TOPICS OF THE DAY

**Canada's Election Outlook: Socialism in Britain: De Gaulle's Programme: The Puzzle of Poland: Our Attitude to Russia.**

The political situation in Canada remains in a state of interesting fluidity with visibility about its future trends considerably beclouded. All parties are making preparations for a Federal general election on the assumption that it may come as a thief in the night, but the weeks are slipping by with the war in Europe unended, and the knowledge of Mr. King's notorious aversion to campaigning amid the rigors of our winter strengthens the belief that the appeal to the voters will now be postponed until next spring. Three provincial elections, which were held in August offered few crumbs of encouragement to any of the major parties. In Alberta the Social Credit Ministry increased its majority and administered a cold douche to the hopes of the C.C.F. who had hoped to repeat in a certain measure their triumph in Saskatchewan but managed to capture only two seats. In Quebec the Union Nationale party led by M. Duplessis secured with a minority of the popular vote a working majority in the legislature and formed a new Ministry. For the severe blow involved in loss of provincial control of their strongest fortress the Liberals received some slight consolation in New Brunswick, while the high personal repute of Premier McNair was a large factor in the return of his Ministry by an increased majority. In both Quebec and New Brunswick the C.C.F. party polled a negligible vote and has yet to demonstrate that it has made serious headway east of the Ottawa River, while in Quebec the poll of the candidates of the Bloc Populaire fell far short of their expectations.

But these results leave the picture of the provincial scene in politics an extraordinary mosaic. The Liberals hold the three Maritime Provinces, the Union Nationale party is in power at Quebec, the Progressive-Conservatives sit uneasily in the saddle at Toronto, Coalition Ministries rule the roost in Manitoba and British Columbia, the C.C.F. is in office in Saskatchewan, and Social Credit in Alberta. Under such circumstances the decision of Mr. King to postpone the projected Dominion-provincial conference was elementary wisdom, because when most of the provincial administrations hold strongly divergent views about the problems requiring treatment by such
a conference, hopes of any harmonious settlement with the Federal Government must have been very slim.

Meanwhile the prospects of the various political parties for the coming Federal election are being freely canvassed and the appraisements naturally vary according to the political sympathies of their authors. But it is interesting to find such a faithful champion of the Ministry as the *Winnipeg Free Press* admitting that the present strength of the Liberal party in the country is only a fraction of its present parliamentary strength and claiming for it only a maximum of 110 seats out of the total or 12 less than a majority. The *Free Press* evidently does not think the prospects of the Social Creditors and the Labor-Progressives, néé Communists, worthy of mention, although the former will certainly win some seats in Alberta, but it gives the C.C.F. a chance of a maximum of between 70 and 75 seats and assigns to the Progressive-Conservatives only 60 seats at the most.

The main reason attributed by the *Free Press* and other commentators for a lowered estimate of Progressive-Conservative fortunes is the failure of Mr. John Bracken to assert himself in the councils of his party and his submissive acquiescence in attempts of Premier Drew of Ontario to mould the Federal policies of his party in the fields of both domestic and imperial relations. The Liberals think Mr. Drew has presented them with a magnificent electioneering issue through the bluntly worded speech in which he criticized the King Government's scheme of family allowances and intimated that his Government would oppose a plan under which Quebec, proved laggard in assuming her fair share of the national war effort, would take toll through her large families of public funds provided by the riches of that provincial exemplar of ardent patriotism Ontario. The Liberal calculation is that this criticism of Quebec will bring back solidly behind Mr. King most of his French-Canadian legions which had seemed lost. At any rate the French-Canadians are now said to regard Mr. Drew as their public enemy No. 1 and to be determined to prevent any administration of which he might be a member ruling at Ottawa. There is evidence that similar sentiments about Mr. Drew are entertained in other sections of Canada outside Quebec and have been intensified by his speech about family allowances, which is being interpreted in the West as an attempt to veto Federal policies.

As a politician, Mr. Drew has many virtues—courage, industry, some imagination and considerable gifts of platform
eloquence—and his record of the administration of the affairs of Ontario during his first year of office. But unfortunately for his own future he has somehow or other contrived to make himself appear to the rest of Canada as the human embodiment of the spirit of condescending superiority with which Ontario is supposed to treat the other provinces. Both the people of Ontario and Mr. Drew would heatedly deny the validity of the charge, but it is constantly made and its truth is widely believed. Accordingly Mr. Bracken, if he wants his party to gain more popular goodwill, will have to make a determined effort to prove that his leadership of it is effective and decisive. His party have in their hands a most deadly electioneering weapon in the rising tide of popular indignation in the English speaking promises about the ill-starred “zombia” army. Its value has been increased by explicit charges made by prominent officers, lately returned from battle zones, that the Canadian army overseas has been greatly handicapped by the inadequate training of some recent reinforcements which it has received. If these charges can be sustained then, now that all menace of an invasion of Canada has been removed, the farce of keeping in Canada a home service army of 50,000 well-trained troops, at a cost of 250 million dollars per annum, when war worn units are suffering in efficiency at the front from the inadequate training of green reinforcements becomes wholly indefensible.

A minor event in our political world is the announced return to the bosom of the Liberal party of that strayed sheep, Mr. Mitchell Hepburn. This mercurial and unpredictable figure has been impelled to shed his coat of independence, because he has become alarmed over the menace offered to the future of Canada by the brand of Toryism purveyed by Mr. Drew and other leaders of the Progressive-Conservative party.

In Britain the lines of battle are now being drawn for the general election which Mr. Churchill has announced to be impending, although not imminent. The dissolution of the existing Coalition has been made virtually inevitable by a report on post-war reconstruction recently drafted by the General Council of the Trades Union Congress of Britain. Declaring that its immediate recommendations are to be considered as “part of the gradual transition of the economic system from unregulated private enterprise to public ownership and public control,” it advocates the transfer to public ownership of the transport and power systems, the coal-mining and the iron and steel industries. The Council holds that public opinion is prepared for the imme-
diately nationalization of the railways and coal mines, but it
does not press for direct administration by the State. Its report
suggests that public ownership should take the form of a corpora-
tion under a Minister responsible to Parliament and with pro-
vision for the representation of the workers engaged in the
industry affected. Where complete public ownership seems im-
practicable or inadvisable, it proposes public control through the
State’s acquisition of key sections of an industry, the financial
supervision of important companies, the assumption by the
Government of the functions of wholesalers in certain lines of
distribution, and the creation of industrial boards within indus-
tries. Such industrial boards would be composed of an equal
proportion of employers and wage-earners, with an impartial
chairman and other independent members appointed and paid
by the Government. The functions of these boards would be to
regulate the concentration and specialization of production for
each industry, to secure a standardization of equipment and pro-
ducts, and to create a common research organization. They
would also be empowered to bring about a pooling of methods,
patents and general commercial information, and to develop
common agencies for marketing and purchasing.

Now the translation of these proposals into legislation would
work a wholesale revolution in Britain’s economic life, and the
only section of the Conservative party which would not be bitterly
hostile to them would be the group of young Tory Reformers
led by Lord Hinchingbroke and Mr. Quintin Hogg, who might
favor some of them. But it can be taken for granted that the
report will be endorsed by the annual convention of the Trades
Union Congress when it meets on October 16. Now members
of the Congress provide the great majority of the delegates who
will attend the later convention of the Labor party, and when
they come to draft its programme for the election, their voting
power will assure acceptance of the proposals of the Congress,
while the non-trades unionist element will probably want to go
even further in the direction of state ownership.

But, as soon as the Labor party adopts the programme of
nationalization outlined above, it can no longer lie in the same
political bed with the Conservatives, and its Executive Committee
lately pronounced itself in favor of its withdrawal from the Coalition
and gaining freedom to fight the election on its own Socialist
programme. Such a decision must mean that the Laborite
members of Mr. Churchill’s Ministry would have to resign from
it as soon as the surrender of Germany occurred, or give up their
membership in the Labor party. It can be suspected that politicians of mediocre talents like Mr. Attlee will be very reluctant to leave the sheltering fold of a Coalition, under which they have been elevated to high office in the state, and that Mr. Ernest Bevin would prefer continued association with Mr. Churchill to the companionship of Professor Harold Laski and other intellectuals of the Labor party, whom he detests. But he must also know that, if he elects to stay with Mr. Churchill and take the Conservative shilling, he will forfeit forthwith the confidence of the British workers, and he will probably remember the pitifully tragic fate of Ramsay MacDonald, after he became a prisoner for life in the Conservative camp. So the great majority of the Laborite Ministers will be afraid not to obey the mandate of their party’s convention, and Mr. Churchill will have to reconstruct his Ministry.

An early withdrawal from the Coalition would be a wise move for the Labor party from the point of view of its long future. Remaining in a Coalition dominated by Conservatives, it would cease to have any attraction for many of its present supporters who would migrate quickly to the Commonwealth or Communist parties, and it would expose itself to the danger of sharing the fate which befell the British Liberal party after the last war and reduced it to an impotent faction. The Labor party has now a unique chance to capitalize the genuine ardor for progressive reforms, which now prevails not merely among the mass of the workers but in a large element of the middle and even of the upper classes. For this potential progressive vote, however, the Labor party will be faced with the competition of both the Commonwealth and Communist parties, but the Independent Labor party, which Keir Hardie formed half a century ago is on the verge of extinction as half of its small parliamentary contingent have joined the Labor party and Mr. James Maxton may soon be its only survivor. The prejudices of the Laborite leaders against any truck or trade with the Communists will probably cause them to reject the renewed appeal of the latter for the cooperation of all the Leftist parties in a “popular front” against the Conservatives. But they will be very foolish if they do not reach some working arrangement for the election with the Commonwealth party, whose programme is on many points identical with their own. Byelections have indicated that Commonwealth candidates can by attracting middle class votes carry rural seats, in which the Labor party has never mustered any serious strength, and an alliance between the two groups might have very fruitful results.
The Conservatives are still pinning their faith upon the ability of Mr. Churchill's great prestige to counteract the damaging indictment which can be brought against them for their pre-war policies, and to produce for them another majority. But they also realize the necessity of meeting the popular demand for drastic reforms and improvements in the social and economic structure of Britain, and so the Churchill Ministry has recently committed itself to a comprehensive scheme of social security which follows so closely the plan evolved by Sir William Beveridge that the latter is able to give it general approval and reserves his criticism only for details. But Ministers have incurred severe criticism for their laggardness in tackling the urgent problems of housing and planning for the urban and rural areas, and such measures as they have proposed in regard to them are vitiated by too great tenderness for property interests. The Liberal party shows no recovery of voting strength and remains a minor faction, but it contains some very able men and has just been reinforced in Parliament by the election of Sir William Beveridge, who however only replaces its most brilliant recruit in recent years, Captain Charles Grey, lately killed in action.

But the fortunes of the coming British election may be profoundly affected by some very arresting developments which are taking place in liberated France. In that country the Communists and in a lesser degree the Socialists have been the core of the underground resistance movement and have furnished the majority of the Maquis, who have rendered such invaluable help to the invading Allied armies. They are the only political parties, which had preserved their organization in some degree and they are in a position to exploit the widespread unpopularity, which many of the most prominent leaders of French finance, industry and business have incurred for themselves through their subservient willingness to support the now hopelessly discredited Vichyite regime and to collaborate with the Nazis. Even before the war they could elect their candidates in most of the urban seats and now they can count upon the support of the mass of the peasantry and a large element of the middle class for drastic measures which will end forever the financial and economic domination of the so-called "four hundred families" and make it impossible for them to regain the power of exercising through political stool pigeons like Laval and Doriot a deciding influence upon the domestic and foreign policies of France.
General De Gaulle has been rated by most people a simple professional soldier, who had no political interests beyond a general conservative bias. But, since he became the titular head of the provisional Government of France, he has shed very rapidly his innocence of the political arts and now shows signs of becoming a very skilful practitioner of them. To-day he enjoys immense prestige with all classes of his countrymen as the undaunted soldier who never despaired of the Republic and battled unceasingly for its liberation. He naturally aspires to retain this prestige and the power than accompanies it and to gain further fame as one of the chief architects of the revival of France’s fortunes after the war. He realizes that in the present revolutionary mood of the French people, he can only achieve his laudable aim by moving sharply to the Left. So he has given prominent places in his administration to Communist leaders like M. Billou, his Minister of Air, a vigorous organizer of resistance and has deliberately dropped from it a number of Rightist politicians who were objectionable to the Communists. He has now followed up this move by a bold espousal of Socialism through an announcement made in a speech at Lille that his government would proceed to put in force a programme of planned economy for the rehabilitation of France, and that it would include state control of all national resources and an equal share of the national income for all Frenchmen. It must have horrified the representatives of the “four hundred families” to find this distinguished soldier asserting that “Governments are much better fitted than individuals to exploit the riches of the earth” and declaring “we have reached the point where it is no longer possible to admit the concentration of interests known as trusts, which to-day answer our needs no more than did the feudal military system.”

The practical measures for implementing this programme of Socialism have yet to be worked out and expounded but, if De Gaulle’s government lives up to its pledges, their enactment is certain because the reactionary interests are in no position to frustrate them. The French Revolution was the birth throes of political democracy for the world and destroyed the power of the French monarchy and aristocracy, but one of its results was to lay firm foundations for a bourgeois capitalist civilization, which has survived the intermittent changes in the political regimes of France. From St. Simon, Fourier and Proudhon onwards there has been no dearth of powerful and passionate advocates of Socialism in France, but the great
The bulk of the bourgeoisie and the peasantry have remained rugged individualists, passionate believers in the rights of private property and resentful of most forms of state interference. Even when Leon Blum, as head of the most Leftist Ministry that France has ever known, secured authority in 1936 and 1937 for a series of drastic Socialist measures, he found many of them unworkable in practice because public opinion would not support them sufficiently. Now General De Gaulle and his associates can see no hope of retrieving France from "the social, moral and political situation which brought us to the brink of the abyss", except by the swift obliteration of the structure of capitalism which has been the bedrock foundation of French civilization for a century and a half. The prospect of such a revolutionary change in France will be welcomed by the Labor party in Britain, but it will be viewed with profound horror in the City of London. A very interesting subject of speculation is what will be the effect in French-Canada, if the people of France endorse as they well may, by a large majority at the next election the comprehensive Socialist programme of De Gaulle. The bogey of the terrible example of infidel Russia could no longer be used to frighten French-Canadian workers away from the C.C.F. But behind the De Gaullist programme there may well be another powerful motive. The British Government is now said to be ready and anxious to accord to De Gaulle's administration full recognition as a properly constituted government, but it has not won the consent of the Government of the United States, which apparently clings to the view that recognition must await a mandate for the administration from the voters of France. This refusal of a status of equal partnership in the democratic alliance, at a time when decisions of enormous importance to the future of France are being taken, rankles as a bitter grievance with not only De Gaulle and his colleagues but with the mass of the French people, and it has been accentuated by the failure to invite any representative of France to attend the recent conference at Quebec. De Gaulle however, knows that, while the Anglo-Saxon democracies are pledged to walk more or less in step in their diplomatic moves, the Russians pursue their own line of policy. He is also aware that, as Mr. Churchill admitted in his latest speech, there is a cleavage of opinions between the Anglo-Saxon democracies and Russia on the question of the future of Poland and on some other issues. So the hope is probably cherished by the De Gaulle administra-
tion that, if it brings the economic ideology and practical policies of France into reasonable conformity with those of Russia, the Soviet Government, foreseeing a new ally for its own plans for the world, will hasten to accord full recognition and force the other United Nations to make a similar move.

Meanwhile this problem of the future of Poland and her relations with Russia continues to be a source of grave anxiety, and the prospect of a satisfactory solution is for the moment darker than ever. The Polish Government in exile was at last brought to its senses, when Mr. Winston Churchill in his speech of September 29th intimated that his Government would not oppose the decision of the Russian Government to fix the so-called Curzon line as the rough basis for the frontier between the two countries and warned the Poles in London to make a genuine effort to reach a harmonious accommodation with Moscow as soon as possible. After this speech the pressure, which Mr. Eden had been applying for the dismissal of General Sosnowski, the *bête noire* of Moscow, from his post as commander-in-chief of the Polish army, bore immediate fruit, and President Rackiewicz announced that he had been replaced by General Tadeusz Komorowski, who under the assumed name of General Bor, had led the heroic uprising in Warsaw of the Polish patriots, which ended in a tragic disaster and the virtual destruction of the city.

This change was obviously designed as a gesture to appease the Polish National Committee of Liberation and its patron Stalin, but it failed signally to achieve its purpose. It produced a violently hostile reaction from Moscow where M. Morowski, the head of the Committee, presumably with the full approval of Stalin, denounced the appointment of General Komorowski, whom he accused of criminal responsibility for an uprising which was sheer madness and avowed a determination to bring to trial the members of the Government in London, who had encouraged the premature revolt. There has been an exchange of bitter recriminations between London and Moscow about the responsibility for the ill-starred revolt, and the Poles in London accuse the Russian of betraying the patriots of Warsaw to their doom by both refusing themselves to send them arms and supplies by planes and declining to permit the use of Russian bases by American and British planes for this purpose. This refusal caused heavy losses for the American and British airforces when their planes, flying from Italy, tried to bring succor, but the Russians, who sent some belated help by plane, contend
that since the revolt never had a chance of success, it was sheer waste of supplies and planes to try to help the patriots.

Unfortunately, this latest outburst of intransigence on the part of the National Committee of Liberation ends all hope of a reconciliation between the two contending Polish factions and constitutes a very severe rebuff to the British Government, which was working in a disinterested spirit for this end. It will also furnish ammunition for the skilful campaign to preserve for Poland territory and resources which will enable her to remain an influential power, predominantly Roman Catholic in religion and free from the baneful domination of Russia. It will also strengthen the hands of reactionary elements in the United States and Canada, of whom Mr. W. C. Bullitt, formerly U. S. Ambassador to Russia and Professor Watson Kirkconnell of McMaster University, are outstanding samples, for carrying on a campaign of hostility to Russia and limning her as almost as great a menace to the decencies of civilization as Hitler's Germany.

Accurate information about this anti-Russian campaign of propaganda cannot fail to reach Moscow and to revive there all the old suspicion of the sinister designs of the capitalist democracies of the West against the Soviet structure. There will be no support for it among the working classes and people of liberal outlook in the Anglo-Saxon democracies. But in the interests of the peaceful world settlement which Russia needs for recovery from her terrible wounds, the Russian Government would be well advised not to furnish its numerous enemies, of which the Vatican is the most formidable, with so much ammunition as some of its recent actions have supplied. It is being credited for generous moderation in the terms of capitulation which it has imposed upon both Romania and Finland, but it should understand that friendly public opinion both in the British Commonwealth and the United States view askance its disposition to enforce unilateral settlements according to its own interests and desires upon neighboring nations. It should try to furnish as little scope as possible for the pernicious work of mischief-makers, whose activities have been meeting with such success that not a few people on this continent are now talking quite calmly about the inevitability of a third World War, with Russia and the Anglo-Saxon democracies locked in bloody strife for the completion of the ruin of civilization.
The transformation in the European scene in the two short months elapsed since the armies of the United Nations after a desperate struggle got the upper hand in what has proved to be the decisive battle of Normandy, is little short of miraculous, far exceeding our wildest hopes at midsummer. Now the liberation of France and Belgium is well-nigh completed, a large part of Poland is free and in Italy the piercing of the Gothic line promises that Von Kesselring’s armies will soon be driven beyond the barrier of the Alps. Three of Germany’s hapless satellites, Finland, Romania and Bulgaria have capitulated to Russian armies and declared war against their late ally. In the Balkan peninsula invasions of Albania and Greece by Allied forces, which will cooperate with the patriot guerrillas operating in the latter country and Jugoslavia and with the southern Russian army now encircling Belgrade, threaten to overwhelm the local German garrisons whose withdrawal was begun too late. Moreover the prospect of an invasion of Austria, over the plains of Hungary, is now being opened up by Russian successes in Transylvania and among the northern Carpathians. In Poland the Germans still cling to parts of Warsaw, but they are rapidly being cleared out of the former Baltic Republics. Accordingly the only occupied countries in which the stranglehold of the Nazis is still firm are Norway, Denmark and Holland, and it may be ended in Holland at any moment.

The present military situation is that the Germans are being steadily and relentlessly driven back to their own frontiers and it is no longer Festung Europa but Festung Deutschland that they are defending. Their Luftwaffe has abandoned all hope of ever regaining ascendancy in the skies, but the Reichswehr is showing its habitual skill and tenacity in resisting offensives pressed with tremendous vigor both on the western and eastern fronts, and is making the Allies pay a heavy price for every acre of ground which they gain. Many units of the German army are reported to contain foreign elements, which cannot be wholly trustworthy, and the problem of providing it with adequate munitions and supplies must have been rendered very difficult by the persistent destruction of German war plants through aerial bombardment and the loss of the oil resources of Romania.

There are rumors of mounting internal disorders inside Germany, where all illusions about the possibility of victory have vanished and a mood of numbed despair possesses millions
of people. But the grip of the dread Gestapo is still firm, and the unfortunate publication of the plan set forth by Mr. Morgenthau, an American Jew, for the complete dismemberment of Germany and the destruction of her heavy industries has been invaluable ammunition for Hitler and his gang. They are now able to tell the German people with convincing evidence that something like complete annihilation is planned for Germany by her enemies, and to urge that it would be better for the whole German race to die in their boots than submit to such a fate. People of Anglo-Saxon stock, faced with a similar threat, would certainly choose the former alternative, and so the Germans in their black desperation may prolong their resistance throughout the winter. But their resources of manpower and materials are diminishing so rapidly that the final debacle of the monstrous fabric of Nazism to be followed by unconditional surrender must come before next spring arrives.

The capitulation of Germany when it comes, will set the Allies free to put into effect plans matured at the recent conference at Quebec for the final discomfiture of Japan. As the result of a series of brilliant victories by the forces of the United States, numerous groups of islands in the Pacific have been wrested from the Japanese. They have been pressed back so far into the inner perimeter of their defensive system that regular aerial attacks of a devastating character upon the heartland of Japan should soon be possible. But on the other hand the news from China is very depressing. The prestige of the government of Chiang Kai-shek is now at a very low ebb. It is justifiably accused of devoting as much of its energies and resources to suppressing the Communists as to fighting the Japanese, and in its military administration there has been so much inefficiency and corruption that its armies have recently suffered a series of disastrous reverses and the Japanese have secured control of all the seaboard provinces of China.

The Chinese profess themselves deeply aggrieved that they have received so little help from their Allies, but they have their own leaders largely to thank for the precarious plight of their country. Yet even a complete collapse of Chinese resistance, which is foreboded in some quarters, could only delay the subjugation of Japan. Except in China she is committed to a difficult defensive battle with waning resources, and she can never again muster fighting power adequate to cope with the combined assault of the immensely strong naval and aerial forces which the United States and the British Commonwealth
will be able to mobilize in the Pacific and Indian oceans as soon as Germany capitulates. So complete victory over the forces of evil which have menaced the free world and brought so much sorrow and misery to it since August, 1939, is now in sight and the task before our statesmen is to garner from the coming victory fruits which will offer some measure of compensation for the prodigious sacrifices of blood and treasure made in winning it.

* * * *

**Wendell Willkie** is dead at the age of 52, his magnificent physique worn out prematurely by tireless labors in good causes. An American corporation lawyer of the first rank, who after emerging in the political arena as a defender of the preserves of power companies, challenged successfully the entrenched power of a reactionary political machine and experienced such a process of political self-education that he became one of the outstanding liberals of the world, would for this record alone be a *rara avis*. But Wendell Willkie, although there was a certain crudity in some of his methods, had qualities of character which made him tower high above the ruck of politicians. In 1940 with full foreknowledge of the certain consequences of his actions he deliberately sacrificed roseate prospects of occupying the greatest public office in the world, the Presidency of the United States by following a course which was bound to arouse the unforgiving antagonism of the *Chicago Tribune* and other isolationist elements in his own, the Republican, party. After giving heartening encouragement to the British people by a personal visit to London in the darkest hour of Hitler's aerial blitzkrieg, he rendered a much greater service to them by the passionate appeal which he made on his return to a committee of Congress for the immediate passage of the Lend-Lease bill on the ground that vital interests of the United States demanded it. Its fate was then trembling in the balance; it is not an exaggeration to say that his intervention turned the scales, and made possible the timely American succor to Britain which enabled her to hold safe the island fortress of freedom. It was an immeasurable service to the whole of mankind, and it called for a courage and disinterested spirit, very rare in politicians.

Thereafter Willkie labored manfully to liberalize his party. He pleaded eloquently and forcefully for more generous policies towards labor and fairer treatment of the negro population; he lent his legal abilities to defend the rights of free speech;
and he preached assiduously the doctrines of liberal internationalism, impressing on his countrymen that it was their duty to assume responsibilities for building a new world order commensurate with their power and influence. His defeat in the primary election marked his failure to convert the hard-boiled leaders of his party to his views and ended his aspirations for the Presidency. But, adopting an attitude of independence, he continued to labor for the causes dear to his heart and he retained a large personal following of admirers in the United States.

His death indeed may exercise considerable influence upon the result of the Presidential election. He had modified the foreign policies of the Republican party so far that it had formally renounced isolationism and as long as he remained alive, he operated as a sort of brake upon its relapse into completely reactionary ways. Governor Dewey, as President, could have relied upon his support for aid to combat the diehards of his party but now that Willkie is dead, they would be firmly in the saddle at Washington, if November brought a Republican victory. So American liberals, whose displeasure with the Roosevelt administration might have induced them to support Dewey as long as Willkie remained in the background, will now be fearful of taking any chances with the Republicans and the prospects of the re-election of Roosevelt, which are by no means dim, may be enhanced by Willkie's death.