

RADIO TALK, WSM
OCTOBER 3, 1943

Good Morning, Friends:

After a week's debate on the Wheeler Bill to defer the drafting of fathers, still nothing is done about it, and the prospects are that nothing much will be done. Of course, no one, in his right mind, is pleased to see the fathers of little ones ~~drafted into the army, to be~~ taken away, many of them never to return. But, for that matter, no one likes to see remain in the army the approximately 700,000 fathers who are already in the army. *No did many like to* ~~I didn't~~ want to *anyone drafted.* ~~draft anyone, but I voted for it.~~ In fact, there is nothing about this war that any of us like, but it's not a question of what we like. It's a question of doing *whatever is* ~~everything~~ necessary for victory. Now, to come right down to it, when those who have charge of mapping our strategy, of deciding when and where our armies will strike, say that they must have more men, what choice does Congress have but to provide the men? I do not mean by this that Congress must jump through the hoop everytime the army and navy say so. But on such questions as the size of our army, I think our military leaders are better qualified to judge. There are so many things which they know ~~but~~ which *Congress does* ~~we do~~ not know. For instance, it's ~~a part of~~ their business to know the approximate size and disposition of the enemy forces. It's their life work to know what size forces it will take to perform a specific task. It's also their job to decide when our armies will strike the enemy, where, and in what force. Would it not follow then that they are best qualified to say whether we need, say, seven million or eight million men. *in the army.* I believe so. *I am anxious to see congress be independent and act as an independent - coordinate branch of the govt without domination by the executive, but it is equally important to realize that there are some things which congress cannot do. One thing congress cannot do is to run the war. In this congress must cooperate with the leaders of the armed forces. We must either support them or kick them out*

In arguing for his bill, Senator Wheeler spoke for about four days.

A good deal of his argument was that ~~a good size army could be drafted~~ *many govt employees*
~~out of the Federal employees.~~ *should be drafted.* Now, I don't know just what that situation
is. But ^{thorough} ~~a~~ ^{on it} report has been asked for. I do think a lot of propaganda for
political purposes has been spread about the number of Federal employees who
are draft dodgers. Undoubtedly, there are some, and wherever such is the
case, they should be taken into the service. ^{immediately.} But the fact is that every
Federal employee is subject to the action of his ^{own} local draft board the same
as every other citizen. I ^{too} know ~~that~~ lots of men have been drafted out of
the government, and I know some agencies which have asked for deferment of
no one. ^{On the other hand,} ~~Then,~~ there are certain key people in government agencies who have been
refused permission to enter the army. ^{even though they wished to do so.} ~~As I said, Congress has asked for~~
~~a thorough report on this situation.~~ *Anyway, this situation will be soon*
~~If people who should be in the army~~
into thoroughly.
~~are being held by some of the government agencies, then, the situation will~~
~~be rapidly corrected.~~

In the meantime, fathers over the nation are facing the draft this
month. In fact, many have already been inducted.

Well
A most unusual thing has happened, ~~during the week.~~ Gasoline allowances
on B and C cards all over the Eastern half of the United States were reduced,
and I haven't heard a single speech in Congress, or otherwise, condemning
it. Not a squawk from anyone. Everyone seems to realize what a terrific
problem we have in supplying gasoline to the huge forces now in action ~~the~~

and the much larger forces which will, in the near future, launch an attack, *and for which reserve supplies must be accumulated,* For instance, it takes one-third of a railroad tank car to fill the ~~fuel~~ ^{gas} tanks of one flying fortress. To make a little calculation, this means that a long distance raid by 1,000 flying fortresses would require more than 300 tank cars of gasoline. An airplane engine burns its weight in gasoline every two hours. *It takes over 12,000 gallons to train one pilot* Then, our huge ground forces use tremendous amounts of gasoline. For instance, it takes over ten thousand gallons of gasoline for the tanks alone in only one division to travel 100 miles, to ~~say nothing of the immense amounts needed for aviation,~~ The military requirements for oil during the remainder of 1943 ^{for ground forces alone} will be about one million barrels per day. General Carvel stated that 65% of all supplies shipped to Africa was petroleum products and one-half of all tonnage of every sort going over seas now is oil and gasoline.

I hope these few facts will serve to illustrate the tremendous problem of supply as well as the terrific drain on our supplies of fuel oils.

Five senators who, during the recess of Congress flew around the world and to many of the world's battle fronts, returned during the week and gave a somewhat critical report. One thing they say is that more of the gasoline *for the allies* should now come from the British fields in Asia Minor. Maybe the Senators are right. I think before one could pass judgment upon that, he would have to know the disposition of ships ^{now and} at the time the Mediterranean became reasonably safe for tanker transport. I think also one would have to know the plans for

the future, both as to numerical and geographical disposition of forces and as to safe convoying possibilities. The Senators broadly hinted, I thought, that the British might be encouraging us to use up all our oil resources while theirs were being preserved. This has very serious implications, and coming from five United States Senators who have had at least some opportunity of physical contact with the problems, it can not be either ignored or lightly taken. There is an old saying that "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing." It may be that the Senators have ~~just~~^{just} learned enough about the situation to give a disturbing report. I am sure I don't know. But I am also certain that the highest leaders of both the United States and Great Britain should take care lest such things undermine the mutual confidence and ~~spiritual~~^{splendid} cooperation so manifest between Great Britain and the United States now, and the continuance of which is so essential for the preservation of peace after this awful holocaust has ended.

Another thing which the Senators felt disturbed about was the use of the airplane bases which we are building all over the world. Showing that he still has an alert, steady grip on domestic developments, the President soon thereafter informed his press conference that he and Prime Minister Churchill had agreed upon the principle of freedom of the air after the war. There has been a lot of talking about the use of these airfields. I hope we can have access to them after the war. But let us remember a few things. Take Brazil, for instance. We needed airfields on the hump

badly
of Brazil in order to fly planes across the South Atlantic. Brazil could have denied us that privilege. After all, the sovereignty of Brazil is as sacred to her as our own sovereignty is to us. But Brazil consented to let us build some air bases, which we have *gladly* done. Now did we build these air bases because we wanted to use them for expansion of our air routes after the war? I don't believe so. We built them because we needed them *now* and we were glad to pay for them if Brazil would only give us the permission to use them during the war. Now I think it's highly important and highly desirable that we negotiate agreements by which we can use these bases and other bases in many parts of the world for post-war expansion of air routes. But in all of this discussion, let us remember that many a nation has accommodated us by permitting us to build air fields and we were very grateful to them at the time and gladly spent the money to construct them in order to hasten the end of this war.

Should we now make in by threat of our great force and say to these countries that without regard to their rights, with out any agreement, we are in your country and we are going to stay. Would that be a good neighbor policy. Nearly every thing has two sides - even a plank in water now thin
The Senate Foreign Affairs Committee turned face about during the week

on the question of a post-war resolution ~~now~~. It first announced that because of the danger of debate and *other* unimpressive reasons, the Committee would not now ~~now~~ consider reporting out a post-war resolution. Then, in a few days, for reasons not yet made clear, they announced that they would forthwith proceed to draft and report a resolution pertaining to post-war foreign policy. This is highly important. Nothing would so strengthen the hand of our diplomats as they go to confer with the diplomatic leaders of Russia,

and Great Britain than to have the Senate approve, as the House of Representatives has already done, the broad purpose and principle of cooperation with other nations after the war to keep the peace. Other nations, friends as well as neutrals, remember how a minority of the United States Senate prevented the United States from playing its part in the peace arrangements concluding World War I. There is a big question mark in their minds as to what we will do this time. There is no doubt but that the American public opinion overwhelmingly favors the principle of collaboration and cooperation with other nations for the purpose of keeping peace this time. But, then, no one doubted that being the sentiment of the American people the other time. The House of Representatives has gone on record, and the Senate should do likewise. It seems to me that some of our elder statesmen in that body need to wake up and realize that we are in a total war and that now is the time for them to act in strengthening the hand of the United States, not only in waging the war, but in the erection of the peace structure.