

L.J. - Sunoco. Tuesday, March 9, 1943.

This news day began with a Number One question-mark -- Did Admiral Standley make his Moscow statement on his own? Or, was he speaking for the United States Government? Did his exceedingly sharp words express his own personal opinion given to newspapermen on the spur of the moment? Or did Washington know and approve what he was going to say in his press conference with American and British correspondents in the Soviet capital?

A mighty big and important question-mark -- considering what our Ambassador to the Soviet Union had to say. He declared that the Stalin Government is deliberately keeping the Russian people ignorant of the war help that the United States is extending to the Red Army - the Russians not being told about Lend-Lease. He indicated that the American people were being misled - in giving millions of their dollars to help

the Soviets, when the Russian people are not permitted to know about it. And the American Ambassador added that, unless Congress ~~xxxx~~ felt that Russia was being helped by Lend-Lease, Congress might be reluctant to continue the Lend-Lease program - the bill being up for renewal right now.

It was all very blunt - Admiral Standley being that way. He is an old time sailor, who rose to the post of chief of naval operations of the American fleet, and his conversation is inclined to be salty and to the point.

In the background of his forthright remarks, was that much debated statement by Stalin, who is ~~xxx~~ also given to strong, blunt words. A couple of weeks ago, Stalin spoke the following: "In view of the absence of a second front in Europe, the Red Army alone is bearing the whole weight of the war," *said he.* Which certainly

did omit the help that Russia is getting from both the United States and Great Britain, and paid no attention to the Allied offensive in North Africa as a means of

drawing Nazi strength from the Russian front. *And he ignored the tremendous British-American air bombings of Germany.*

Today in Washington, newsmen made a beeline to the White House to propound that burning question - Did Admiral Standley speak only for himself or for the United States Government? A presidential news conference was scheduled for today, and that promised to be most interesting - the newsmen putting the question to President Roosevelt. At the White House, the word was - the news conference was called off - to which ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ Presidential Secretary Steve Early added that comment on Admiral Standley's remarks would be given by Acting Secretary of State Sumner Welles. So that put the focus of interest on the State Department, a Sumner Welles news conference. This duly convened, and the question

was promptly answered. The Acting Secretary of State declared that Admiral Standley was giving merely his own opinion, and was not speaking for Washington.

He stated specifically that the Admiral had not consulted Washington about what he said to the newsmen ^{in Moscow} ₁

49 What about the correctness of the ambassadorial statements? Is it true that the Soviet Government is keeping the Russian people in ignorance of the American aid it is getting? The Acting Secretary of State had nothing to say about that. He explained that he would make no comment until he had an official report on what the Admiral said. ~~"I have," he explained, "cabled Ambassador Standley, asking him to let us have the text of what remarks he may have made,"~~ said Sumner Welles.

Later, however, a State Department spokesman declared that on January Twenty-Third, the official Soviet newspaper, PRAVDA, published the facts of

American and British aid to the Soviets, - PRAVDA printed Russian aid figures given out at that time by American Lend-Lease Administrator Stettinius. And this same comment was echoed by Congressman ~~Set~~ Bloom, Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. He referred to the publication of the Stettinius report in PRAVDA and added the following: "The people of Russia, seeing and using a great multitude of United States and British Lend-Lease supplies," said he, "must of necessity know of the Lend-Lease aid."

50
Much the same thing was stated by Congressman Johnson of Texas, who added that he thought Admiral Standley had, in the Congressman's words, "got his facts mixed up a bit."

All of which puts the focus of interest on the actual words that Admiral Standley used. He said:

"I have carefully looked for an admission in the Russian press that they have received material aid from America. Yet," he ^{(continued,} ~~added,~~ "I fail to find any real acknowledgment of it." The point would seem to be - what constitutes "real acknowledgment."

^{stated}
Admiral Standley ~~added,~~ that foreign newsmen had been told by Russian generals that Soviet troops at the front were getting no American armament except trucks. To which the Admiral added: "They are getting plenty of other kinds of material. If it's not at the front, I don't know what they are doing with it."

^{TP} After which we may note some official figures given out in February, figures showing that up to that time the United States and Great Britain had sent to the Red Army six thousand, two hundred tanks and five thousand, six hundred warplanes.

The attitude taken today by Acting Secretary

Sumner Welles indicated decided disapproval of Admiral Standley - his tone suggested a rebuke. And that led to the immediate surmise that the Admiral might be recalled from Moscow - because of what he said about the official Soviet attitude toward Lend-Lease.

One interesting sidelight is given by Washington Correspondent Lyle Wilson of the United Press. He tells us of an incident that occurred in Moscow at the time of Wendell Willkie's visit to the Soviet capital. A great public banquet was given, with Willkie in attendance - and also the British Ambassador. Stalin made a speech, and created a sensation when he denounced the London Government for taking a hundred and eighty-three fighter planes that were being sent from the United States to Russia. Stalin used the exceedingly blunt word - "stealing." This - in the presence of the British Ambassador.

52
Apparently, the Soviet war leader had the facts wrong. The planes shipped from the United States and destined for Russia had been diverted. They had been taken; - but, not by the British. They were ordered to North Africa - by the Americans. *The order was given* ~~This was at the command~~ *by* of Lieutenant-General Arnold, Commander of the United States Air Forces - who requisitioned the Soviet-bound planes and sent them to be used in our North African offensive.

U.P. Correspondent Lyle Wilson adds that the situation created by the Stalin remark, in the presence of the British Ambassador, was remedied by Willkie, who immediately went into a speech of his own - and thereby gave the London Ambassador a chance to pass it all off without saying anything.

Today Wendell Willkie spoke forth ~~on~~ the Admiral Standley episode, and deprecated the remarks

made by our Moscow Ambassador. Willkie ^{referred to} ~~spoke of~~ the Lend-Lease supplies that ~~xxxx~~ we are sending to the Soviets on the one hand and the sacrifices of human life that the Russians are making on the other, and he added: "Perhaps we are entitled to more credit than we are receiving, but naturally the Russians look upon the loss of lives of their own young men as more important than materials and supplies."

53
Today's reaction in Congress does not give any support to Admiral Standley's intimation that ~~Congress~~ Congress might be reluctant to continue Lend-Lease to the Soviets. Some ^{legislators} said they did ^{not} like the Soviet lack of appreciation, but added that aid to Russia would go on. Even Congressman Hamilton Fish of New York, long time bitter opponent of Communism, stated that the Standley affair will have no effect on the extension of Lend-Lease. "We'll vote for it,"

said he, "because we will want to supply them as long as they will keep on fighting."

As yet, no

~~We haven't~~ official comment from Moscow; ~~as yet~~

but, here's something from the Soviet Embassy in

Washington - which this afternoon released the text of

a message from Russian women to American and British

women. The Russian women say: "Your support and material

aid are keenly felt in our country and are a source of

inspiration to us in our great struggle."

RUSSIA

On the war front in Russia - Red Army troops are closing their grip on the great Nazi fortress at Vyazma; ^{the last} ~~however, the Nazis are holding their last~~ salient thrust forward on the Moscow front. The fortifications are twenty miles deep, and as powerful as German military science can make them. But the Red Army has smashed into that defense belt with a three-pronged advance. ~~One drive flashing down from the north is threatening the German line of retreat.~~ There are rumors that the Nazis have begun an evacuation of Vyazma - giving it up as they have given up a whole series of vital strongholds.

Further south, Red Army forces are reported to have reached the River Dnieper. This is stated by the official newspaper of the Young Communist Organization. Soviet troops, driving to the Dnieper, marks an important step in the Russian war, which has

been so much a conflict of rivers - the Volga, the Don,
the Dnieper, the Dniester. From times immemorial,
Russia has been dominated by its rivers.

NORTH AFRICA

In North Africa, the Germans continue to fall back. Rommel goes on retreating in southern Tunisia, and the Afrika Korps is pulling deep inside the Mareth Line - this after its offensive over the weekend was beaten off. ^{IF} French forces are developing a flanking threat in the vicinity of the salt lake called El Djérid. And all the while our air forces continue their raiding and bombing.

AIR WAR

The air war launched from Britain is on a twenty-four hour basis - with night bombing forces picking up as daylight raiders leave off. The latest city hit by the bombers was ^{em}Nurn_^berg ^{- again -}_^ with its important Nazi associations and also its war industries. British bombing raids deep into Germany have been held up for several days by bad weather, but now they are slashing out again.

PACIFIC

Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox stated today that the Japs in the Pacific are growing weaker - this because of constant American blows at their long supply lines. He referred to it as a campaign of attrition with planes and submarines attacking the war communications of the enemy, and stated that the Japs are encountering increasing difficulties in supplying their bases. "I won't say extreme difficulties," said the Secretary. "I would say - increasing difficulties."

56 Today's Navy bulletin tells of our bombers hitting the Japs at Kiska in the Aleutians and smashing up four of their air bases in the Solomons - increasing their difficulties some more.

TAXES

Today the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives turned down two pay-as-you-go tax proposals that embodied ideas of tax forgiveness. ~~The rejected plans would have provided for the cancellation in part of the taxes for Nineteen Forty-Two incomes.~~ The committee turned them down, just as it voted yesterday against the Ruml Plan of Pay-as-you-go -- the one to forgive all income tax for last year.

~~The word we have is that the committee is likely to adopt a tax program that would simply take twenty percent of all wages. This twenty percent of all earnings would be withheld as part payment of taxes on this year's income. On top of this we'd have to pay the taxes we owe above the twenty percent. The treasury would issue a kind of receipt for the money withheld, and these we'd turn in -- plus the additional amounts. This would duck the tax forgiveness altogether, and presumably the twenty percent would be withheld from the tax payer while he is paying off on last year's~~

~~income.~~

The Republicans on the committee state that they are going to back the Ruml Plan, with its complete forgiveness of taxes on last year's income -- ^{or} ~~with~~ some modification of that idea, They ~~declare~~ that, ~~no matter what the committee represents, it will take the Ruml Pay-as-you-go idea to the floor of the House,~~ and will call for a showdown. Congressman Knutson of Minnesota, speaking for the Republicans committee members, predicted that some ^{form} of the Skip-a-year proposal would be backed by ninety percent of the Republicans in Congress and enough Democrats to constitute a majority.

PARLIAMENT

27
Today the British House of Commons witnessed what might have appeared to be a most unseemly spectacle. The Speaker of the Commons was dragged to the Speaker's chair. He resisted -- protesting that he was unworthy. But they yanked him to the chair, and ^b~~p~~ounced him into it. Undignified? Not at all. It was stately, with the majesty of ceremony.

Still more strange -- Great Britain has been without a House of Commons for a week. Last Wednesday the Speaker of the Commons died, and there can be no session of the lower house of Parliament unless it is called by the Speaker. But, at the same time, a speaker can be appointed only by the House of Commons in session. So you see the dilemma -- no Commons without ^a_^ Speaker, and no Speaker without Commons.

The British solved the problem in a typical British way -- by reverting to tradition. The last time a Speaker of the Commons died while in office was away back in the reign of George the Third, Seventeen

Eighty-Nine. So they found out what was done then, and followed it point by point today.

28 The Commons assembled merely as what was called -- "a collection of gentlemen." The Sergeant at Arms performed his usual ceremony. He took the mace to the Speaker -- who wasn't there. He bowed to the empty chair, and then Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden arose and said: "I have to acquaint the House that His Majesty the King, having been informed of the death of Captain, the Right Honorable Edward Algernon Fitzroy, Speaker of the House, gives leave to the House of Commons to proceed forthwith to the choice of a new Speaker."

28 1/2 In other words a royal edict did the trick. And the House proceeded to choose Colonel Douglas Clifton Brown. Whereupon they tried to escort the *new* Speaker to the chair -- but he refused to go. He resisted, proclaiming his unworthiness -- and had to be dragged to the chair. Because -- that was the way

they did it during the reign of George the Third,
one hundred and fifty-four years ago.

9 And now let's drag Hugh James to the
microphone.