

WEEKLY NEWS ANALYSIS BY ROGER SHAW

German Flyers Slash at Britain; American Republics Sign Pact; U. S. Studies 'Peacetime Draft'

(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.)



This new streamlined mobile station of the U. S. Army Recruiting service is shown as it was put into service at Bradenton, Fla., with a prospective soldier already taking the first step towards "warrior" status. If and when Congress approves the Burke-Wadsworth bill, the army is ready to put into effect a selective compulsory military training program, in which event the coaxing of recruits will become a lost art.
(See—The Draft.)

THE WAR: Mostly Aerial

The war was becoming increasingly aerial and submarine in its essential nature. The armies were quiet, for they had little to do. The Germans had released the Dutch, Norse and Belgian war prisoners, and sent them home on parole. Some 250,000 Polish prisoners were expected to be next, with the French not too far behind. The German troops were playing "skat" in weary garrison duty, from the Arctic circle down to Portugal, and they were infiltrating into Spain. It looked as if the Spanish and Rumanians might enter the war on the German side, and already the British foreign office was trying to back up little Bulgaria in its claims for some Rumanian territory.

Russia, the bear that walks like a man, as Kipling put it, increased its Soviet hold on the three small Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and on the Rumanian province of Bessarabia as well. But the prospect of German-Russian warfare did not appear to be very likely. The European continent was quieting, and it was slowly consolidating in its new "continental" form. The Germans, Rumanians, Hungarians, and Bulgarians conferred at Salzburg, in what used to be Austria. Over the conference loomed the red shadows of Stalin and the Stalinites.

?????

The aerial losses of Germans and British were so conflicting, in the reports, that nobody could hope to judge. So were the amounts of damage done, but the unhappy Dutch were probably suffering as severely as anybody, along with the English east coast and the German Rhineland. It was indecisive, criminal, and stupid. Rumors of peace continued on all sides, and the conflicting radios blared incessantly. Definitely, the Vatican was peace-minded, and so were the Hollanders and (it was variously reported) General Goering and Mr. Lloyd George. Would the lightning-war Blitzkrieg turn into a Blitzfried, or lightning peace?

HAVANA: The 21

The 21 American republics and "republics" found out, at Havana, that the Argentine was the chief stumbling block. This generally happens at Pan-American get-togethers, for the following reasons: The Argentine is pure white—much purer than the United States. It is two-thirds Hispanic, and a third sturdy North Italian, extremely good stock. It is prouder than Punch, and ultra-patriotic. It con-

NAMES ... in the news

¶ Mrs. Daisy Borden Harriman, the American lady ambassador to Norway, was reported en route home, on the U. S. army transport American Legion—in company with the Yankee ministers to Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, recently absorbed by Soviet Russia.

siders itself the natural leader and champion of Spanish America, against Uncle Sam, Hitler, and the Mikado alike. Argentines think that Mexico, Cuba, Bolivia, etc., should take advice from themselves—and not from the Yankee Colossus, as they call the Americans. Ireland generally throws a monkey wrench into British imperial conferences, and Dr Leopoldo Melo has been doing approximately the same thing, to the secret distress of Secretary Hull.

As the conference ended the 21 nations signed a pact, known as the "Act of Havana," which provided for "provisional administration" of any European owned possessions in this hemisphere "if a non-American state shall attempt to replace another non-American state, thus threatening the peace of the continent."

THE DRAFT: Conscripts?

What about universal military service in peace time? That was a burning question before all the Americans. Some of the best military critics opposed it as inefficient, and the Republican Senator Vandenberg and the Democratic Senator Wheeler did not seem to like it either. Neither did the pacifists, nor many of the isolationists. A real congressional debate over the issue was taking definite shape.

Was it scientific, in the light of modern warfare, which demands highly trained small groups of mechanical specialists, like tankmen and flyers and motor-minded technicians? Perhaps it was. Perhaps it was not. There was need for cool, hard rationalizing, and no place for hysteria or emotionalism. Some of the best generals were for it, and so were many public-spirited citizens. By and large, American youth seemed to be anti-conscript, and some people linked interventionism with the proposed draft. It was a fair field for patriotic debate, and intelligent study. Many good U. S. nationalists went at it in that enlightened spirit.

BRETONS: From Britain

Early in the Middle ages, a lot of frightened Celts escaped from Britain and settled across the channel in France. They called their new home "Brittany" in honor of their old home. The people that chased them out of Britain were the heathen Anglo-Saxons, who changed Britain into Anglo-land (England.) The Bretons kept on speaking Celtic, and they refused to join France politically until about 1500. When the great French revolution came, in 1789, they resisted it by force for eight long years, for they were backward and ultra-conservative.

Of late years, they learned about independence from the Celtic nationalists of Ireland, and a Breton nationalist movement got going. When war broke out last fall, Premier Daladier jailed some of the Breton nationalists, along with other "dangerous" elements. This was a mistake. It made the Bretons pro-German. Now, with German help, a new and semi-independent Brittany may be set up: its capital at Rennes.



By LEMUEL F. PARTON
(Consolidated Features—WNU Service.)

WHO'S NEWS THIS WEEK

NEW YORK.—J. B. Priestly and the U. S. A. got along nicely together until his play, "Time and the Conways," began to make trouble in 1937. In this play, Mr. Priestly went metaphysical and conjured time into fourth dimensional unreality. Perhaps because they had long felt the urgency and reality of a newspaper deadline, the American dramatic critics didn't quite get it and scored the play as just so-so and maybe not even that. Mr. Priestly said they were rude and boorish about it and challenged not only their time sense, but their sense of propriety and their fitness for their jobs.

That must have gone deeply under Mr. Priestly's skin, since, as the "Voice of England" at a moment when time, at any rate seems to be real, he takes a short-wave, short jab at radio commentators in this country. He thinks that "people who are not prepared to fight anything, anywhere" should mind their manners and not belittle others who can and will fight. While that may not necessarily make "Time and the Conways" a good play, it reveals Mr. Priestly, and no doubt England, as ready to meet all comers, and that seems all to the good. Perhaps when television comes, we'll be saying, "Smile when you say that, pardner."

This reporter, having once talked with Mr. Priestly, can testify that he has a nice smile. While his estimate of our present or potential belligerency may have been somewhat tactless, in his novels and magazine articles he has shown much more sound discernment of the American scene than the writings of certain other visiting Britons, who kiss and run and thereafter engage in long-distance smearing. He, at any rate, said his say while he was here.

Mr. Priestly, 46 years old, took honors in literature and history at Cambridge, went to London from his native Yorkshire and found the literary ladder just an escalator. His novel, "The Good Companions," was his first big success. This reader thought there was deep insight in his "Midnight in the Desert," written after his stay in Arizona, with his family. In his routine short-wave address, he stresses the common cultural ties of England and America, without being oily about it and has seemed to this hearer an effective special pleader. But he does seem to look on our critics as alien parachute-jumpers, or even something less admirable.

THE professor who pieces out the dinosaurs from a single bone has a distinct advantage over interpreters of world events. Nobody can dispute him. This writer has just finished reading a magazine article of 1934 about Lieut. Gen. Eiki Tojo of Japan, in which it is made clear that he is typical of the headstrong army caste, sure to destroy itself, and that quickly.

But here today is General Tojo named war minister in the new army cabinet which seems bent on destroying anybody or anything rather than itself. In the short view, at least, the dinosaurs of totalitarianism are subject to laboratory observation—but only in the short view, close to a deadline.

Little is known about General Tojo in this country, but available data indicate that his rise to power will not be reassuring to those who look for peaceful, pleasant solutions of world discord. His betes noir are the U. S. A. and Russia.

Like Pericles of Greece, he advanced himself by kicking up war scares. He agrees with the doctrine of Adolf Hitler, expounded in "Mein Kampf," that all alliances are push-overs and that the only tough and durable nation is the one that stands alone. He is smart, hard-boiled, resourceful and contemptuous of theories, sentiments, and negotiations. He is of an un-reconstructed feudal family, and has been in the army since his early youth.

Bruckart's Washington Digest

New U. S. Political Alignment Is Now Taking Definite Shape



Banter at the Fight Camps.

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

WASHINGTON.—Something like four years ago, I wrote in these columns an expression of belief that President Roosevelt would be the instrumentality of our era to bring about a realignment of political groupings in the United States. I wrote, then, that his own thoughts and actions, together with the sources of the advice he was accepting, would bring about this result whether Mr. Roosevelt so intended or not.

The prediction that I made in November, 1936 was based upon what I believed likely to be the principles to which Mr. Roosevelt would adhere in his second administration. There was no intimation at that time, however, that Mr. Roosevelt could, or would, be a nominee for a third term as President. Even without that indication, the wide breach between the conservatives of both Democratic and Republican parties, on the one hand, and the advisors that surrounded the President seemed certain to accomplish the end that I then predicted.

With Mr. Roosevelt seeking his third term under the Democratic label, and Wendell Willkie running as the Republican nominee, there surely can no longer be any doubt that the campaign of 1940 will see a complete and very unusual shift among voters. The closing of the polls on November 5 will have recorded, I believe, probably the greatest transition in political thought alignment that our nation ever has known.

An assertion so broad requires an explanation. An explanation of the reasons can go only to the fundamentals of the circumstance. That brings the statement that, in the minds of many long-experienced politicians, the issues are going to be more sharply defined this fall than in most any campaign within the recollection of this observer.

Issue of Third Term Will Be Hotly Debated

First, anyone who doubts that the Republicans and anti-third term Democrats are going to let the third term issue pass unnoticed must be somewhat "teched" in the head. From what is now plainly visible, every fact and every possible supposition about a third term, or the tradition against any man staying in the White House for 12 years, will be filling the air and the newspapers from the moment that Mr. Willkie's speech of formal acceptance is recorded. It is much too obvious to pass by also, that the Roosevelt opponents will accuse him of every type of malicious design and insincerity which clever political brains can conjure into written or spoken word.

From many sources among Democrats who are sticking to party faith and doctrine, always heretofore strongly resentful of the third term idea, I hear that preservation of the party, itself, depends upon preventing Mr. Roosevelt from becoming the first person to have three consecutive terms. It is too early to say whether those Democrats will be effective in their aid to the Roosevelt opponents, but, whatever their numbers are, they tell me of their decision to regain control of the Democratic label.

The war within the Democratic party itself together with the third term issue, therefore, presents the basis for a tremendous shift of par-

ty strength. It forms the basis for one phase of that realignment for which I spoke. If those Democrats fail to regain control of the party—and they were beaten down in the Chicago convention by the well-oiled New Deal faction's machine—the conservative wing of the Democratic party has no place else to go, save to the Republican side. Some of them, like Vice President Garner, who was so completely ignored that his name hardly was mentioned at Chicago, doubtless will go a-fishing. There will be quite a few of those. The question yet to be answered is, how many will be active in the campaign?

Relief and Farm Vote Should Go to Roosevelt

On the other hand, Mr. Roosevelt will gain some votes from the other side. He will get a large percentage of the relief votes again, as he did in 1936, and he will have perhaps as much as 40 per cent of the farm vote, or that is the guess of men who know political thought in agricultural areas.

The President's foreign policies have proved attractive to certain elements in this country, and obviously they are going to stick with the man who has helped their fatherlands.

From these three angles—the relief, the farm and the foreign vote—we see a regrouping along new lines. The relief and the farm votes may be said to have been held by the President before, but that is not quite an accurate statement. The realignment, in these two cases, appears to be something of a settling down process.

Willkie Supporters Will Woo All Disgruntled Democrats

From the Willkie camp, observers cannot fail to note how plans are being made to give a haven to dissatisfied Democrats. Moreover, those same plans take into account the need for a political home for that portion of the farm and labor vote which has a desire to find new affiliations. It is very clear that the Roosevelt farm program has not won complete endorsement, and the Republicans have the feeling, too, that the actions of the National Labor Relations board which surely has been influenced by John L. Lewis and his C. I. O. have not helped the New Deal team with William Green's A. F. of L.

There have been so many complaints from business men, great and small, about the bungling and the waste in Washington that Mr. Willkie can be expected to hold most of that vote. He can be expected also to have whatever influence that segment of national life has in persuading workers to turn to the Republicans.

And with respect to the third term, already guns have begun to bark out their missiles of criticism of the Roosevelt "draft" by the Chicago convention. They are saying thus early that the "draft" was no draft at all; that Mr. Roosevelt carefully planned the machinery by which he would be "drafted," and that his release of the delegates on the eve of the convention voting was a gesture so painfully sour that it serves as proof of the President's lack of capacity as a politician. They are charging also that Postmaster General Farley knew there was no draft movement, except that which the President prompted, and that is why he is fading out of politics and becoming a baseball club president.