

Tuesday, June 18, 1940.

President Roosevelt stated today that he intended to present to Congress a proposal for compulsory military service in this country. Compulsary military service for all young men -- and <sup>maybe</sup> all young women. That's the astonishing part of it -- the young women.

At his press conference late today the President stated that this Universal Service would be military only in the ~~more~~ broader sense of the word. All the young men and <sup>maybe the</sup> women would not be trained for combat duty -- fighting in battle. The President listed the following categories -- combat service, duties in uniforms behind the battle front for technicians and mechanics, communications and aviation. Non-uniformed training, for work in industrial production necessary for an army in war. Conservation units, trained to prevent the resources of the nation from being wasted in time of war. So the President's plan does not mean that all young Americans would be trained for the infantry in the firing line, the artillery or war aviation.

What about the young women? That's the most interesting angle in this new proposal for military training.

The President was <sup>by</sup> ~~xx~~ no means definite or specific about the military training <sup>for</sup> that all the girls in the land <sup>It was maybe</sup> ~~would have to~~ get. He said <sup>it would be</sup> ~~that was~~ a problem -- to find various kinds of services for the feminine conscript. Hitherto young women have hardly been considered the right kind of man power for the infantry. <sup>#</sup> How long will the term of service be? One year. All the young men <sup>maybe the young</sup> and women to do compulsory service for a period of twelve months. The President said he was not quite ~~xx~~ decided just when he would present this program of Universal Service to Congress. It might be in three ~~xxx~~ weeks, it might be six weeks.

## ARMISTICE

The news is still a blank about armistice and peace conditions for ~~XXXXX~~ France. We know only two definite and precise things that happened today. First, Hitler and Mussolini agreed to give France an armistice and decided upon the terms. Second - this news was followed by a French order to continue the fighting, since no armistice had yet been ~~xxxxix~~ concluded.

The German and Italian dictators met in Munich, amid ~~juli~~ jubilant Nazi demonstrations. What transpired between them is a dead secret, save for this brief announcement:- "The Fuehrer and the Duce, in a conference at Munich today, agreed upon the attitude of both governments toward the French demand for an armistice." That's all we know officially.

There's this added detail - that the conference between Hitler and Mussolini was a long one, and that it was attended by the Berlin under-Secretary of State, who is the treaty-and-document-drafting-expert of the Hitler Foreign Office. The length of the conference and the presence of the treaty-and-document-expert were taken to indicate that some elaborate paper was drawn up. This in turn was regarded as indicating that Hitler and Mussolini had formulated terms, not merely for an

armistice, but also for a peace settlement with France.

What such peace terms may be is utterly ~~xxx~~ unknown; -  
*there*<sup>^</sup> is only guessing and speculation. The general opinion ~~xxxxxxxx~~  
expressed in ~~xxxx~~ Nazi Germany is that the harshest kind of  
treaty will be imposed on France. "A settlement ~~xxxx~~ ~~xi~~ without  
sentimentality," they're saying. Revenge for Versailles, the  
Germans getting even for the peace they had to sign at the end of  
the World War, the treaty they've hated for more than a score of  
years. The same opinion comes from the seat of the French  
Government at Bordeaux. Nothing official is given out, but the  
general French expectation is that Germany will probably demand  
Alsace-Lorraine and the whole northeastern section of industrial  
France. Italy demanding the familiar list - Savoy, Nice,  
Corsica, Tunis, Djibouti.

From Italy the word is mixed - ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ contradictory  
prognostications. There have been Italian rumors that France  
might even be required to give up territory to Spain, Japan,  
Belgium. Today, however, there were suppositions of a different  
sort. Suggestions were made that France might be offered a  
relatively mild peace - if. The meaning of the "if" is indicated

by Italian rumors along this line. That Germany and Italy might propose to France something more favorable than was suggested by Britain, the British offer to pool the French and British Empires. Then there's an Italian newspaper thought that a Hitler-Mussolini settlement with France might be based on the bitterness which the Italians say the French now feel toward the British. In those Roman rumors of mildness the cloven hoof is clear to be seen - the notion that France might be induced, might be tempted, to join with the totalitarian combination, which would make it easier for Germany and Italy to attack Great Britain. Accent on the French Fleet and the large French Colonial Armies.

This Machiavellian stuff is pretty vague, and it is only a mere element of rumor among contradictory rumors. However it does suggest a couple of alternatives. The treaty offered France may be a ~~ix~~ bitterly harsh one, which is likely. Or - it may be a relatively mild settlement based on the notion of France ~~ixx~~ tying up more or less with the Nazi Fascist ~~sixxxx~~ system, the Machiavellian slant. But we really know nothing - nothing about what Hitler and Mussolini today decided to demand of France for an armistice and for peace.

We are told that the decision of the ~~xxxxx~~ Munich

meeting is being transmitted to the French Government via Spain, by way of Franco. It is generally understood that ~~xxx~~ Marshal Petain's initial request for an armistice was sent to Franco for transmission to Hitler, <sup>as</sup> ~~All of which points to the correctness of what he heard on Friday, the inside information which xxx Wythe Williams provided and which I passed along, that xxx Marshal Petain was making armistice overtures to Germany by way of Franco.~~

However this all may be, the French Government up to now has not signed the Hitler-Mussolini terms for an armistice - not so far as the news relates. Instead, the French Ministry of National Defense at Bordeaux have <sup>s</sup> just ordered the French Army to go on fighting. With this went the statement that the Germans were using tricks in pushing their forces deeper and deeper into France, spreading the word that the war was over, trying to persuade French troops to lay down ~~xxx~~ their arms, using ~~xxx~~ white flags in some cases. So the Ministry of Defense broadcast an order in the following words, "No armistice has been affected. The duty of everyone therefore is to continue resistance."

All ~~xxx~~ of which gives no indication of whether or not

the French Government will accept the German-Italian terms,  
whatever they may be. No proof that ~~XXXXX~~ France is definitely  
out of the war.

ADD ARMISTICE

Here's a late flash just off the wire. From Spain  
comes the report that parts of the French Navy and Air Force  
are refusing to submit to peace with Germany. Madrid describes  
what it calls "massed<sup>S</sup><sub>A</sub> of French war planes speeding across the  
Balearic Islands. Balearic Islands, from France to the  
French possessions in Africa." This may be most significant,  
if the kind of French armed forces that can get away should  
refuse to stay in France for a peace with Germany and Italy.



CHURCHILL FOLLOW ARMISTICE

*Statesmen - and others - are discussing  
It's worth giving sharp attention to the declaration*

*that declaration*

made by Prime Minister Churchill in the House of Commons today.

Firstly, because he had a pointed thing to say about France making a separate peace with Germany and Italy. He referred to the Treaty of Alliance between France and Great Britain, the Treaty under which the two Allied nations entered the war. This pact provides that neither France nor Great Britain shall make a separate peace. Has London released Paris from that obligation? No, not

at all. Winston Churchill spoke these measured words:- "France's Government," said he, "will be throwing away great opportunities, and casting away their future, if they do not continue the war in accordance with their treaty obligations - from which we have not felt able to release them."

So a separate peace by France will constitute a treaty violation - according to the formal statement made by the British Prime Minister. Tie that in with those other words he spoke - about France's Government throwing away great opportunities and casting away their future. But if France stays in the war, Churchill had the following to say about that: "If final victory rewards our trials, France will share in the gain, and freedom

will be restored to all." <sup>H</sup> It all sounds like a British warning to France.

Winston Churchill today made another contribution to explain the catastrophe that befell the armies of the Allies. He blamed, as he had previously blamed, the French High Command for not withdrawing the Allied Northern Armies from Belgium and Northern France - immediately after it was clear that the Germans had broken through the little Maginot Line for a flanking drive. The immediate result of this mistake was the disaster of the pocket in Flanders. The British Expeditionary Force <sup>was then and there</sup> put out of action, as we all know, and a considerable part of the French Army lost. Today the Prime Minister estimated that in Flanders the French loss was fifteen or sixteen divisions. Which would figure to be more than two hundred and twenty-five thousand men - that much of the French Army put out of the fight. The total of British and French - some twenty-five divisions, lost in the Battle of Flanders. Churchill pointed to the subsequent ~~xxx~~ Battle of France, how bravely and tenaciously the French had fought in resisting the stupendous drive launched against Paris and beyond. And he added, "It may well be thought that twenty-five divisions of the best

trained and best equipped troops might have turned the scale."

How much aid did the British give to the French in the Battle of France? Churchill answered that also. Only three divisions, xxx said he. That was all that Great Britain could equip for battle.

Churchill sounded this ~~sententious~~ warning:- "The Battle of France is over," said he, "and the Battle of Britain is about to begin." <sup>H</sup> xxx What are the prospects for the Battle of Britain? The Prime Minister discussed that momentous question with the House of Commons. First of all, he admitted that there might be an invasion of Britain. Hitler might succeed in throwing invading troops onto the shore of <sup>now not so Merrie England,</sup> ~~the tight little isle,~~ Winston Churchill expressed this by saying that the British Navy did not pretend to be able to prevent raids of from five or ten thousand men flung across the sea, in the dark of night or on a foggy morning. But he pointed out that any really large scale invasion, the kind that might have a chance of ultimate success, would involve such an armada of ships that the Germans could never make the grade. Great Britain still has its Navy, said Churchill. Other weapons too, air force and mine fields. These would stop

any such mighty armada as would be needed for successful invasion. "It would be intercepted," said Winston Churchill, "long before it reached the coast."

People have been saying - if the Germans could get to Norway across the Skagerrak, why couldn't they get to England across the Channel? Prime Minister Churchill answered that one. He pointed out that Skagerrak and <sup>English</sup> Channel conditions are very different. He said the British Navy would be able to operate in the English Channel, as it was not able to do in the Skagerrak. Speaking of that, he <sup>added:-</sup> ~~said:-~~ "We were compelled to use only our submarines." Just as a reminiscence, that statement would seem to be final proof that there never was any battle of the Skagerrak; ~~that~~ the much headlined dash of the British Fleet into the Norwegian Strait - simply never happened. The only British ships in there were submarines.

The Prime Minister reiterated that Great Britain will go on fighting - alone, if necessary. Fighting - in collaboration with the British Dominions and with the supplies provided by the United States. What are the ultimate chances of the British winning the war? Winston Churchill displayed no complacent

optimism in answering that. He used these temperate words:-

"There are good and reasonable hopes of final victory."

And if Great Britain should lose? Winston Churchill, literary man of renown and master of the art of words, was at his most effective when he said:- "If we fail then the whole world, including the United States and all we have known and cared for, will sink into the abyss of a New Dark Age - made the <sup>more</sup> ~~more~~ sinister perhaps and more prolonged by the lights of a perverted science." That's a word picture - a Dark Age sinister with the lights of a perverted science.

DEFENSE

The proposal to give the United States a two-ocean fleet was illuminated by some figures today. The idea is, of course, that this nation should be defended by Atlantic squadrons superior to any naval power that Europe might have, and a Pacific Fleet to over-match anything that ~~xxxx~~ Asia might have to offer.

Today Admiral Stark, Chief of Naval Operations, told the House Naval Affairs Committee that the United States Navy should be increased by seventy per cent. The committee right now is considering the Naval Expansion Bill presented by the President. This calls for a boost of twenty-three per cent. Well - seventy per cent is a lot more. It would mean, said Admiral Stark, the addition of one million, two hundred and fifty thousand tons of warships. He suggested two hundred more fighting craft and a hundred thousand tons of auxiliary vessels. He estimated that the cost of ~~xxxxxx~~ seventy per cent naval expansion would be four billion dollars.

Naval circles in Washington are watching the European situation closely, with the focus of attention on the French Fleet. If the Navy of France were added to those of Italy and Germany, it would certainly alter the picture of European sea power. And European sea power right now is a governing factor in our own ~~moral~~ calculations.

POLITICS

In the world situation - there's a focus of attention on Philadelphia. In this time of tremendous decision in Europe, American international policy is of the utmost importance - the kind of policy we pursue, the wisdom and the effectiveness of it. And a good deal of that wisdom and effectiveness is likely to be decided next November. So this year our Presidential election is not merely a national affair, it's a world affair. And two events of key significance are the conventions of the two great parties. Philadelphia, Chicago. And Philadelphia <sup>is</sup> ~~comes~~ first <sup>on the</sup> ~~schedule~~.

The Republicans are certainly confronted with their problems, the way the picture in Europe is so swiftly changing - and every change affects the business of votes over here. What candidate to select? You can gaze into your favorite crystal ball for the answer. More immediate is the question - xxx what to put in the platform. Especially - what slant on the European conflict should the platform take? The Republican leading minds are debating that right now.

58  
The Program Committee is in charge of the preliminary job of selecting the planks and shaping them. The chairman is Dr. Glenn Frank. Today, he addressed the Republican platform

builders and denounced what he called the irresponsible powers assumed by President Roosevelt in foreign affairs. Talking about the President's stab-in-the-back declaration when Italy entered the war, Glenn Frank described it in these words, "an informal declaration of war." He accused the President of actions in the international field which were not okayed by Congress. "Millions of both parties in this country," said the Chairman of the Republican Platform Committee, "are distrustful of this administration, which proceeds on its own hook to assume responsibilities in Europe that Congress has not authorized."

Republican spokesmen are pressing along the line <sup>at the same time</sup> that President Roosevelt has been leading us to war and <sub>^</sub> keeping us in a state of defenseless disarmament. G.O.P. presidential possibilities proclaim sympathy with the Allies, and hostility toward war. You might describe the policy they advocate as - pro-Ally and anti-war. Yet here again that question of terminology comes to mind, the question I mentioned last night - can we correctly continue to speak of the Allies? or is it now - Britain and ~~xxx~~ British?

8th

29

59th

+