America and over a million copies in Britain.

I suppose that I cannot leave this part of my talk without making a brief reference to this much used phrase "the special relationship" between our two countries.

Whatever criticisms may have been levelled in the past at so-called "British colonialism" or "Yankee Imperialism", this "special relationship" does not imply any attempt at an Anglo-Saxon hegemony. For the historical reasons, some of which I have tried to describe, it implies a common approach to world problems and, usually, a common attitude towards crises both great and small.

Let me give one example of how all this works in practice. You are perhaps an official in the United States or the British Embassy in Ruritania. The Ruritarians perpetrate some particularly beastly act. One of the first reactions of the British official in his Embassy or the United States official in his Embassy, is to consult together. This is not because they wish to impose some Anglo-Saxon directive on Ruritania but because long experience has proved that, by and large throughout the world, British and American reactions to a given set of international circumstances are much the same. On many occasions, similar telegrams of advice go back to Washington and to London. I think this is the best illustration of how the "special relationship" works in practice.

Now let me say something about common trade and economic ties. When the first British settlers landed at Jamestown the motive of this first permanent English plantation in the New World was trade.

The Virginia Colony of 1607, like the later Mayflower Expedition, was financed by a joint stock company which expected to make a profit on its investments. Trade continued to provide the sinews of colonisation, and as the 17th century advanced, this was expressed in the Navigation Acts designed to bind England and her colonies together in a mutually profitable relationship or mercantile system.

Extensive territorial settlement in the great hinterland of the American continent was a secondary consideration at that time. The thriving coastal communities ensured commercial development. Westward expansion only created conflict with the Indians and later with the French. In 1763 the British Government issued a proclamation (which was ignored) forbidding settlement west of the watersheds of the rivers flowing into the Atlantic. The object was to preserve peace with the Indians and so improve the prospects of trade with them. Trade, not territorial acquisition, was the motive in London and it was the motive of most of the earlier colonists.

Brebner, the economic writer, describes the economic interplay between the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada, in the first half of the 19th century, as follows:-

"During that period, much of what happened in Great Britain was almost as important in the lives of North Americans as what happened at home. The economic triangle of buying and selling, investing and dividend paying, migration and production, into which Great Britain, the United States and Canada, poured their efforts became the mightiest thing of its kind in the earth and seemed destined to remain so. ... The three countries remain locked in an interplay whose vitality could triumph over a generation of economic isolation, depressions and wars."

During the 19th century, Americans bought British goods not merely because they were the cheapest, but also because from Britain alone could they get long-term credit. The cut-throat competition between British manufacturers, particularly in the cotton industry, kept down prices. Indeed, British investment in the United States of America during the 19th century was tremendous. President Jackson estimated that European holdings of State and Corporation stocks in 1839 stood at 200 million dollars, mostly British. The money went into the construction of your railroads, canals, roads and harbours - indeed into the whole vast development of the United States of America.

The gigantic flowering of American business enterprise in the 19th century was partly an Anglo-Saxon inheritance. It had its roots in the doctrine of "laissez faire". But of course it was of inestimable benefit for you to have so many immigrants from other countries in Europe with all their varied skills and knowledge.

Cultural ties between our two countries have been among the most important links. Whatever Bernard Shaw may have said in "The Apple Cart" about the common language separating rather than uniting us, it is obvious that a common language has made for much easier and more effective communication between us both.

British cultural influence has, of course, varied very much in intensity throughout your country. It was always far weakest in the West where, if I may say so, the European most rapidly became American. The English influence upon the South is indisputable, particularly when the 17th century Virginia merchant class gave way to one which modeled itself on the old cavaliers. It has been said well, I think, that the South aspired to "realise the ideal of the English country gentleman".

But it was here in New England that direct admiration for contemporary English culture has been most pronounced. Indeed the cultural contribution to the United States of Americans of British stock is overwhelming.

I have tried to say something within the compass of this brief speech about our common Anglo-Saxon heritage in the historical, political, social, economic and cultural fields. I have emphasized that although our political unity was broken at the end of the 18th century, partly, at least, as the result of the actions of an obstinate King and his obstinate ministers, nevertheless the strands were so entwined that they could not be broken. Indeed as the years have passed, they have drawn us much closer together.

But all this has been said much better by Sir Winston Churchill. You will remember his words in August, 1940 -

"These two great organisations of the English-speaking democracies, the British Empire and the United States, will have to be mixed up together in some of their affairs for mutual and general advantage. For my own part, looking out on the future, I do not view the process with any misgivings. I could not stop it if I wished. No-one can stop it; like the Mississippi - it just keeps rolling along. Let it roll! Let it roll on full flood! Inexorable - irresistible - benignant - to broader lands and better days."

E N D

British Information Services, an agency of the British Government

845 Third Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

This material is filed with the Department of Justice, where the required registration statement of B. I. S. under 56 Stat. 243-258 as an agency of the British Government is available for inspection. Registration does not imply approval of this material by the United States Government.