

HAIR FALLING OUT?

This Letter Speaks for Itself

Clifford Street,
Seddon.
Dec. 20th, 1942.

Salmond & Spraggon Ltd.
Dear Sirs,

I have been using Pure Silvikiran for a few months now, and have had amazing results—was nearly bald—the hairdresser said she never saw a person with so much new hair. I am very pleased with my new hair—it has come back as it was in my schooldays. I am still in ill-health so it is only thanks to Pure Silvikiran that I am no bald now, instead of having a thick head of wax hair.

Now what makes it curly and wavy—the reason is I always use Tonic Lotion Silvikiran in the daytime. No need for a hair set when you can get natural waves as well as keeping your scalp clean. And don't my girls like it. I've just got to hide the bottle if I want any left, so will give them a bottle each for Xmas. Not forgetting the shampoo—I have been using all three for six months. I'm using the last bottle of Pure Silvikiran now, will carry on then with Tonic Shampoo and Oil.

Now let me tell you, I am not telling you all this just to please you—it's all true, as my friends can tell you. But you must use it every day, not miss two or three and start again as a friend of mine does, and then wonder why you aren't getting results. The only thing is I cannot get my hair to shine (that is because of gland trouble.) So you will understand Silvikiran has had a battle and come out with flying colours.

Yours faithfully,
Mrs. P. Watson.

FOR HAIR BEGINNING TO FALL—Slight Dandruff—apply Silvikiran Lotion—keeps normal hair both healthy and tidy. Price 3/5 & 6/- per bottle.

FOR SERIOUS FALLING HAIR—Severe Dandruff—apply Pure Silvikiran—the Concentrated Hair Food. Price 8/3 per bottle.

Silvikrin

FOR THE HAIR

Drugs Ltd., Sydney Road, London, N.10.
N.Z.5-3

CAMERAS BOUGHT

Take your Camera off the shelf. Turn it into cash. Kodak pay top prices for all kinds of Photo Equipment. Sell now at today's better valuation.

KODAK NEW ZEALAND LTD.

162 Queen Street, Auckland; 292 Lambton Quay, Wellington; 681 Colombo Street, Christchurch; 162 Princes Street, Dunedin.



Lest We Misunderstand (II)

HOW U.S. DEMOCRACY WORKS

(By HERBERT AGAR, in the London "Observer")

LAST week we printed an article written to remove some of the big mistakes Americans make about Englishmen and Englishmen make about Americans. This week, we round that article off with a warning by a well-known American editor against a special mistake most non-Americans make when they read pronouncements by American statesmen.

HOW is American foreign policy created? To what extent can a President make promises which will be considered binding in the future? Can the speeches of the Vice-President or of the Cabinet members be taken as commitments on the part of the Government? These questions are often asked in England to-day; it is important that they should be answered accurately.

The answers in many cases are disappointing to the British public. Yet the answers should be stressed, since nothing but harm can come from building false hopes. As D. W. Brogan recently said, "Truth may divide us: polite fiction certainly will."

The truth is that American foreign policy is immediately subject to the fluctuations of the popular will. No Government can bind that will, or make certain that it remains unchanged. No Government can make commitments which are necessarily binding.

Leading Public Opinion

When a British Cabinet Minister makes a statement, he is committing his Government to a policy. When an American Cabinet Minister makes a statement, he is merely trying to lead the country in a direction which he thinks wise. He has no responsibility to the legislature, and the legislature assumes no responsibility for what he says.

If the British public would learn to regard the speeches of even "the most important public officials" as attempts to lead public opinion rather than as definitions of future policy, misunderstandings would be avoided.

The people, of course, can be misled as well as led. They can be confused by adroit politicians, and their will can be misinterpreted. Great decisions can be taken which do not necessarily represent the desire of the people. But in the long run, on such basic issues as world-participation or world-flight, the people will decide. And their decision is subject to change every few years. Only when the people have shown themselves overwhelmingly in favour of a policy for a considerable period of time, and have

learned to identify the national well-being with that policy, can the outside world assume that the issue is settled and plan accordingly. The Monroe Doctrine is a case in point.

During a recent debate, Senator Taft said that the Atlantic Charter and the agreement among the United Nations not to make a separate peace were statements of Presidential policy, and should not be regarded by the world as permanently binding. And Senator Vandenberg added that it was "terribly important that the world should understand this, so as not to mistake the nature of the agreement."

The Senators were not saying that the Atlantic Charter will be disregarded, or that a separate peace is conceivable; but they were reminding the world that the international commitments made by the President alone are subject to reconsideration by the Congress at a later date. "I do not believe," said Senator Taft, "that Congress is bound to make any treaty carrying out the policies of the Charter."

In other words, if we assume a post-war reaction into isolationism, there is nothing to prevent such a reaction from finding expression in national policy at an early date. Nothing that Mr. Roosevelt or the members of his Government can say or do to-day can bind the people if later they turn against the policy of world-collaboration.

A "Terribly Important" Fact

Mr. Vandenberg is accurate in saying it is "terribly important that the world should understand this." It is also important that the world should not, as a result of understanding this, lapse into discouragement and conclude that it is impossible to count on the Americans for help, or for stability of policy. That does not follow. What does follow is that it is necessary to win over the majority of the leaders and the voters in both the major parties before a basic national policy can be regarded as fixed.

It may well be that by 1944 both parties will accept a large measure of world-responsibility. The Democratic Party, although there are many dissidents within its ranks, has accepted the President's views on foreign affairs. The Republican Party, with an equal or larger number of dissidents, may well accept the views of Mr. Willkie and Governor Stassen. If this happens, it will be a sign that a considerable majority of the people has decided that the United States can best serve its interests and discharge its responsibilities by joining with the other free people to promote an international order which can maintain the peace of the world.

Position of President

If the Republican Party rejects the Willkie-Stassen leadership, it will be because a large part of the people are still undecided on this most vital of issues. In that case, there will be no recourse except to the people themselves.

What is the relation between the President and the Senate in the field of foreign policy? It is difficult to describe because it is dependent to a great extent on the shifting prestige of the President. As Woodrow Wilson said, the office of the President "is anything he has the sagacity and force to make it." During any President's term of office his sagacity is likely to vary, and his force is certain to vary. The powers and privileges of his office are therefore inconstant.

The Constitution of the United States provides for a division of powers between a legislature which makes laws and an executive which enforces them. But the President is given power to make recommendations to Congress. Strong Presidents have always used that power to create the main lines of national policy.

The President is the only elected officer who represents the nation as a whole, rather than a sub-division of the nation. So long as a President's policy is strongly supported by public opinion, he is able to get his way (or most of his way), with Congress; but if his hold on the public weakens, his power to make policy and to secure Congressional support for his policy weakens to the same extent. This is especially true of policy which must be embodied in a treaty, since "two-thirds of the Senators present" must give their consent to a treaty.

It Depends on the Man

Woodrow Wilson's ambiguous statement is as close a definition of the President's powers as can be made. If the President loses his hold over public opinion, there is little limit to the extent to which Congress can thwart his policies; if the President maintains that hold, there is little limit to the extent to which he can enforce his policies. It follows that in foreign affairs there can be stability only when a majority of the people have believed over a considerable period of time that a policy is clearly in the national interest.

Those who are eager to see the United States firmly and irrevocably committed to a world-minded plan, must hope that the harsh experiences of modern history, and the repeated disasters which have afflicted our world, will persuade the American public that international co-operation is the path of safety and of honour. The United States is as likely to accept large responsibilities out of a desire to act magnanimously as out of a desire to save itself from danger. The national leaders can do much in their speeches to enforce this lesson. But unless the lesson is accepted, no speeches and no statements of intention should be accepted as permanently binding. Senators Taft and Vandenberg are doing a service in reminding the world of this fact.