

From the point of view of the outside world, however, one big question mark must be set against Japan's trade revival. Resting largely on currency depreciation, it not only depresses the living standards of the Japanese workers but forces competitors in other countries to adopt similar tactics. It is, in other words, part and parcel of the disastrous trend toward economic nationalism for which the principal com-

mercial countries, including the United States, are jointly responsible. This process hinders the reestablishment of world monetary stability and strengthens the general tendency now evident for capitalist rationalization at the expense of the workers. Further intensification of international competition in the world markets on this unhealthy basis may well lead to economic chaos and war.

Last Look at the Campaign

By RAYMOND GRAM SWING

Washington, October 29

THE campaign ends with the Democrats in a slightly more favorable position than after the Maine election. Then they were happy with the prospect of losing not more than twenty-five to thirty seats in the House and of making a net gain of six in the Senate. Now they expect to lose not more than twenty in the House, and to gain eight or nine in the Senate without dropping a single Democratic Senator.

The Administration will have the best of both worlds at the polls. It will get nearly the entire left and center vote. It will lure a goodly number of conservatives with the new spirit of graciousness to business now pervading the White House. The left has no alternative to the New Deal, and now conservatives are beginning to say they have no effective alternative to the President when it comes to holding a radical country in check. It takes magic to produce such a favorable political situation and the President has done it. If it is deliberate strategy it is as brilliant as it is unsound. It can be excused if the trial period for business would have begun, election or no election. It is unsound because obviously the President cannot lead both a radical country and the conservatives who fear a radical country. The President may not be deliberately playing both ends against the middle, but he has marked the campaign with a tinge of equivocation, and has somewhat befuddled the clarity which existed when the campaign began.

Many close fights give the election an interest which it otherwise would lack. First in excitement and importance is the race of Upton Sinclair in California. The attack on him has embraced the whole range of dishonesty from simple lying to forgery. The State was flooded with handbills purporting to be the indorsement of Sinclair by the Young Communist League. No such league exists in California, and Communists as such are as hostile to Sinclair as are conservatives. The handbills were finally traced back to the office of an attorney with a large corporation practice. The Republican Attorney-General of Los Angeles County brought action to disfranchise about 100,000 voters, charging false registration, almost exclusively of persons in poor circumstances. The procedure he laid down involved the personal appearance of each voter and the production of proof of qualification. This would take months, and was meant to rob Sinclair of a large body of votes.

In Washington I had the astonishing experience of being told by an authoritative Democrat that Sinclair probably would lose and by an equally authoritative Republican that probably he would win. I suspected wishful thinking

in both instances. The President's firm refusal to be drawn even into left-handed support of the party's candidate is defended by the prevarication that the White House is keeping out of local campaigns. But Sinclair expected no open indorsement, certainly not as much help, say, as was given Guffey of Pennsylvania. Guffey was invited to two White House meals, and was able to tell White House correspondents that the President had authorized a power survey in the State. This might mean the expenditure of over \$50,000,000. This is the kind of vote-catching which, since Maine, has infuriated the impoverished Republicans. The President, in telling the newspapermen that he had not promised to help Sinclair, said it with such emphasis that he was interpreted as meaning he had no intention of giving any help. A few days later the unsavory Guffey got what Sinclair was not to have. The letter which came to Sinclair headquarters from Postmaster-General Farley made it appear at first that Sinclair was at least to get the blue ribbon of the party boss. But it was later explained that it was a form letter with a facsimile signature, and that even the note under the letter itself, handwritten in Mr. Farley's particular green ink, was a facsimile, too, added to all form letters to make them look more personal.

Reports from California indicate that Sinclair has lost ground since the primary. His indorsement by the American Federation of Labor should mean that he will carry San Francisco County. The support of the Utopians might actually decide the election, for their numbers are now reported as fantastically large, perhaps as great as 400,000. The assertion often made that even if elected Sinclair will be powerless because of a hostile legislature is denied by Sinclair's friends. They say that if he wins he will also have a majority in the lower house. He then could checkmate an obstructionist senate by free use of the referendum.

The word from Wisconsin is that Senator La Follette is ahead, but his brother will have a smaller vote for the governorship. Senator Fess apparently is beaten in Ohio. Senator Robinson in Indiana is enough on the defensive to have campaigned during the last few weeks wholly on local issues, after finding his attacks on the New Deal were not popular. His reelection is in doubt. Senator Vandenberg in Michigan made a similar change in tactics, and after beginning with outspoken criticism of the New Deal, softened his tone and found some things to praise. Unless there is a New Deal landslide, his reelection is probable, and he then would rank as one of the few eligibles for Republican standard bearer in 1936.

The President has tolerated an inference that he would like to see Bronson Cutting beaten in New Mexico by Representative Chavez. Not only is Farley giving Cutting's opponent all possible help in the interests of regularity, but the President appears as sponsor of the drive. Senator Robinson of Arkansas, as the Administration's man in the Senate, visited the White House to discuss the campaign and his own participation in it. Leaving the President, he announced his engagements as including two speeches against Cutting in New Mexico. What other meaning could be given this than that the President approved? Progressive Republicans will have cantankerous words to say on partisanship when Congress meets.

To listen to the Republicans, the decisive factor in the campaign is money, and the victory of the New Deal is being bought solely with expenditures for relief, public works, and crop restriction. Certainly many special payments have been timed to count as much as possible at the polls. But the Republicans, while suffering from this disadvantage, suffer, too,

from not having a modern program to offer the country. They are keenly aware of the costly time-lag in the present party routine, causing the campaign of 1934 to be fought on the repudiated platform of 1932. The Republican National Committee did formulate a set of principles for this year, but these are not authoritative, and are timorous and vague. They bind no candidate, and they are not forceful enough for these abnormal times.

The impression in Washington is that the New Deal in some specific details is losing ground in the country, yet the President, if anything, is more popular than ever. But his strength is due in part to the vacuum left in political life by the absence of an organic opposition. So long as a Republican Party platform composed many months before the crisis of 1933 is forced into use, and no one can bind the Republicans to anything more timely, the one-sidedness of the campaign is almost inevitable.

[Mr. Swing contributes a regular weekly letter from Washington.]

Fascism at Columbia University

By A SPECIAL INVESTIGATOR

RECENT events in Europe have again focused the attention of the American press on Italy. Compulsory military training for eight-year-old boys, Mussolini's insistence upon militarism, and his provocative challenge to Jugoslavia have recently aroused unfavorable comment in journals which last year had almost forgotten that Italy was the model upon which Hitler based his government by mass murder.

The visit to this country of 350 Italian students, many of them prominent athletes, was, of course, a propaganda move designed to win the friendliness of American university students to the fascist cause. With this fact in mind, it is refreshing to note that the *Columbia Spectator*, the student newspaper, carried on October 5 an editorial calling upon President Butler to take the same courageous, liberal stand against fascism which his colleague, President Conant of Harvard, took in the Hanfstängl incident. The same issue of the *Spectator* carried a front-page article by Sir Anthony Jenkinson, former Oxford student editor, deploring the apathy and inertia of American universities in regard to fascism.

The apathy and inertia which Sir Anthony deplors is nowhere better illustrated than in Columbia University itself. Presided over by one of America's leading liberals, Columbia should be the center of a campaign against all forms of fascist intolerance. In fact, President Butler only last spring, in a brilliant speech before the American Woman's Association, pointed out the dangers of fascism and communism and made a plea for a militant defense of American democratic ideals. Thus it is rather surprising that Dr. Butler says nothing about, and therefore presumably is not aware of, the subtle fascist propaganda within the walls of his own university. The center of this propaganda is the Casa Italiana. The Casa, a handsome seven-story building, is an integral part of the university, as are the library, the college, and the law school. It is the home of the activities of the Italian Department. And yet it has become an unofficial adjunct of the

Italian Consul-General's office in New York and one of the most important sources of fascist propaganda in America. Let us observe at the outset that while German Nazi propaganda has been for the most part clumsy and obvious, Italian fascist propaganda has been subtle and elaborate.

No liberal can quarrel with the principle that Columbia University must permit all varieties of political opinion, including fascism, to be freely expressed there. The Casa Italiana has consistently violated this principle, however, by refusing to permit, within its walls or in its publications, any expression of opinion at variance with fascist doctrine. In spite of definite attempts on the part of unbiased students, outstanding Italian liberals such as Count Sforza, Gaetano Salvemini, now a visiting professor at Harvard, and Guglielmo Ferrero have never been invited to speak at the Casa Italiana. The Casa has several rooms for Italian visitors to this country, but none except Fascists have been housed there. Most of the furniture for this center of fascist propaganda was donated by the Italian government.

It is not generally known that Giuseppe Prezzolini, the present director of the Casa Italiana, was in the days before fascism a crusading liberal. As editor-in-chief of the *Voce*, an Italian periodical published in Florence between 1908 and 1916, he attacked the corruption of the reactionary and demagogic regime of the period to such an extent that he was known throughout literary and political Italy as *l'uomo puro*, "the incorruptible." A good part of the activity of Prezzolini and his associates on the *Voce* consisted of attacks on the intellectual bombast of the pre-war nationalist movement, which later became the very keystone of the present fascist doctrine. Among the collaborators on the *Voce* were Benedetto Croce, the noted philosopher, Gaetano Salvemini, now in exile in America, Amendola, a courageous liberal who was killed by the Fascists for his part in the Aventine opposition after the murder of Matteotti in 1924, and Giovanni Papini, the author of "The Life of Christ." All these men, with