

WEEKLY NEWS ANALYSIS By Farnham F. Dudgeon

Lack of 'Friends, Men and Guns' Hurt French Cause, Says Petain; U. S. 'Coalition' Cabinet Selected

(EDITOR'S NOTE—When opinions are expressed in these columns, they are those of the news analyst and not necessarily of this newspaper.)
Released by Western Newspaper Union.



If all Henry Ford's tentative orders to turn out warplanes on a mass production basis materialize, this gigantic tool and die plant in his River Rouge, Michigan, plant will become the hub of the plane-motor industry. It is now the center of production for Ford motor cars and government defense engineers point out that once tools and dies are completed and set up to turn out a standardized plane, mass production could begin and continue at top speed indefinitely.

(Mass Production.)

THE WAR: 'Too Few'

While his armies were busy with "mopping up" military operations against a badly battered France, Adolf Hitler busied himself preparing the terms under which his soldiers would cease firing.

France, meanwhile, after cautioning her troops to fight on until the actual signing of an armistice was announced, dispatched her peace envoys in a snow white plane to meet the Germans and hear their terms of surrender.

As the nation waited, its 84-year-old premier, Marshal Henri Petain, explained why he had sought peace and why France had been unable to defend itself against invasion. France, he said, had too few friends, too few young men, too few guns and it had wasted the victory years following the armistice of November 11, 1918.

Military deficiencies accounted in large part for the distress of France, in the premier's opinion. He pointed out that only 2,700,000 troops faced the Germans at the beginning of the "battle of France" along the Somme and Aisne rivers. This was a half million fewer than France had on the battlefield after three years of hard fighting in the World war. England had not nearly as many men on French soil in 1940 as she had in 1914-18, and in addition, the old ally, Italy, was an enemy and ally United States a "neutral."

Biggest worry of ally England was the disposition of the French fleet following any armistice between France and Germany. If Germany gets control of the whole strength of this fleet, the Rome-Berlin axis will have sea power that could compete favorably against England's armada.

London was happy enough though over the appointment of Frank Knox and Henry Stimson to President Roosevelt's cabinet (See below). The British hailed this move as assuring a continued policy of U. S. material and moral aid to the allied cause.

THE PRESIDENCY:

Coalition

No respecter of precedent, but respected even by his enemies as a master political strategist, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, distracted little from his reputation in these two categories with his pre-G. O. P. convention appointment of Frank Knox and Henry L. Stimson to his cabinet. These two important Republican leaders were asked to serve in what was termed a "coalition" cabinet—Knox as secretary of navy and Stimson as secretary of war. Knox was the Republican vice presidential candidate in 1936 and Stimson served as secretary of state in the Hoover administration. Both have

NAMES in the news

President of Yale university, Charles Seymour, warned his graduating class against a "complacent attitude" toward the serious challenge that totalitarian states have thrust at democracy.

Catching Pose



Here is 81-year-old Governor Luren D. Dickinson of Michigan, as he appeared last year in an "Old Timers" baseball game staged in Detroit. The governor now announces he has switched from catching baseballs to votes and will be a candidate for reelection.

INDUSTRY:

New Competition

Many are the economists who have forecast a trade war between Germany and the United States after Adolf Hitler has finished his political and military war in Europe. It now appears that the Nazis are not going to wait for a final cleanup of Europe before launching this type of attack upon the American markets.

For from South America comes news that German steel companies are offering steel in that sector at prices below United States quotations and are giving a cash guarantee of delivery by October. To some observers this early beginning of the long awaited trade war seems a bit premature. For Adolf Hitler still has a few big obstacles to overcome before he can expect to compete with American business in this hemisphere.

Germany bases her ability to deliver these shipments of steel upon the fact that she has virtual control of 95 per cent of the French steel industry and this, plus the Reich's own output, combined with the Belgium-Luxembourg production, amounts to about 40,000,000 tons per year. Biggest problem is keeping all these steel mills running at capacity and still being able to maintain order throughout the "protected" nations. And after the steel is produced, Germany must reckon with Britain's still-effective sea blockade.

Slump

Petroleum, another industry which has a big stake in foreign markets, has a more immediate problem on its hands. In Texas, oil reserve tanks are almost full, prices are slipping every day, and foreign markets are near collapse. That state's railroad commission, which controls the output of oil, is studying the problem and is considering a 30-day shutdown of producing wells to boost prices.

LATIN AMERICA:

Tangle

Latin American nations are at present in default of some \$1,000,000,000 worth of bonds held by U. S. investors. To the development of additional foreign trade and in the meeting of foreign competition in this hemisphere (see Industry) this default creates a huge stumbling block.

Economic relations between nations become difficult when debts pile up and as U. S. business has lost many of its foreign markets due to war in Europe, the federal government is making every effort to untangle the debt problem in the Latin American nations.

One current proposal is to launch a huge government loan program to the Latin American nations and give them a chance to make payments on their debts, eventually repaying the United States on a long-term basis. President Roosevelt is expected to outline details of this plan within a short time.

MISCELLANY:

Democratic National Chairman James A. Farley officially released the information that William D. Bankhead of Alabama, speaker of the house of representatives, will be named temporary chairman and keynoter of the party's national convention, which convenes in Chicago, July 15. Sen. Alben W. Barkley of Kentucky will be named permanent chairman.

Bruckart's Washington Digest

U. S. National Defense Program Needs Careful Study by Public

President Roosevelt's 'Stab-in-the-Back' Speech Causes Nation to Consider Carefully Any Preparedness Suggestions or Military Policies.

By WILLIAM BRUCKART
WNU Service, National Press Bldg., Washington, D. C.

WASHINGTON.—There are many persons throughout the country who are growing more and more disturbed—not to say alarmed—at the dangers inherent in the administration's so-called defense program. More and more persons are asking aloud for something in the way of an explanation, and more and more one meets with situations and conditions in the defense program that cause doubts to arise.

The climax to this circumstance appears to have developed with the speech which President Roosevelt made at the University of Virginia—the pronouncement that has come to be known as the Charlottesville speech—early in June. From the words uttered there by the President of the United States has come a wide division of opinion on the course our nation is being guided. Unless I am incapable of reading signs, we will hear reverberations of that speech for weeks to come.

And it is not strange that people everywhere should talk about that speech! It was remarkable. Some folks said it was "amazing." But however you wish to characterize it,



SENATOR VANDENBERG
From neutrals to non-belligerents.

there can be no doubt that Mr. Roosevelt spoke with great depth of feeling when he described Dictator Mussolini almost personally as a man who stabbed his neighbor—France—in the back. Nor can anyone doubt that the President spoke the mind of a vast majority of the American people. They feel that way about Mussolini's cowardly decision to join with his bloodthirsty axis partner, Hitler.

But it is not a question of how you feel or how I feel, as individuals. Mr. Roosevelt is President of the United States. As such, it is difficult, if not utterly impossible, to separate himself as an individual from the presidency of a great nation. And if it were possible, millions of persons throughout the world still would regard whatever he says as the statement of the President, and therefore the statement of the United States, as a nation. There is a difference.

President's Official Statement Carries Much Importance

So, regard it as an official view. There can be no distinction. Thus, it becomes a matter of grave importance. The head of a nation that is officially neutral, as between the allies and the dictators, has uttered words that place the United States formally on the side of the allies and he did it without approval of congress. The congress, it is to be remembered, is the body authorized by the Constitution to declare war and congress has taken no such decision. The President's Charlottesville declarations, therefore, can be termed unwise at the best, and probably will be subjected to much more virulent descriptions before the year is out.

Now, another phase of the defense preparations that is causing concern. I refer to the policy of supplying government-owned war stocks for use of the allies.

It happens that the United States signed, and the senate of the United States ratified, what is called the Hague convention. This is an agreement among nations of all the world which sets down certain terms and rights and obligations called international law. Article 6 of the Hague convention states:

"The supply, in any manner, directly or indirectly, by a neutral

power to a belligerent power, of warships, ammunition or war materials of any kind whatever is forbidden."

Policy 'Short of War' Has 'Official' Approval

It is to be recalled, moreover, that the President has consistently stated that the United States must do "everything short of war" to aid the allies in their struggle. That policy has been put forward officially so many times that it seems to occasion no surprise any more. It ought to cause surprise, however, because it is not the pronouncement of a neutral nation.

Senator Vandenberg of Michigan accurately described the picture when he said the other day that President Roosevelt's policies had taken us out of the role of neutrals and have made of us "a non-belligerent nation on the allied side." The Michigan senator had no quarrel with building up a real defense program and he wanted to see that done. But Senator Vandenberg, like many others, fears there are things being done that may sooner or later be held to be an act of war. And when that happens, in we go whether we are ready or not—and the United States has very little at this stage of the game with which to fight!

My own feeling is that the national government can give freedom to its citizens to help the allies in any direction that they see fit or are able to help. But the United States, as a nation, and Mr. Roosevelt, as President, must be careful of where the whole people are led. These things that I have mentioned and countless others, each constitutes a half step. Many half steps, even taken slowly, will take us to the brink, and then it is ever so easy to topple off.

'Stop Hitler' Movement Is Another Serious Problem

Another situation ought to be discussed, because it is part and parcel of the whole problem. Every day and almost in every way, we hear or read statements by persons of official position as well as thousands of self-appointed saviors of the nation that all of this defense preparation, all of these vast expenditures, all of the emergency actions, are necessary and warranted because "Hitler must be stopped before he gets over here."

I believe there is something like 90 per cent of the citizens of this country who look upon Hitler as the greatest criminal of the ages. They hope that his power can somehow be wrested from him and that his physical body can be made to stand the tortures of the damned. On the other hand, and while still holding that hatred of the man mainly responsible for the deluge of blood, is it not better to use common sense in making preparations for the eventualities that some of the leaders now profess to see? It strikes me that common sense, if allowed to rule over the hysteria that has been promoted in this country, would produce vastly better results in the way of a national defense structure which all agree we require.

From many persons who have seen the carnage of the current war and from many others who are familiar with the lives and living conditions of Europeans, I have become convinced that whether Hitler wins or loses or whether there is a stalemate, the insane leader of the German reich will face a far greater problem than any he has met in battle. It will be the condition of stark and real famine and pestilence. It will come after the war just as surely as night follows day. All of Europe will be involved, and the price of war will be paid.

My information is that this year of untended crops, this year of destruction of men, is leaving Germany, especially, and most of the others as well, without a semblance of a storehouse of food. The fighting men were withdrawn from production early. Moreover, food rationing started in this war in its first weeks, whereas it was not used in the first World war until late in the second year and then to a less degree than now. There is the "machine" that will stop Hitler from coming over here, and it will be effective.

I repeat, therefore, that we can prepare to defend ourselves, but we need not be hysterical about it.

Speaking of Sports

Sarazen, Like Old Man River, Keeps Rolling

By ROBERT McSHANE
(Released by Western Newspaper Union.)

That sturdy little Roman, Gene Sarazen, gave golfdom one of its major thrills a short time ago when the fates decided that he and Lawson Little should battle it out for the forty-fourth National Open championship.

Little won the match, and no one denies that his was a gallant victory. But it was a sad blow to the thousands of fans who have rooted for Gene during the past 20 years. They took consolation in the fact that the 18-hole playoff was just as exciting as could be expected in a man-to-man duel between two of the greatest match players who ever lived.

Cocky and courageous, Sarazen has won virtually all the honors offered to a professional golfer. Thirty-eight years old, this was his twenty-first National Open tournament after his debut at Toledo's Inverness course. He won the Open in 1922, and again in 1932.

Standouts of the 30's

Looking back over the Terrific Thirties, one can find but a handful of standout golfers. The handful includes Ralph Guldahl, Sam Snead, Harry Cooper, and a few more. Most of the big names featured in today's golfing news belong to the Johnny-come-latelies—the boys who look good during a particularly hot stretch, and then settle down to a less publicized mediocrity.

Gene won all six of the major championships, five of them during the thirties. In 1932 he won both the U. S. and the British Open crowns, establishing a scoring record in England. In 1933 he won the Professionals' match play tournament. Two years later he scored his still famous double-eagle to tie Craig Wood and win the Augusta



GENE SARAZEN

Masters' in a playoff. He was Western Open champion in 1930 and Metropolitan king in 1925.

Sarazen backers will concede that one other man was a consistently better golfer. That was Bobby Jones. From the time the Emperor Jones won his first title in 1923 until he finished competition the top man of them all was never without a title. He won 13 major championships, including the 1930 grand slam of the National Open, the National Amateur, the British Open and the British Amateur.

When Jones entered a tournament it was always him against the field. That can't be said about Sarazen or any other player since Jones' time.

Gene Calls the Turn

Gene called the turn about two months ago. He couldn't, he said, see any reason why, at his age, he shouldn't still be good enough to win. He planned on entering a few tournaments, getting plenty of practice, and then going out for bigger game. The success of his strategy almost made a third-time Open champion of him, and must have been a surprise even to himself.

There'll be no forgetting Sarazen's semi-final finish to gain a tie with Little. Needing to come back in 34 strokes, two under par, the Connecticut farmer picked up birdies at the eleventh and thirteenth. He got them by holing a bad eight-foot putt on the sixteenth, a terrific 30-footer on the seventeenth, and just missing a 60-foot attempt for a birdie that would have won the title for him on the eighteenth hole.

When the tournament was over Sarazen knew that youth finally had been served. Tournaments as tough as the Open are won by younger men—players whose muscles are elastic, who can shake quickly the effects of a grueling, punishing round against heart-breaking competition.

GENERAL HUGH S. JOHNSON Says:

Washington, D. C.

WHY WE MUST STAY OUT
Apart from emotion, there are three compelling reasons why we should now stay out of war. (1) We not only have nothing to put in but due to criminal neglects, we are defenseless on our own shores. (2) Our great need is time to prepare our defense and, on all the facts, and the opinion of all competent experts, we could have from 18 months to three years if we do not invite every danger we fear and rush headlong into a situation we are now totally unable to handle. (3) If we stay out of this thing and become strong, we shall have a voice in the outcome. If we go in, by our present weakness foredoomed to defeat, we shall just be another Hitler trophy—"voe victis"—woe to the vanquished.

In the post World War "cordon sanitaire," France incited the little countries to threaten Germany on her promise of help—and then neglected to remain able to help. On the same formula, Britain encouraged Poland to resist on England's "guaranty" of assistance and was wholly unable to help. Similarly, for domestic politics, we are holding out false hopes to England and France and have incited them to war.

All those small nations are gone—nine of them. France and England are responsible. France also is gone. England is going. We are repeating the same ghastly international immorality and suicide. For God's sake let's keep out—at least long enough to get ready to get in.

ISAIAH 1935-1940

For long this writer has insisted that Mussolini is a mess and recently predicted his June 10 raving and called it a "stab in the back of France." We have all finally awakened to our own miserably inadequate defense and the pitiful defenselessness of the allies. But all that is no excuse for flopping around like a beheaded hen. The administration should have made it clear much earlier and more calmly. It knew but, for political reasons, was not frank.

The very first issue of this column, March 15, 1935, now reads like the Prophet Isaiah. It discussed the dumb inactivity of the allies, discussed what Hitler was preparing in rearmament with his excellent industries, and said in part:

"Today the French army with its allies could march from one end of Europe to the other—but not after the Germans rearm with modern equipment. Fully equipped, they would be a military nation far superior to the French and . . . on no provocation at all could bring down on the world a new 1914 or worse . . . This mad move of Hitler's starts catastrophe on the way . . . he stops at nothing—ethics, mercy or humanity—and he certainly would not be stopped by a political boundary or so slight-a consideration as the peace of the world . . . With the vim, vigor and vivacity of a man whose house is threatened by a vast conflagration we should immediately . . . provide for the mobilization of our wealth, property and industry as well as our manpower."

That was written five years ago. Although the disastrous future was then that clear and that avoidable, we and the allies did little.

Since 1933, when this writer helped to persuade congress to authorize ample funds to mechanize and motorize the army, he has been clamoring—many times every year—about our complete military impotency in modern land and air weapons and trying to dramatize the now bloodily proved helplessness of troops who do not have them against those who do.

With this in view, more than four years later, while the allies, bluffing on the bob-tailed flush of their similar defaults in defense, sought to prevent Hitler from retaking the German City of Danzig and the Polish Corridor from the dictatorship of Poland, this writer predicted the effect of the Russian development and accurately (within 36 hours) that Hitler would march.

On this reasoning it said, among several other times, on August 23, 1939, ". . . if our peace and perhaps our fate are to be decided on this statemanship of Britain and France . . . we certainly are in a hell of a fix . . . Let's run our own policy and not turn it over to Mr. Chamberlain . . . We are not remotely prepared for war and neither is England or France. Hitler is. If we assent to or engage in a fight, let's choose an occasion which concerns us and a time at which we have at least a Chinaman's chance."