

Good Evening, Everybody:-

Today's events in the British House of Commons have the form of a first act in a two-act play. Prime Minister Chamberlain made his keenly awaited appearance before Parliament to explain the Norwegian failure -- Act One.

Tomorrow, Winston Churchill will give to the Commons his version of the Norwegian affair -- Act Two. And that's likely to provide the climax.

Churchill, one of the most vivid personalities on earth, was today placed virtually in complete command of the British war effort. Chamberlain announced that Churchill has been given war power almost without precedent. While still remaining First Lord of the Admiralty, he will supervise military operations day by day. He will, as Chamberlain said, "give guidance and directions to the chiefs of staff." He will give them the objectives which they are to carry out. So, it is now not difficult

to apply to Winston Churchill the epithet of -- WarLord.

Seventy-one-year-old Neville Chamberlain had an ordeal today, having to explain a defeat so irritating to the pride of Great Britain.) Chamberlain was nervous and ill at ease, as well he might be -- having to account for painful happenings, and having to do it in the face of outbursts of parliamentary hostility. The Prime Minister was dogged by a thing he said some while ~~ago~~ ago:- "Hitler missed the bus." That was apt in telling at the time it was spoken. But today the opposition jeered with shouts -- "Who missed the bus?"

The Prime Minister himself undertook to explain his aphorism. That he didn't mean Norway. The epigram applied to the Nazi failure to attack the Allies at the beginning of the war.

The heckling with shouts of "resign" was so uproarious at one point that the aged Prime Minister sat down until the Speaker could restore order.

--o--

Prime Minister Chamberlain gave the following version of the Allied expedition to Central Norway. It was made at the

request of the Norwegian Government. Great Britain received what the Prime Minister described in these words: "the most urgent appeals from the Norwegian commander-in-chief to attack Trondheim." He said, "We had to consider the effect on the Norwegian Government forces and the people, if we made no attempt to hold central Norway." So the expedition was undertaken.

What about the possibility of a direct attack by the British navy? There's all sorts of criticism in London because a strong naval attempt was not made. Chamberlain declared today that the idea was considered. "I can say now," he stated, "that the idea was constantly before us." But they had to reckon with the possibility of naval losses from the fire of forts held by the Germans.

On the other hand, it seemed that Trondheim might be captured by attack on land. So the attempt was made that way, the land way.

It failed, explained the Prime Minister, for two reasons. First -- because the Norwegian army did not destroy railroad lines and bridges and thus impede the German dash toward

Trondheim. Second, because the Germans had possession of the airports.

Chamberlain stated ~~xxx~~ that the Allied losses were not great. "There were no large forces involved," he told the Commons today. "In fact, there was not much more than a single division." A British division numbering nineteen or twenty thousand men.

The Chamberlain address was followed by immediate attacks from the opposition. The Labor Party concentrated on the Chamberlain statements that the central Norwegian campaign was a rather small affair. Labor Leader Clement Attlee put it this way: "The Norwegian ~~xxxxx~~ campaign was never meant to be a mere tip and run exploit. The country," he declared, "considered it of major importance." He ~~fx~~ referred to stories that young and untrained boys had been sent to Norway. "The French sent their best troops," he declared. "We sent territorials. And they didn't even have snowshoes," he added. He stated that one transport sailed without even having ~~fix~~ rifles aboard.

The Labor leader accused the Cabinet of taking too

light a view of the failure. "We've got to face the facts," he declared. "This is a reverse." And he added the words -- "rebuff and set-back." He charged that the attitude of the Cabinet was one of excessive optimism and complacency. (He referred to the Chamberlain declaration when he announced the first withdrawal from Norway. "The Prime Minister's speech of last Thursday," he argued, "was over-optimistic and over-complacent." And then he added -- "Mr. Churchill is far too optimistic." And he went on to ~~xxx~~ criticize today's decision to place Churchill in charge of British war strategy.

This takes us to reports that Winston Churchill may blow the lid off tomorrow. There's a London whispering campaign in which the blame for the Norwegian defeat is being placed on him. If the fiery Churchill feels that he is being made a target for unfair attack, he's likely to get up and tell the inside story. What has he to tell? London rumor is that he may reveal that he himself argued for a strong swift naval attack on Trondheim. Still more, Churchill's friend, Admiral Sir Roger Keyes, offered personally to lead a dash of the fleet. But this bold

strategy was overruled by higher-ups in the British Cabinet.

These London rumors built up ~~into~~ plenty of drama when in Parliament today that same Admiral Sir Roger Keyes arose to speak. He's an M.P. He stated that he had indeed wanted to organize and lead an attack on Trondheim. He said that he had been told at the Admiralty that the naval experts believed the British fleet could blast its way into the port. But -- this wasn't considered necessary because the army was making good progress. Furthermore, that the situation in the Mediterranean made it undesirable to risk the warships. Meaning apprehension that Mussolini might jump into the war.

Churchill's friend, Admiral Sir Rober Keyes, is a conservative M.P., a member of the Prime Minister's party. He spoke for the conservative opposition to the Norwegian war policy. His comment on the Chamberlain explanation today was this:-

"Everything the Prime Minister said," he declared, "strengthened my contention that the capture of Trondheim was essential, imperative and vital. It is," he said, "a ~~shocking~~ shocking story of ineptitude, which ought never to have been allowed to happen."

The question tonight is, "Will the Chamberlain government be able to survive all this storm of parliamentary criticism? The belief is, that it will. This opinion is partly based on the Churchill appearance scheduled for tomorrow. His flaming rhetoric is likely to carry the day for the government -- with Churchill appearing as Britain's new general manager of the war.

MEDITERRANEAN

One ominous thing was said with emphasis in the House of Commons today, stated by the Prime Minister -- Hitler may swiftly strike ~~agi~~ again. Neville Chamberlain voiced that apprehension, and said no one could tell where the blow might fall.

The Mediterranean area is reported as a likely probability. Today the press of Nazi Germany shouted one long chorus of alarm -- that the Allies intend to spread the war to the ~~Mediterranean~~ Mediterranean. So the Nazi newspapers were saying in screaming headlines. ~~Great~~ Great Britain and France determined to force Italy into the war.

The chorus is so ~~unanimous~~ unanimous that there is a bit of suspicion that it may be a smoke screen -- a camouflage intended to divert attention from something else. Maybe while raising the hullabaloo about Italy and the Mediterranean they really are planning to launch some kind of blitzkrieg against Great Britain. Perhaps a wave of terror from the air. Or maybe the Low Countries are in danger. It is to be noted that today the government of Holland took sudden new defense measures --

cancelling all military leaves and calling up naval reserves. Here's the latest:- Holland has just suspended all telephone and ~~ti~~ teletype communication with other countries.

CANADA

This seems to be as good a time as any to do something I've been wanting to do for several days -- make a sort of confession of radio faith. Because of the war news and the problems of handling it.

We all have our sympathies. I know I have mine. But what ^{has} ~~is~~ that got to do with telling the news honestly and squarely? Judging of the facts as intelligently as one can, ~~ix~~ using as cool a head and as realistic common sense as possible.

A newsman has the advantage of being next to the wire all day -- close to the endless stream of foreign dispatches. He has a chance to size them up, balance off one thing against the other, and form some sort of opinion about what the facts really are. That's the job, and he owes it to the job not to let personal feeling blind him or twist his judgment.

The radio is too powerful an institution in modern life for this country to allow it to become an instrument of any kind of war propaganda. Impartial ~~jd~~ judgment in handling the news -- that's the order which has come down the line from the National Broadcasting Company and my sponsors the Sun Oil Company.

With all of which I agree heartily. No matter what my own sympathies may be, I don't want to be fooled with phoney news -- neither ~~is~~ does the radio audience. I feel that factual and unbiased news-telling is a duty owed to the American public. Also -- to the people of Canada.

It is Canada, precisely, which calls forth this confession of radio ~~for~~ faith. The Dominion has necessarily a wartime censorship, and the American news broadcasts are not now transmitted by the Canadian stations. Nevertheless, ^{Canadians} listen to broadcasts from across the border. Almost anywhere in the Dominion they can tune in -- and they do. And there you have an anomalous situation. Canada is at war, and the United States is not -- not a belligerent. People in war sometimes do not like the non-belligerent point of view. And that's natural.

I've had a number of complaints from Canadians who disliked things I had to say about the war in Europe. One example -- the story cabled by American war correspondent Leland Stowe, that the Allied troops in Norway were insufficiently equipped with fighting aircraft, anti-aircraft guns, tanks, and

artillery. This account was printed in Canada and in Great Britain too, in ~~xp~~ spite of censorship -- and it ~~was~~ turned out to be only too correct. Yet, I got blasts from Canada -- threats of boycott. Accused of being pro-German -- a Nazi. Because I told ~~ix~~ what turned out to be true.

On the other hand, I've had letters from Canadians telling me to pay no attention to any such protests. Letters insisting that Canadians listening to the American radio want the news told coolly and realistically, want the facts. They take the view expressed by ~~Lloyd~~ so many -- and just now by Lloyd George., Prime Minister of ~~Great~~ Great Britain in the First World War. Lloyd George, writing in the New York Journal-American gives us these words: "It's far better for the sake of the Democratic cause that the truth should be told to its champions in time -- 'ere it's too late to retrieve the situation." And that hits the spot exactly.

So I intend to go on telling the war news as impartially and as factually as I can -- trying to pick out the truth and the reality from amid the daily maze of confusion and

contradiction. And I wonder whether most Canadians who
listen in won't agree with me, won't say to me -- yes, go on and
tell the war news unfalsified and untwisted by sentiment or bias,
-- as well as you can. I wonder ~~ix~~ whether they won't say that?

NAVY

Here's something concerning the argument about the German claim that Nazi sky bombers sank a giant British battleship. Secretary of the Navy Edison today stated that, from all the United States Government could find out -- the story is not true. Testifying before the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, the Secretary put it in these words:- "We learned on reliable authority," said he, "that German airplanes have not sunk any British battleship." He went on to say that British losses because of sky bombing have not been large.

At this point of the ~~xxx~~ proceedings an interposition was made by Admiral Stark, Chief of Naval Operations. He made a statement in these words: "Only eleven British warships, the most important of which were four destroyers, have been sunk by aerial bombing since the war started." So said the Admiral.

This information concerning the sea and sky fighting off Norway was given as an argument in defense of the battleship as a weapon of war. President in every mind was the statement made by the Secretary of the Navy last week, when he said -- that warplanes had a temporary advantage over battleships. Today

Secretary Edison argued that too many inferences were drawn from what he said. He used these words: "erroneous deductions were ~~xxxxx~~ made, placing too wide an interpretation." He admitted that under certain circumstances bombers may lick battleships -- but not often. "Naval warfare on the ~~big~~ high seas, on the broad Atlantic and the Pacific," said he, "is not warfare in land-locked fjords."

PUBLISHER

A political big-wig at Terre Haute, Indiana, had a truly inspired idea -- of the allegation in a damage suit be true. The inspired idea concerns the dilemma that often faces a politician -- what to do when a newspaper prints a blast against you. That apparently insoluble problem was neatly solved by County Prosecutor Leonard Kincaid of Terre Haute. So charges Mrs. Mayme Presnell, Publisher of the WABASH VALLEY POST.

That periodical is a free circulation affair, and has plenty of influence in the county. Several weeks ago the WABASH VALLEY POST printed a barrage of charges against ~~Prosecutor~~ Prosecutor Kincaid, declaring that he permitted bookmakers and gambling games to operate. That was decidedly embarrassing, with the primaries coming along, today in fact was primary day. Of course in such a situation, a fellow would like to get an apology from the newspaper, have the paper take back all it said. But that usually is a rather difficult thing to accomplish. Not for Prosecutor Kincaid -- so charges Publisher Mrs. Mayme Presnell.

Today she filed a fifty thousand dollar damage suit, ~~and~~ accusing him of getting out an edition of her newspaper.

She states that he employed a printer to imitate the WABASH VALLEY POST and run off a huge lot of copies, which were circulated far and wide. The false edition featured an apology for the attack against the prosecutor, and headlined a confession that the charges against him were false.

Whatever the facts in the case may be, it does point to an interesting idea. When a newspaper prints a blast against you, all you have to do is get out an edition of that same paper with an apology to yourself.

Clever these lawyers, eh Hugh?