

victory in this war for the liberation of East Asia from the shackles of Anglo-United States Imperialism. . . . China, after thirty years' hard struggle, has not yet succeeded completely in shaking off the fetters of Western Imperialism, and this struggle could not be carried out successfully by China alone, but needed a front formed by all the liberty-loving East Asiatic peoples!"

Sun Fo, in an article released on the eve of the double tenth, dwelt on another theme. After setting forth the conditions of internal democracy, he stated: "The Democratic Movement in China has so far been unsuccessful. The reason for this failure is that the national revolution has failed to eradicate the anti-Democratic reactionary forces." China's principal duty, he urged, was the early realisation of democracy by the termination of the period of political tutelage, the promulgation of the Constitution, the reorganisation of the Government and the establishment of a constitutional régime. The Central Executive Committee's resolution last year, and President Chiang's recent instructions to the People's Political Council were clear indications that the nation's leaders intended to go forward along this path. As guardian of his father's testament Sun Fo seems to be allowed considerable liberty in expressing his opinions, but it may suit the Generalissimo to permit this semi-official opposition which is in tune with Chinese public opinion, and, in the hands of someone more able than Sun, might be of much greater danger to the Administration.

In reviewing the conduct of the war the *Ta Kung Pao* continues to press for the revision of the Allied "Europe first" policy, and proposes that Allied troops in India should move into China and that British troops should land on China's south-eastern coast and take Canton to reopen China's sea communications. A Government spokesman, questioned at a press conference on the 11th October about the reason for China's military reverses, declared that "inadequate supplies of anti-tank guns and tanks were the principal reasons for Chinese defeat in the Honan battle," and that "shortage of heavy armaments accounted for the Chinese failure to save Hengyang." This spokesman had the grace to add: "To say that we have not enough supplies does not, of course, mean that our Allies do not wish to give us enough. We appreciate to immense difficulties of transport our Allies have to face, but the fact is that China, so far, has received very limited help."

The Japanese press has devoted much space to the Japanese capture of Foochow, where fighting is still going on in the north-western suburbs of the city. It is maintained that the operation has completely frustrated the American plan to establish a submarine base at this port. Japanese forces in obtaining their objective are stated to have been "more cautious of the China-based American air force and enemy submarines infesting the nearby seas than of Chungking troops." *The Nippon Times* of the 12th October, after declaring that the Japanese capture of Foochow and the drive on Kweilin had completely removed the American hope of using Chinese naval and air bases against Japan, added that the American Press was now concentrating on Chungking's shortcomings, intending not only to place the blame for the failure on Chungking's shoulders, but "to utilise the occasion to subordinate Chungking more than ever to direct United States control."

Many flowery passages of rhetoric celebrated the first anniversary of the Philippine Republic on the 14th October, General Koiso and President Laurel vieing with each other in finding suitable phrases to meet the occasion.

UNITED STATES.

With the election only three-weeks away the campaign is daily growing more intense; no longer is it true that the electorate is apathetic. There are signs that in certain key States such as New York, the registration and vote is likely to be heavier than was at first expected, and this should improve President Roosevelt's chances of re-election. All the polls show the President ahead, but Governor Dewey has been steadily reducing this lead since the campaign started.

The Democrats, however, will be helped in one of the most vital states and even beyond its confines, by the decision of the *New York Times* to support the President. In the last Presidential election the *Times* supported Mr. Willkie; it has consistently opposed the domestic policy of the Administration. Now, however, it has taken its stand on the issue of foreign policy. It has not been able, it has announced to see any sharp distinctions between Governor Dewey's and the President's domestic policies, but in the matter of foreign policy, it finds the Democratic Party "more united and consistent." "Mr. Dewey's

campaign," it asserts, "has been disappointing, particularly in view of the necessity of plain speaking, because of his earlier position." But still more disturbing, it says, is the fact that the Republican party is itself deeply divided on foreign policy and that Mr. Dewey is relying on the support both of the isolationist and internationalist factions. "Both factions support Governor Dewey; one or the other will be disappointed." Mr. Dewey, it alleges, has failed to drive home the issue hard enough to discourage even the more extreme wing of the isolationists from giving him its support. Further, it points out that Mr. Roosevelt "has first-hand knowledge of problems that will arise in the making of the peace" and that his prestige might be one of "the most important cohesive factors binding together the new world organisation in its first experimental years." Finally it deplores the attitude of the Republican Party to Mr. Hull's Reciprocal Trade Agreement programme. (In this connexion it is interesting to note that the National Foreign Trade Council Convention recently reaffirmed "its belief that the reciprocal trade agreements programme is the most effective way yet devised in our history to bring about the reduction of tariff barriers here and abroad and to foster a great volume of foreign trade.")

The action of the *New York Times* will surprise many of its readers. But Mr. Roosevelt has also received support from an unexpected source in California, where the "Willkie wing" of the Republican Party, which consists of several hundred influential internationalist Republicans, have stated that they cannot support Mr. Dewey and that they will vote for the President.

Last week-end the unusual step was taken of issuing from the White House a statement replying to various charges which had been made by Mr. Dewey, and which he had supported by quotations from General Marshall, General Arnold, Senators Truman and Barkley, Mr. Berle and General Hershey. The statement purported to show that in every instance Mr. Dewey either misquoted or took the words from their context, thus altering their real meaning. The result is likely to be damaging to Mr. Dewey.

The publication of the text of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals has, on the whole, obtained widespread approbation. The exceptions are the extreme right wing papers such as the *Hearst chain*, the *Chicago Tribune* and the *Denver Post*. Mr. Dewey's statement "I am very happy over the result. All peace-loving people must rejoice that we have found so large an area of agreement about world organisation for peace," set the keynote for the Republican Press, so that both Democratic and Republican comment expressed equal support and saw in these proposals the creation of an institution far superior to the League of Nations. But while expressing genuine pleasure over the area of agreement achieved, the press in general recognised that the plans were tentative and far from perfect, and emphasised that everything depended on the sincerity and integrity of the Great Powers acting within the new framework. Left wing comment has shown itself apprehensive over the amount of control given to the Great Powers as against the small nations, and there has been much discussion by both liberal and conservative papers, whether Republican or Democratic, on such specific points as the problems of the veto of American participation in the use of armed forces. It is generally recognised that the unsettled "ten per cent." contains the really crucial issues, though the measure of agreement reached is regarded as genuinely encouraging.

Following President Roosevelt's statement to Dr. Stephen S. Wise (which was repeated in a letter to Senator Wagner) that he adheres to the Palestine Plank of the Democratic election platform, Governor Dewey has issued a similar declaration with regard to the similar plank in the Republican platform. Mr. Dewey declared that he favoured the reconstitution of Palestine as a free and Democratic Jewish commonwealth in accordance with the Balfour declaration of 1917 and the Resolution of the Republican Congress in 1922. He asserted that he was in favour of "the opening of Palestine to unlimited Jewish emigration and land ownership in order to give refuge to millions of distressed Jews driven from their homes by tyranny. As President I would use my best offices to have our Government working together with Britain to achieve this great objective for a 'people who have suffered so much and deserved so much at the hands of mankind.'"

Senator Taft (Republican, Ohio) who with Senator Wagner (Democrat, New York) sponsored a resolution some few months ago calling on the United States to use its influence to open the doors of Palestine for the free entry of Jews, recently wrote to Mr. Stimson, the Secretary for War, who had objected last Spring on military grounds to this proposed legislation, to enquire whether his reasons for opposing the measure still existed. While confessing that there was a strong feeling among many officers in the War Department that the passage of such a resolution would interfere with their military effort, Mr. Stimson stated

[28421]

E 2