propriate money to defend our country or whether we are not." To which Senator Capehart retorted that allowing all you would for inflation, how could the Department of Defense account for such facts as had already been reported to a Senate Committee, namely: a rise in the cost of a switchboard from $994 to $4,802; in the cost of a special type of radio set from $4,597 to $20,185; in the cost of a sound ranging set from $4,959 to $15,000? And so on through many items.

Senator Case's amendment was voted down. The Department of Defense got its money. Moral: none. There is no efficient way to build a war machine in haste. It might have been built with forethought; now in place of forethought we have to use the cataclysmic power of billions spilling over. Senator Byrd states the dilemma: "My concern is double-edged, because as a member of the Armed Services Committee I am fearfully aware of the military potentialities and what it takes to meet them, and as a member of the Senate Finance Committee I am fearfully aware of our approach to insolvency and confiscatory taxes."

RECORD OF THE HEARINGS

By MORRIE RYSKIND

THE FREEMAN *is proud to present below what it considers the most important revelation since the Pumpkin Papers. Herewith are the minutes of the joint meeting of the House and Senate Un-American Military Affairs Committees. For obvious reasons, the press and public were barred and no notes were taken, except by a young lady acrobat our correspondent had secreted in one of the chandeliers. Considering the fact that she doesn't take shorthand, and making due allowance for her unfamiliarity with some of the personages involved, we nevertheless feel that the record, faulty though it may be in some respects, should be presented to the American people.* THE EDITORS

Q. Your name, please?

GEN. MARSHALL. I regret I have not the necessary notes with me, but I shall be glad to bring you the information at some future date. Or the Committee can get it from Secretary Acheson, since that is more in his province.

Q. General Bradley, who first spoke to you about the possibility of firing General MacArthur?

JOHN GARFIELD. I can't recall. These fellows would call me up, knowing I was a liberal and I would just say, "All right. Put my name down."

Q. Mr. Ferrer, you concede you may have been involved in some Communist fronts. Can you tell us who induced you to join them?

GEN. BRADLEY. I gave that information to the President in my capacity as confidential adviser, and feel it is privileged. I can not answer unless so directed by the President. Any bets?

SEN. KEFAUVER. I would remind the chair that any betting that is done must be performed under the auspices of my committee.

THE CHAIR. The chair so rules.

Q. General Marshall, when you went to China to ask Chiang Kai-shek to form a coalition government with the Chinese Communists, who gave you the directive for that mission?

GEN. VAUGHAN. I have nothing to say, because whatever I say is misquoted and used against me.

Q. General Garfield, did General MacArthur ever disobey a military order from the Chiefs of Staff?

GEN. COLLINS. Well, not exactly. But we asked him to put only South Koreans at the Manchurian border, because otherwise it would have looked as though we wanted to win this war instead of just containing it. Because if — and we might as well face the possibility — we should win this war, Russia is liable to throw the atom bomb and we need those troops for Europe for Russia to throw at. So we naturally concurred in the firing of MacArthur, though we admired him as a military figure.

Q. General Schulberg, you say you left the Communist Party before 1940, yet you attacked the investigatory powers of this committee in 1947, signed the *amicus curiae* brief to the Supreme Court in defense of John Howard Lawson and Dalton Trumbo, and voted for Henry Wallace in 1948. How come?

PRES. TRUMAN. Well, I was going to fire the SOB (*here some forty-two words have been deleted by the military censor and the Post Office*) over a year ago — I mean, under a year ago — I mean — anyway, I'm President!

Q. Now, General Ferrer, you didn't know Benjamin Davis was a Communist although he ran openly as one?

GEN. GARFIELD. I never met a Communist in my life. You've got to remember I look at these things globally, and General MacArthur was looking at them only from the standpoint of Korea.

Q. General Vandenberg, when you wrote the article about our air force for the *Saturday Evening Post*, weren't you guilty of the same insubordination with which MacArthur is charged?

SEC. ACHESON. I might point out that at that time we were certain that the Chinese Communists were merely agrarian reformers, while Representative Martin, to whom General MacArthur wrote, is a leading member of the war party in the United States. Besides, my understanding is that President Truman doesn't read the *Post*. This information came to us at the meeting at the White House: Those present were Gen. Marshall, Sec. Pace, Averill Harriman and myself and the President. We didn't know who was going to leak first, so we fired MacArthur immediately.

(A motion to adjourn *sine die* was now made and upheld by a strict party vote, with the lone exception of Senator Wayne Morse who temporarily deserted his party to vote with the Republican minority. As soon as this was discovered, the Republicans hastily switched their votes. In conclusion, the Chairman briefly thanked the men who had testified.)

THE CHAIR. I want to thank all of you, Generals Marshall, Bradley, Ferrer, Collins, Vaughan, Garfield, Acheson, Schulberg and Vandenberg, and Commander in Chief Truman, for the cooperation you have given this Committee by confessing so freely and honestly.

We are sure the public will acept your frank admissions at face value and we hope you will all have your Hollywood contracts renewed at even higher salaries than before. Meeting adjourned.

THESE HATED AMERICANS

By GARET GARRETT

THE WINDS that blow our billions away return burdened with themes of scorn and dispraise. There is a little brat wind that keeps saying:

"But you are absurd, you Americans, like the rich fat boy from the big house who is tolerated while he spends his money at the drug store and then gets chased home with mud on his clothes. He is bewildered and hurt, and yet he wants so much to be liked that he does it again the next day. But this is parable and you are probably too stupid to get it. If you do you won't believe it, and so no harm is done. You will come again tomorrow."

Another wind says:

"You worship success, you Americans. You have thereby ruined all your spiritual and moral values, such as they were. Your controlling idea is Babylon for the masses. Since success is your idol you are unable to understand the souls of other people or that they have souls. You are unable to comprehend the spiritual content of communism and are deluded to think you can shoot it out of the world."

How shall one answer insulting winds? You do not assert your possession of spiritual values. But as for success, we may be sure that if it seems to be acclaimed here more than anywhere else that is only because it is magnificent here and because it multiplies the satisfactions of common life in a manner that is the envy of the whole world.

Having lived the most fabulous success story in the history of the human race we are rich — so rich that the next richest country is by comparison poor. In a world where one-third of humanity barely subsists on the poverty level, this is a fact that can not be forgiven. Yet one may be permitted to suggest that its magnitude is not the only unique fact about American wealth. First, we made it all for ourselves, the hard way, by our own free labor, and the primary ground of it was a life of Puritan thrift, self-discipline and austerity, while the rich in Europe, exploiting their own and their colonial labor, lived in dazzling luxury.

Secondly, American wealth has been shared with the world. That idea is still so strange that the meaning of simple words needs to be emphasized.

Never before in the history of mankind has one rich nation literally shared its wealth with others. In World War I we made very large loans to our associates, which afterwards we expected them to repay only in part, but which they nevertheless repudiated in whole, not because they couldn't pay but because it was too hard to pay and because the Americans were already too rich. And this was the beginning of capitalism's fatal leukemia in Europe, especially in Great Britain, where the movement to repudiate war debts to America originated — fatal because capitalism rests on the inviolability of contract.

Then came World War II, and remembering the humiliation of being called Shylock for expecting to get anything back on account of Europe's war debts in the first case, we said: "This time we erase the dollar mark." That was the meaning of Lend-Lease. After the war our allies would owe us nothing. All the dollars did was to measure the quantity of things they required of us — not a debt to be repaid.

During the war and five years of postwar time what with Lend-Lease, global emergency relief, the $4 billion loan to Great Britain, the Marshall Plan, military aid, the North Atlantic Pact and all, the amount of American wealth distributed throughout the world was roughly equal to the total national wealth of the next richest nation, namely, Great Britain. The postwar Marshall Plan was pure giving. We said to the nations of Europe, all of them at first, including Russia: "Estimate what your deficits will be for several years, count it all up, and send us the bill." Russia and her satellites declined. All of Western Europe accepted, with expressions of affection and gratitude. Winston Churchill called it the most unselfish act in the history of the world.

In that spirit we sent them food, fuel, raw materials, machines and even money to pay their debts. We built new factories for them, and powerhouses, and restored their railroads, besides irrigation works, modern roads and agricultural projects in their colonies. Roughly, they used two-thirds of our Marshall Plan money for restoration and the other third for expansion on lines competitive with American industry, so that they might be able to compete with us in the markets of the world to better advantage; and by the end of 1950 western Europe's productive power not only had been fully restored; it was 30 per cent greater than before the war. That was sharing. Never had such a thing happened or been imagined before in this world.

Nevertheless, a shrill Socialist wind from Britain says:

"Now you are guilty of hypocrisy. It is not for the sake of the world you do it. It is for your own sake. You have had a surplus you could neither consume yourselves nor sell to others, and to get rid of it you were obliged to give it away, for if you did not somehow get rid of it you would drown in it. Such is the riddle of your capitalism. Therefore, instead of taking merit for giving your surplus away you should be grateful to other people for receiving it."

This hurts, coming from the British, who have been the principal beneficiaries of our sharing. And there was no surplus. It was not surplus we gave away. It was wealth; and it is nonsense to say we could not have used it ourselves — if not in the same forms in which it was distributed abroad, then in other forms, since wealth is a thing that may assume any form. True, our standard of living went on rising, but that is not to say it might not have advanced much more if we had employed here the wealth we gave away. Could we not use the dams and power plants we built in western Europe? Or the roads