

18-12-14-assembly_mixdown-2.mp3 (39m 17s)

<https://jotengine.com/transcriptions/pa2EoL083nyk7GISqLftlw>

6 speakers (Theo Mayer, Candy Martin, Mike Knapp, Sir Hew S., Mike Shuster, Michael Carew)

[0:00:07]

Theo Mayer: Welcome to World War One Centennial News, episode number 101. The award winning World War One Centennial News podcast is brought to you by the US World War One Centennial commission, the Pritzker Military Museum and Library and the Star Foundation. Welcome to the show. This episode is part two of our Aftermath Special, exploring the near-term implications of a world transformed by World War One. Next week, we'll be publishing our 2018 Holiday Music episode, period and related music for you to enjoy his ambience for your holiday. Then to wrap up the year, the two following episodes will reprise your favorite segments and interviews of 2018 and you're invited to participate. If you have a favorite segment, send us a direct message on our Twitter channel @theWW1podcast, and message us about what you'd like us to include. Starting the second week of January we'll be getting back to our more regular programming with a 2019 refresh of World War One Centennial News, a shorter, tighter version of the podcast you've been enjoying, as the war that changed the world becomes a world transformed. This week on episode 101. Candy Martin tells us about the Gold Star Mothers of World War One. Mike Knapp joins us from the American Battle Monuments Commission. Sir Hew Strachan discusses his take on the three top global changes brought about by the war. Mike Shuster presents his powerful post called, THE COST OF A SEAT AT THE PEACE TABLE, and Professor Michael Carew offers a well crafted overview of the key positions, events and effects of the conflict. All this comes together for a wonderful overview and perspective on World War One in the second of our two-part special titled, The Aftermath, this week on World War One Centennial News. I'm Theo Mayer, the Chief Technologist for the commission and your host. Let's jump in. As most of you know the Gold Star Mothers are women who've lost a child in the service to our nation. The name comes from World War One when families with great pride and honor hung service flags in the windows of their homes. Now these service flags featured a bold blue star for each family member serving the nation, and a golden star for each member that had made the ultimate sacrifice. More than a decade after the war ended, a unique and quite incredible event took place. Gold Star Mothers and wives traveled across the Atlantic to visit the battlefields of Europe and the graves of their fallen loved ones. Last year on episode number 50 of the podcast, we were joined by Candy Martin, the past National President of the American Gold Star Mothers who is herself a Gold Star Mother, having lost her son, First Lieutenant Thomas Martin, US Army on October 14th 2007 in Iraq and a woman who herself also proudly served 38 years in the US Army. Candy Martin, welcome back and thanks for joining us again. Candy, first off would you please refresh our audience's recollection about the mission of the American Gold Star Mothers organization?

[0:04:03]

Candy Martin: American Gold Star Mothers has a mission with a heart. It's a mission of service to veterans and their families. And we'd like to say that we continue the service that our fallen sons and daughters never got to finish. So it's really special to me knowing that there's other veterans, other families out there who are maybe a little bit more comfortable, have a little bit more hospitality reach out, because there's Gold Star Mothers out there who truly have a heart and care.

[0:04:33]

Theo Mayer: Candy. Let's talk about the Gold Star pilgrimage of the 1930s. What was it? Who participated? Who organized it?

[0:04:41]

Candy Martin: The Gold Star pilgrimage was a result of a congressional act that was passed in 1929, and it was designed to take the mothers and the un-remarried widows of those who had lost their lives in service in World War One, the Great War, and they took them to the cemeteries over in France. France was primarily the big one, but there was also a national cemetery where we laid ours to rest in England. And they took those young mothers and the young widows, and they took them across in a ship, just visit the grave of their loved ones who had been buried on foreign soil. Originally when it came about in 1929, [inaudible], history shortly after that is when the stock market fell, and we had the Great Depression. But the federal government still was true to their word in making sure that all of those mothers and those widows that wanted to go were able to make the trip. Originally it was thought, "Gosh, what do we do with this?" So what do they do? They turn to the military and I'm really proud to say it was the Quartermaster Corps of the United States Army that took on the mission, because at that time it was the Quartermaster Corps still is today who manages our mortuary affairs within the military. And so it was the Quartermaster Corps who sent officers over to France, and they were the receiving end of receiving all of those shipped loads of mothers and young widows that would travel across the Atlantic Ocean.

[0:06:12]

Theo Mayer: Now, this war was really different from anything else, the nation had experienced. How would you characterize that?

[0:06:19]

Candy Martin: World War One, I think it was such a time of pride that people believed that they were doing something bigger than themselves. They were supporting and defending our country on foreign soil before that war got brought to our own home country. And they believe that that's just how you do things, because you have to defend and you have to be willing to stand up and say, "If not me, who?" And that I think is really critical and important, and so it was. It was a very prideful time in the fact that that's when we started seeing the first blue star service banners that people were hanging in the windows, and the blue star banner was the one that denoted that they had someone that was serving in our military, and of course, the number of blue stars with the number of people generally men who were serving and it was a very proud time in American history where we would see all those displayed. When we go through history, we see where World War Two, we still had the blue star banners. But when we got to the Vietnam War, another war that was on a foreign soil, you didn't see so many of those blue star banners because it was not a very prideful time. Very sad for those families that were not able to display and depict how many people they had serving. But World War One it truly was very proud time for the families.

[0:07:38]

Theo Mayer: That's a great observation. So the last time we spoke, you were working on organizing a trip to retrace the original Gold Star pilgrimage. Did that work?

[0:07:48]

Candy Martin: Sadly, it did not. We knew that we needed to have certain number of pilgrims that were going to make that retracing the steps of the Gold Star pilgrimage and it was a very lofty goal that we had in trying to do this and unfortunately, we didn't get the numbers that our travel agents wanted us to have. And so we had to pull the plug on that sort of thing. However, what it did do is it connected so many of us here in the United States, with those in France, who were going to be receiving us on that and the connections that we made with the Gold Star families here in the United States, learning about how the French today still feel very drawn to United States. And when you think that we have a common goal in remembering and honoring those who paid the ultimate sacrifice, that's truly warm. I was able to connect with several historians when they found out that we were looking at doing this trip and also connect with authors who have written many books that talk about the Gold Star pilgrimage as a result of World War One. And so it was really a great connectivity. So some good things did happen as a result of the ideals, the dreams that we had in trying to do that lofty trip.

[0:09:05]

Theo Mayer: Well, it sounds like you made some really great connections. And you're right, over the past months as we participated in the US battles being commemorated in France, the genuine outpouring of appreciation and welcome by both the Belgians and the French people was really touching.

[0:09:22]

Candy Martin: It always warms my heart to hear those stories. In the past several years, I've gotten firsthand letters that have been written to me from family members where the story has been passed down from family [inaudible] a family member. And in one case that comes to mind there was an aircraft crashed on the family farm, but there was a family member who saw the crash happen. They tried to save the aviator, but it didn't happen. And sadly, this young man was buried over there. And so that story has been handed down from family to family. When we think about 100 years, it was 100 years ago right about this week, that [Grace Sterling Seibel] and her family received the personal effects of her last son, [George 00:10:06 Seibel]. So when I think 100 years ago, I think to that mother who knew that her son was not coming home and how she turned that sorrow and disturbance and that's what we know as American Gold Star Mothers.

[0:10:22]

Theo Mayer: Candy. Thank you very much for joining us. Candy Martin is the immediate past National President of the American Gold Star Mothers and is a Gold Star Mother herself. Learn more about the Gold Star Mothers organization at the link in the podcast notes. Last week, we were joined by Peter Francis and Dr Glyn Pryor of the Commonwealth War Graves Commission. We spoke about the history of the commission and its enduring responsibility to the fallen soldiers of the United Kingdom and it's Commonwealth. Now this week in part two of our Aftermath Special, we want to introduce you to the American Battle Monuments Commission and its role to the US fallen. With us to explore this is Mike Knapp, the Chief of Historical Services from the commission, also known as the ABMC. Mike, thank you for joining us. Welcome to the podcast.

[0:11:16]

Mike Knapp: Thank you for having me.

[0:11:17]

Theo Mayer: Mike, General of the Armies John J. Pershing, the man who led our forces during World War One had a deep personal involvement in the establishment and direction of the ABMC. Could you tell us about that?

[0:11:30]

Mike Knapp: Sure. As I'm sure everybody that follows the podcast knows Pershing leads the American Expeditionary Forces during the war and at the conclusion of the war, he ends up leading an agency whose name is a bit misleading if you look at us nowadays, we're known as the American Battle Monuments Commission. The reason that that's our name and it doesn't have cemetery anywhere in there is there's a little bit of a process. Following the war and almost before the end of the hostilities, certain American units were starting to put up impromptu memorials to their service. And these began to spring up all over Europe. And they ran the gamut in terms of quality, and design some were just stellars built out of rubble from the battlefield with rifles and bandits and helmets stuck in them. In particular, is a somewhat apocryphal story about Pershing who complained that the fifth division which has a lot of memorials in Europe, was that they basically put up a monument everywhere soldier from the fifth division stopped go to the bathroom, and his intent was to not have Europe end up looking like Gettysburg with fields and fields covered with monuments and no real overall design. So in 1921 they create the American Battle Monuments board to review design plans and recommendations for memorials, and in 1923 becomes the American Battle Monuments Commission, and Pershing is named as the first leader of that. He is the first chairman of the ABMC and that's a position that he holds until his death in 1948. So we want to fast forward a little bit out of that into the '30s. There are something like 200 different cemeteries that have been established during the war and they start the process of consolidating these remains into what they call concentration cemeteries, and the decision is made that they're finally will be eight permanent World War One cemeteries. The ground that these cemeteries lie on is given to the US in perpetuity and at that point the ABMC is taking over helping design them with the Commission on Fine Arts and other agencies to make sure that these are respectful and symbolic striking places. The ABMC is also chartered to build a non-denominational chapel at each one of the cemeteries. So as you can imagine General Pershing had very strong opinions on what campaigns would be memorialized, how and where? And then that just carried over into the cemeteries.

[0:13:58]

Theo Mayer: Now you know interview with the UK last week, it struck me that both nations decided to take a very egalitarian approach to their war dead, seeking equal treatment of officers and enlisted men and so forth. Could you speak to that?

[0:14:13]

Mike Knapp: Yeah, I think we've taken pretty much exactly the same approach that they have done. What's interesting for us that I like to point out specifically, burials in our cemeteries where you have any of the African American units, the Pioneer infantry, or any other regiments of the 92nd, 93rd Division, they're not segregated. And at this time in the United States of course, and even in Arlington Cemetery, where there is a big World War One section, the graves are segregated by race, and they didn't do that in our cemeteries overseas. I think it probably became too problematic to say, "Okay, now we're ready to bury this body. But we know this is a guy from the 369, so he needs to go in the black section." So I don't know how much of that was by design, or how much of that was by necessity.

[0:15:00]

Theo Mayer: Interesting. I know that General Pershing's own grave was equal to that of his men.

[0:15:07]

Mike Knapp: Yeah, the only difference is he's in the center of them. But I think at the end of the day, there probably was a great deal of feeling on his part that much like he fought throughout the period of our involvement in the war for the US to be a separate entity in a separate force, I think he probably felt the same way that these are the guys in this campaign, and they should all be here.

[0:15:27]

Theo Mayer: Okay. So, Mike, there was a debate in the UK about the repatriation of bodies. Was this also a discussion in the US?

[0:15:34]

Mike Knapp: Yeah, it actually was. I think if you look at US history, prior to this military history, a lot of our conflicts are close to home. People can get brought back home or the families can go get them as more often the case. And then in instances where we have people that die on foreign shores, they've just been buried there. But World War One, as was already pointed out in this segment, the numbers are staggering. We've never had numbers like this before. It's a staggering chore to imagine bringing that many bodies back to the United States. So what they hit upon

was they actually gave families the option of bringing their loved ones back. So in World War One, they were faced with three options that they were given the choice of, they could leave their loved ones in Europe at one of the permanent cemeteries, they could have them returned to the United States to be buried in a federal cemetery, such as Arlington or one of the cemeteries that existed at some of the different posts around at the time, or they could have them returned and be buried in a private cemetery.

[0:16:37]

Theo Mayer: Now, essentially later, has ABMC's responsibility and role evolved and changed?

[0:16:42]

Mike Knapp: I think the larger way that our role has changed is as you might imagine, up until now, there really wasn't any need to explain to people why we had cemeteries in Europe. But as we get to be 100 and 75 years in the case of World War Two removed from the events, there are a lot of people that have lost sight of this. So the way that our mission has changed a little bit is we now have to educate people and to keep ourselves relevant in the public eye, just so that they know. And that's primarily for the American audience, I would say, although younger generations of some Europeans have the same question, but in general, the Europeans still get it. I mean, to this day, with regard to World War One, there's still a great deal of gratitude for the Americans coming over and helping to win that war. We are no longer dealing with solely grieving families and people that all understand intimately and personally, why the cemeteries are there. Now, what we're doing is we're telling new generations of Americans and Europeans, "This is why the cemetery is here. This is the role that America played, and this is the cost of that role."

[0:17:46]

Theo Mayer: Great interview. Thank you, Mike.

[0:17:47]

Mike Knapp: You're very welcome. Thank you for having me.

[0:17:50]

Theo Mayer: Mike Knapp is the Chief of Historical services at the American Battle Monuments Commission. You can learn more about the commission by going to abmc.gov or by following the links in the podcast notes. Next, we're joined by Sir Hew Strachan, who some of you met in Episode Number 32 when we spoke about the incredible radio docudrama, *Enter the Peace Broker*. Sir Hew is one of the most respected World War One historians anywhere. He's the Professor of International Relations at the University of St. Andrews and Emeritus fellow of All Souls College, University of Oxford. Sir Hew, it's wonderful to have you back on the podcast. Thank you for taking the time.

[0:18:34]

Sir Hew S.: It's a great pleasure too. I'm delighted to be back on.

[0:18:37]

Theo Mayer: We've been calling it the war that changed the world. Now, in your opinion, as one of the great subject matter experts on World War One, what would you pick as the top three changes that were brought about by the conflict?

[0:18:51]

Sir Hew S.: I suppose the first and most obvious thing if you look at it from the perspective of 1918, 1919 is that four of the major empires in the world have collapsed. That the result across Central and Eastern Europe and into Asia and into Central Asia, and down to the Middle East is massive. Here it's essentially a situation where there is a vacuum in terms of governance, in terms of which the successor states will be, all those going on. And possession is nine-tenths of the law. So while the peacemakers are meeting in Paris, these competing entities are fighting each other and the force of arms is deciding a great deal. So that's perhaps a long answer. But I think that's one of the most dramatic changes. The second would be the entry of the United States into the world order, its role in shaping the international order, its positioning of itself as a global par. So that will be my second point. And I think the third is that what emerges out of both those things is that our understanding of how states should be put together itself changes. So there's a consideration of power politics and in some ways Wilson pays no attention to those principles of power politics. He simply says, or he gives vent to the idea of national self determination. And that remains even today. Something we respect as a principle, but of course, has been a tremendous source of conflict in the 20th century world, not just in the short term in the run up to the Second World War, but also still today.

[0:20:23]

Theo Mayer: That's fascinating. So your biggest take on all of this is that the transformation from this was political?

[0:20:31]

Sir Hew S.: Yes, I think I would. I mean, if the implication of your question is, is it economic? Is it social? Well, of course, it's those things as well.

[0:20:38]

Theo Mayer: Sure, technological or social?

[0:20:41]

Sir Hew S.: There is a lot and I think I will put political, economic and social ahead of technological, because although the technologies of war are put on a new footing by the First World War, you can see the antecedents of much of that with industrialization, between 1850 in 1914, and perhaps most basic would be the notion that there are societies with mass popular press, with a very high level of literacy, with a degree of economic security, and with a genuine sense of progress, defined it all sorts of ways, which makes for the war being a surprise in that you'd expect Europe to have more sense than to go to war, and also makes this war so radically different so quickly. It becomes a major war involving whole societies from 1914 itself. And the collapse of the empires at the end of the war is something which all have realized is a possible implication of this war from 1914 itself. Change is there but change now is going to be in a much more radical form and the revolution reform.

[0:21:47]

Theo Mayer: Now there are some who argue that World War Two is simply a continuation of World War One. What are your thoughts on that subject?

[0:21:54]

Sir Hew S.: I've never bought that argument. I don't think I've ever bought it, I certainly don't buy it now. The aspiration that this is a war to end all wars, which is an aspiration expressed by socialists, particularly in France in 1914, and one, of course reflected by Woodrow Wilson after the US entry. That's one genuinely felt across Europe in 1919. But I think if you look at the situation across the world, from the perspective of 1924, let's say, with the Treaty of Lausanne, and with people returning from the war, I think there must then have been a sense of optimism and that whatever has happened in relation to the war and the experience of the war can begin to be put behind societies as they look forward. So I don't think you can jump from 1919 to 1939 or 1941. There's too much in between.

[0:22:45]

Theo Mayer: You've written a lot of books and a lot of articles about World War One and you've done a lot of research and what are some of the key issues about this global catharsis that remain unknown, unknowable and unresolved?

[0:22:58]

Sir Hew S.: There are areas where I think research will still be done, which will leave us much better informed. In the Russian case, Russia's been neglected because at least up until the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russian history began in 1917. And so the first one was always looked at as a precursor to the revolution. And the same point in a slightly different way applies to the Ottoman Empire. But it has remained a story too dominated in some ways, by the fact that the easily accessible source material is in languages other than Turkish. In terms of what remain unknown, one is on hunger in the First World War. But what I think we will always struggle to identify is how much hunger across Europe in the First World War was the direct product of the war effort, and how far hunger was a product of maladministration, of the mobilization of peasant societies, of withdrawal of animals from agriculture for use in the armed forces. In other words, how much is hunger an indirect consequence of the war rather than direct consequence of military action, and this seems to be crucially important, because one of the things that I thought would happen as a result of this [inaudible] but hasn't, is that we haven't the faintest idea what the total number of dead as a result of this war is. Most economic historians will say demographically the impact of the war is pretty short term, and most societies have recovered fairly quickly in the 1920s. But it would still, to my mind, be the great project actually to answer that question. So there's a lot to be done.

[0:24:34]

Theo Mayer: Thank you. Nice chatting with you.

[0:24:35]

Sir Hew S.: Thank you Theo.

[0:24:37]

Theo Mayer: Sir Hew Strachan is Professor of International Relations at the University of St. Andrews, and Emeritus fellow of All Souls College, University of Oxford and an author of many books and papers. Learn more about him and his work at the link in the podcast notes. Mike Shuster, former NPR correspondent and curator for the Great War Project Blog, joins us reading his powerful post called, THE COST OF A SEAT AT THE PEACE TABLE. Mike, your

post this week struck me as both powerful and for me surprising, as it talks about the human cost of the war to America and the political response to our president by our allies. I didn't know the story.

[0:25:19]

Mike Shuster: That's right Theo. And as you noted, the headline reads, "THE COST OF A SEAT AT THE PEACE TABLE." Allies tell Wilson, "Stay home." Colonel House Agrees: Wilson Infuriated especially to the Great War Project. After the armistice is signed, General Pershing arrives in Paris "where he finds himself the toast of a delirious city." So reports historian Thomas Fleming. "In the Place de la Concorde, his car was mobbed. Celebrating doughboys rescued him, fending off the ecstatic Parisians, some of whom tried to get into the back seat to kiss the iron general." "Later celebrating in private," Fleming reports, "Pershing inadvertently summed up the doughboys contribution to the victory: the men were willing to pay the price." Fleming writes, "The Americans had been in combat two hundred days, approximately six months. In that time 50,300 doughboys were killed. Another 198,000 were wounded in action. Another 62,600 died of disease, an appalling 38,800 of these in training camps in the United States. Another 4500 were killed in accidents. "Another thousand committed suicide." All told, total deaths were 120,000. Later, after the war, the U.S. Government— the Veterans Administration — revises its figures, adding in deaths and the wounded and concluded that deaths by war-related disease, wounds and others types of trauma brought the total cost to 460,000. Add to this, men disabled by gas attacks who were particularly prone to die young, Fleming reports, and another 41,000 doughboys listed as shell-shock victims. Many of these, Fleming reports, were hospitalized for life, listed as psychiatrically disabled. According to historian Fleming, these figures added up to a "disproportionately large toll suffered by the American fighting force in the Great War." The primary reason for this: "The lethal firepower of the German army and the primitive tactics of the American fighting force, which relied on unsophisticated frontal assaults until the last days of the war." This certainly should have been sufficient to give the US a seat at the negotiating table. But there is a problem. The Europeans have no desire to give President Wilson a seat at all. According to Fleming, "Soon after people stopped dancing in the streets, sour notes began to appear in the peace process. The president assumed that the Allied leaders would welcome his announcement that he was coming to Europe for a peace conference. Instead they advised Colonel House [Wilson's closest adviser] that they would be much happier if he stayed home. The French prime minister, George Clemenceau, told House that Wilson's presence, "Seems to be neither desirable nor possible." According to Fleming, "Behind this hot political air was a deep suspicion and not a little dislike of Wilson's overbearing political style." Some in Washington agreed with this. Better for Wilson to stay home and let House and others do the hard bargaining that inevitably was to come. What's more, it turns out House shares this view. He tells Wilson in a cable, he would only support the president's coming to Europe for more ceremonial moments in the peace conference. Wilson, needless to say, is infuriated. And that's the news from the Great War Project this week, a century ago.

[0:28:46]

Theo Mayer: Mike Shuster is the curator for the Great War Project Blog. The link to his post is in the podcast notes. We've talked a lot about the impact of the war on men's bodies and minds, on the cities and towns where the fighting took place, but this really was the war that changed the world. It had profound effects on just about everything. Joining us to explore the effects of our pre-war to post-war world position and foreign policy is Michael Carew, Professor of Economics and Finance at Baruch College and author of the book, *The Impact of the First World War on U.S. Policymakers: American Strategic and Foreign Policy Formulation, 1938–1942*. Michael Welcome to the podcast.

[0:29:34]

Michael Carew: Delight to be here.

[0:29:36]

Theo Mayer: So Michael as we just heard in Mike Shuster segment, as the peace negotiations begin 100 years ago this month at Versailles, they did not particularly want Woodrow Wilson to participate, our only president ever with a PhD in political science, no less. So what are some of these varying position of the allies and what do they hope to come out with?

[0:29:58]

Michael Carew: The primary allies that we were dealing with or that Woodrow Wilson was dealing with was rooted in three considerations. In the first the other allies, Italy, Great Britain, France had been at war and all those countries had suffered extensive casualties. And they look at the entry of Wilson as a late comer and a not major contributor to the victory. The second element is that when Germany in October of 1918, sought an armistice it addressed its request to Wilson. Now, Wilson had published his so-called 14 points, and the Germans were seeking to obtain an armistice based on those 14 points, which was Wilson's perspective not that of the collective allies. So this rubbed the other allies entirely wrong. The last aspect of this is that the British and the French and the Italians were looking for a settlement of the war, that was a vast variance from that of Wilson. Both the French and the British, to a lesser degree, the Italians wanted a vengeful piece, they wanted compensation for the damage that had been done in

France, the losses taken by the British and the French and some assurance that Germany would never again be able to rise as a threat to the piece of Western Europe. So you have these differences of perspective and they was as a result, a less than perfect enthusiasm for Wilson's now come to Europe and essentially dictate to the Versailles discussions.

[0:31:51]

Theo Mayer: Michael we never ratified or became a signatory to the Versailles Treaty. Why was that?

[0:31:56]

Michael Carew: Wilson was reelected in November of 1916 on a campaign of anti-war sentiment and the tagline of Wilson's reelection campaign was he kept us out of war. So when he was inaugurated the second time, less than a month later, he had gone to Congress and asked for a declaration of war. So the American political environment was poisoned by this 180 degree change of policy. And in that context, in the pool of 1918 November of '18, immediately before the armistice in the midterm elections, the republicans had gained control of both the house and the Senate in what was tantamount to a rejection of the Wilson administration. So the domestic politics of the United States were hostile. This domestic hostility to Wilson manifested itself in the ultimate rejection of the Treaty.

[0:32:58]

Theo Mayer: Well, during this time, Wilson suffered some health traumas as well, didn't he?

[0:33:01]

Michael Carew: When Wilson returned after the negotiation, and presented the senate with the treaty, he understood immediately that he had a political problem. So he made an effort to go over the heads of the Senate and run a political campaign nationwide. And while initially there was positive response in this city by city tour, after roughly a week, the hostility of the crowds and the local newspapers as Wilson moved to the west became manifest, and Wilson became increasingly distraught in the combination of his destructive negotiations that he had been put through in Versailles, his belief that somehow Colonel House who was his trusted aide had betrayed him lead to, if you will, a nervous breakdown when he was in Pueblo, Arizona, and then he immediately returned to Washington as an invalid, and effectively was an invalid for the next two plus years.

[0:34:03]

Theo Mayer: Okay, if you were going to condense it down to the single most important issue, what were the lessons for us to take away from the effects of World War One on US policy?

[0:34:13]

Michael Carew: First and foremost is the fact that we were grossly, one might say criminally unprepared to go to war. So that when 1938 came about George Catlett Marshall took the posture that we must have a major preparatory effort to re mobilize and to rearm the United States. That is probably the most important aspect with the effect of the world war and experience on subsequent American policy.

[0:34:43]

Theo Mayer: Well, Professor Carew, you've given us a really concise and clear vision of the general policy issues and challenges from pre-war through the peace negotiations. Thank you so much.

[0:34:54]

Michael Carew: That's very kind of you, and I appreciate the opportunity.

[0:34:57]

Theo Mayer: Michael Carew is a Professor of Economics and Finance at Baruch College and author of several books. Learn more about his writings and books by following the link of the podcast notes. And that wraps up the second of our two-part special on the immediate aftermath of World War One. We hope that the special help you keep, maybe develop a perspective and overview of this globally transformative period. And as we think you'll discover, in our 2019 episodes the actual transformation both for our nation and everybody else is only in mid stride from the war the change the world. We want to thank our guests Candy Martin, past President of the American Gold Star Mothers. Mike Knapp from the American Battle Monuments Commission. Sir Hew Strachan, Professor of International Relations at the University of St. Andrews. Mike Shuster, curator for the Great War Project Blog. Michael Carew, author and Professor of Economics and Finance at Baruch College. Many thanks to Katherine Akey, my co-conspirator and the show's line producer. To Matt Nelson and Tim Crow, our interview editing team to Jael Michelle for his research, and I'm Theo Mayer, the show's producer and your host. The US World War One Centennial Commission was created by Congress to honor commemorate and educate about World War One. For the past five years, we've inspired a national conversation and awareness about World War One, including with this podcast. We've brought the lessons of 100 years ago to today's educators and their classrooms. We've helped to restore

World War One memorials and communities of all sizes across the country. And now as we head into 2019, we have one more key goal yet to complete. With your help, we're going to build America's national World War One Memorial in Washington, D.C. To learn more, go to ww1cc.org/memorial. We want to thank the Commission's founding sponsor the Pritzker Military Museum and Library. And we want to thank the Star Foundation for their support. The podcast and a full transcript of the show can be found on our website at ww1cc.org/cm. You'll find World War One Centennial news in all the places you get your podcasts and even using your smart speaker by saying play WW1 Centennial News podcast. The podcast Twitter handle is @TheWW1podcast. The Commission's Twitter and Instagram handles are both @WW1CC and we're on Facebook @WW1 Centennial. Thank you for joining us. And don't forget, keep the story alive for America for generations to come, by helping us build the National World War One Memorial in Washington, D.C. Use your smartphone to text the letters WWI to the phone number 91999. You'll get back a text that shows you how. Thank you for listening. So long.

[0:38:13]