

usual tone of restraint and arraigned Japan in unqualified terms as seeking conquest, oppressing subjugated peoples and generally playing the rôle of Hitler in the Far East.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Before leaving Washington for Warm Springs, Georgia, on the 28th November the President attempted to calm public feeling on the Far Eastern situation by his assurance at his press conference that United States policy towards Japan was one of "infinite patience." His sudden return on the 1st December was consequently taken to mean that United States-Japanese relations must suddenly have taken a turn for the worse. To all outward appearance, the United States Government were still awaiting a Japanese reply to the document which Mr. Hull had presented to Admiral Nomura and Mr. Kurusu on the 26th November—although General Tojo's threat to purge East Asia of Anglo-American influences gave the impression that, all bluffing apart, the answer might be action rather than words. On the morning of the 1st December, pending the President's arrival back in Washington, Mr. Hull entered into further conversations with Admiral Nomura and Mr. Kurusu, but his subsequent remark that these had only dealt with "subordinate phases," and Mr. Kurusu's explanation on the 2nd December that he was still awaiting further instructions from Japan, seemed to indicate that both sides were now merely playing for time. The gravity of the situation is revealed by the President's question as to why additional Japanese forces have been sent to Indo-China. An answer can hardly be delayed. Mr. Andrew Jackson May, Chairman of the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee, has announced that "Congress will support a declaration of war now if Japan moves southward," and the attitude of the American press has also stiffened towards Japan, only the *New York Daily News*, among the usual appeasers, lamenting on the 1st December that war with Japan would be madness. (See also under "Far East.")

In the view of Mr. Walter Lippmann, the presentation of the United States terms to Japan as the *sine qua non* of peace in the Pacific, following upon the recent revision of the Neutrality Act, represents a milestone in American policy and marks the passing of the isolationist-interventionist controversy. This is perhaps over-sanguine, although that controversy has been far less in evidence during the past two weeks. On the other hand, the line-up of former isolationists behind the President has steadily continued—even Senators Gillette and Taft, two of the most inveterate opponents of his foreign policy, having signified at the beginning of last week their readiness to support him "on all measures of foreign policy which have been approved by Congress." The results of a newspaper poll among Republicans, published on the 29th November, indicate that 51 per cent. of the members of that party now favour, with Mr. Willkie, an even more active foreign policy than is being at present pursued.

The formal adherence of Finland to the Anti-Comintern Pact has visibly worsened United States-Finnish relations. Mr. Hull's statement on the 28th November described the Finnish decision as "highly significant." The question uppermost in the mind of the United States Government, the Secretary of State added, was "to what extent Finnish policy is a menace to all American aims for self-defence"; for every act of the Finnish Government since the delivery of its note "has confirmed our apprehension that it is fully co-operating with Hitler and his forces." Following the publication of this statement, M. Procope, the Finnish Minister, gave a press conference in Washington to reiterate the already familiar arguments of his Government—a move which he clearly felt to be imperative in view of the increasing hostility of many American newspapers, not excepting a number of those published in Finnish. Another significant move on the same day was the resignation of Mr. A. Higgins, the Finnish Honorary Consul in New Orleans, an old friend of Finland, who felt that he could no longer continue at his post while that country became "the friend of our enemy and the enemy of our friend." The American-Danish press has vehemently attacked Denmark's adherence to the Anti-Comintern Pact as an act desired neither by the Danish King nor by the Danish people.

While the Labour Committee of the House of Representatives has been giving its sedulous attention to a large number of legislative projects—one representative said there seemed to be fifty-seven varieties—to curb strikes in the

defence industries, Mr. Roosevelt has astutely averted the strike which threatened to render some 1,250,000 employees of the American railroads idle on the 7th December by referring the dispute back to the "fact-finding" board originally set up to deal with it, and thereby obtained on the 1st December a decision acceptable to both sides. The press continues to debate the whole labour question somewhat heatedly, although its more virulent denunciations have during the week been reserved for the Administration's price-control policy. For some time it has here tended to find a scapegoat in Mr. Leon Henderson, whose Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply was set up by the President last April to check any danger of inflation that might be inherent in the defence programme.

Closely interwoven and often inseparable, the problems of production, labour and price-control very largely condition the degree of material assistance which the United States is able to render to this country and its allies. The fact that America will be spending something like \$2,000 million monthly on its own defence programme and on its commitments to the Allied cause by the spring of 1942 means that the already rapid expansion of her purchasing power will be accelerated. Yet concentration upon defence production causes the supply of consumers' goods to be ever more drastically curtailed. As it is, the country has spent some \$2,000 million more on its war effort since July 1940 than during the corresponding months of 1917-18, according to a review just published by the Office of Production Management. At the same time, the most tangible result of recent labour agitation has been to put more money into the pockets of the American workers, the Congress of Industrial Organisations, for example, boasting that, between January and April of this year, its affiliated unions have won wage increases amounting to \$380 million annually. It is because he has refused to control wages and farm prices, and because he has not hesitated to advocate the limitation of profits, that Mr. Henderson has incurred the particular opprobrium of the press. At the moment, the Administration can sit tight in the face of all opposition, for the presence of a powerful farm bloc in Congress assures it a safe margin of support there. This was evident on the 26th November, when the House of Representatives, which is still considering a selective Price-Control Bill originally submitted by the Administration on the 1st August, rejected by 218 votes to 63 a counter-proposal for an "all-inclusive" price ceiling, which had been introduced largely as a challenge to official policy. During the last few weeks there has been a growing movement against any form of control; the Farmers' Educational and Co-operative Union has, for instance, now set up an office in Washington to co-ordinate the "efforts and interests" of rural and industrial workers—which undoubtedly means fighting the rigid farm-price and wage-ceilings now advocated by the bulk of the press; and, significantly enough, the Congress of Industrial Organisations has promised its complete collaboration.

The State Department has now decided to drop the proposed convention between the United States and this country that was to have provided for mutual exemption from taxation of all property and transactions connected with defence. This was originally initialled on the 17th October and submitted to the Senate on the 30th for the necessary ratification (see this *Summary* No. 107); but considerable criticism of the principle of any such convention has all along been expressed in the United States, and when the text was referred to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate, it was there turned down unanimously. On the other hand, an intimation by the Department that the United States is in full sympathy with the British plan to accord sovereign independence to Syria and Lebanon represents a welcome change of attitude (see also under "Middle East"), and adds emphasis to the President's announcement on the 25th November that he has appointed Mr. William C. Bullitt, former United States Ambassador to the Soviet Union and to France, as his personal representative to survey the political, military and diplomatic situation in the Middle East, Egypt and Libya, and to report, *inter alia*, on Lease-Lend needs there. Mr. Bullitt's mission results from a desire on the part of the President to obtain a first-hand, detailed and comprehensive view of the situation in that important theatre of the war and to supplement the information and recommendations of the American State and Service Departments.

On the 1st December appeared the first issue of a new Chicago daily newspaper, the *Sun*. A project of long standing, and financed by a group headed by Mr. Marshall Field III, the *Chicago Sun* will challenge the virtual monopoly