

THE
American Forum

O F T H E A I R



Vol. XIV

SUNDAY, AUGUST 19, 1951

No. 33

**“What’s Going to Happen
to Mobilization?”**

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Democrat of Minnesota

SENATOR EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

Republican of Illinois

THEODORE GRANIK

Founder and Moderator of the American Forum of the Air

Announcer: Good evening. It's time again to join the American Forum of the Air. Each week at this time the Bohn Aluminum and Brass Corporation, one of the nation's largest producers of aluminum and brass products, presents the American Forum of the Air, dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues vital to you and your country.

Here is a special announcement: a statement from the United Automobile Workers, CIO:

"One week ago on this program, Charles R. Sligh, Jr., in defending a sales tax proposal, quoted from a letter calling for a 'Soviet America' which he said purported to be a letter written by Walter P. Reuther, President of the United Automobile Workers, CIO. Mr. Reuther has repeatedly and publicly, over a period of years, stated that he wrote no such letter and, in fact, the very Saturday Evening Post article from which Mr. Sligh quoted, included Mr. Reuther's repudiation of the letter, a fact which Mr. Sligh failed to mention. Yet this false claim continues to be circulated. The record of Walter Reuther in fighting communism both in and out of the labor movement speaks for itself.

"If Mr. Sligh is seriously concerned about our national tax program and the welfare of our national economy, we challenge him to debate with Mr. Reuther on this program September 16 their respective tax proposals on their merits."

Tonight the American Forum of the Air presents a discussion on the vital topic "What's Going to Happen to Mobilization?"

Here with us this evening to discuss this problem are two distinguished members of the United States Senate: Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, and Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Republican of Illinois.

And now, here is your Moderator, who twenty-three years ago, founded The American Forum of the Air, Theodore Granik.

Moderator Granik: President Truman has cautioned the nation against any letdown in our mobilization, if and when an armistice is negotiated in Korea. But Senator Dirksen recently stated that we should examine our mobilization policies to make sure we have no repetition of conditions following the last war when planes and other weapons were ground up for scrap as obsolete.

Now, Senator, do you think we should have a congressional investigation into military procurement and planning?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, as a matter of fact, Mr. Granik, it occurred to me that if you are going to take so much money out of the pockets of the taxpayer, they have some interest in this mobilization; and if it is going to be a good job, you are going to have to mobilize on all fronts, and that is going to require monitoring on the part of the people's representatives.

I do not know whether I fancy that word "investigation" particularly, but I think there has to be a surveillance committee of some kind, because in this day and age, when you mobilize, you do not merely mobilize men and weapons — you mobilize morale, you mobi-

lize money, you mobilize confidence, you mobilize loyalty — all of those are a part of the mobilization structure. For that reason it seems to me that it has got to be under constant surveillance, otherwise extravagance and waste and heavy expense creeps into it. And that is quite important to the people who furnish the money.

Moderator Granik: Senator Humphrey?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I surely would not want to disagree with my good friend, Senator Dirksen, about the necessity of having a constant watch over the expenditure of such vast sums of money as are required by a defense program of the proportions which we now have entered upon. But I am sure that my friend from Illinois knows that the Armed Services Committee of the Senate has a special subcommittee known as the Preparedness Subcommittee under the able chairmanship of Senator Lyndon Johnson of Texas that right now has done an outstanding job of watching over the procurement policy of the Federal government. I would also like to inform my good friend that the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of which I am proud to be a member, has just recently authorized, and has now launched upon an investigation of the procurement policies of the Armed Services in the defense mobilization. So you see, we already have two committees, and if it requires a third, I would have no protest to a third committee. But I think the important question is what are we going to do about mobilization? Do we continue on with it at the tempo that we now have, or do we relax it? And my proposition is, and my feeling is, that we must continue. In fact we must continue at an even greater pace than we are going at the present time.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Mr. Granik, may I say to my good friend and colleague, Senator Humphrey, that I am quite familiar with the operations of congressional committees. I have seen them and I have been on them a long period of years. One of the difficulties with committees today is that they are not adequately staffed, and, secondly, they do very little field work. They are almost as bad as the Federal Budget Bureau in that respect.

I went around the world in 1945. I took a good look and then I served as Chairman of the committee of members of the House Appropriations and Armed Services Committees in 1947. We took testimony in four or five countries, and I can tell you that the thing you find on the ground is quite different from what you find on paper in the nation's capitol.

I was at Munich at the time when they were grinding up airplanes—some of them were flown in there as a matter of fact—costing \$225,000 to \$250,000. They stripped them, they cannibalized them, sent out parts and then ground them up. I thought "what an awful waste!"

That is not all. It so happens in this day and age with the acceleration of the defense program, so often the first unit off the line will almost be obsolete by the time the last unit comes off the line.

And so it is something more than mere surveillance. I think we need to have something deeper.

Moderator Granik: Do you suggest a relaxation of the military preparedness program?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Indeed not if there is necessity for it. There is something to be said about that. I am one of those who believes that the strength of America is here at home, not in the symbolic legions abroad. So I want to consider all the other things — the fiscal aspects, the moral aspects, the ethical aspects of mobilization — all of them are a part of it.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am very much impressed by the eulogy of the investigatory process of the defense program as I have just heard it, because I know there is great precedent for it in history. The Truman Committee, the committee headed by our President at the time when he was a Senator in World War II, made an outstanding and enviable record in watching our expenditure policies. I concur in that. May I point out that the Johnson Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee has done just that, and to date has saved the taxpayers over a billion dollars.

I want to ask my good friend from Illinois a question: Just where does he stand on this defense program? He said that he believes we ought to have the defense program if there is a need for it. Now, I wish to ask the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Dirksen, is there any doubt in your mind as to the need for this defense program? Is there any doubt in your mind as to the need for our having a unity of effort with our allies and a building up of the strength of the free world? If there is, what are your doubts? Let us document them so that the people may know what they may be.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Let me say to my friend from Minnesota that I think every prudent person in the country believes in preparedness, believes in security, but I do not believe in the confusion that may go along with it. I do not believe in waste and extravagance that may go along with it. I saw the other day, notwithstanding the fact that it has been controverted by the Army, that they bought a million nine hundred thousand pounds of pepper. They bought 6,000,000 gallons of paint in small cans to be delivered in 60 days. That is a part of the preparedness program that I do not go for, because I think it is sheer waste, and I want to be awfully sure that when you are going to take this money out of the pockets of the taxpayers that they get their money's worth, because it is their boys who are going to be offered on the altar of defense, and they are going to pay the bill. And if I had not seen all the extravagance and waste in some sections of the country, I would not be quite so interested perhaps in monitoring or in an investigating committee to see that this thing is kept on an even keel.

I am not one of those who thinks that all of the wisdom in the world lies in the head of a man who has a uniform on. I think there is some other wisdom in the world besides that.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am still trying to get the Senator to come down to where all of this fabulous waste exists. There is just one point the Senator brought up about the little paint cans. Of course, the Senator is aware of the fact that the House committee made a special investigation of that. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Minnesota now has in his briefcase a copy of that report, which I will be very glad to present right now to the Senator from Illinois.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I know all about it. You do not have to show it to me.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Thank you, then I can save the time.

The Senator does know that instead of there being waste, it was really a very remarkable purchase on the part of the Government that saved the Government millions upon millions of dollars. All I am saying is that rather than make these blanket charges about there being waste, that we ought to look at this carefully, because there are billions of dollars involved. I ask the Senator what does he want done with the defense program other than what we are doing? Because it appears to me that what we are doing is a very sound policy, namely, getting a force of three and one-half million men who are fully trained and equipped, and getting an air force of 95 air groups at a minimum. In fact, I think we ought to have more. I proposed 105 air groups instead of 95, and a fleet of not less than 1,100 vessels. And add to that the tooling up process that goes with our industry, and the stock-piling program which we now have well under way. This makes sense. In other words, building up a force that is big enough to meet the immediate need. And secondly, a basic economic strength that will cover all-out mobilization in case of an all-out attack.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I am certainly glad to hear Senator Humphrey say that, because there runs in my mind a great address made to the country on the 20th day of August, 1950. It was made by none other than a great former President, President Hoover. He emphasized air strength, he emphasized naval strength. He said that you do not want a huge ground force, unless you are going to invade Asia. I am glad to see that my friend from Minnesota at long last has come to endorse the basic premise that has been laid down in the field of defense by former President Hoover.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I wish to thank the Senator from Illinois for including me in his great, fine company. As a matter of fact, what Mr. Hoover had to say was all right, only he did not go far enough. Mr. Hoover just forgot, you know, that there was another part of the world.

I did not think we were going to have the great debate again. I want to ask the Senator from Illinois just what does he propose that we do with this defense program? The question is: What about mobilization now? Apparently he wants to reexamine it. There is a lot of reexamination going on in Congress. What is the purpose of it? To find out whether or not somebody bought a few cans of paint they ought not to buy? Isn't the purpose of reexamination really to deter-

mine how much strength we need to fight the kind of menace we have?

Moderator Granik: Is there a limit to the amount of foreign aid we can extend, Senator Dirksen?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I think there is a limit to the capacity of this country to support everybody in the world and to provide both guns and butter for our own country. Only recently Senator Byrd, who is regarded, I think, as a fiscal authority in this country, said:

"We are on the way to fiscal debacle and to insolvency at the rate we are going."

What we see looming ahead in 1952, 1953, and 1954 is a tremendous Federal deficit, unless, of course, we raise taxes over and above those that are contemplated at the present time.

Now, capacity, of course, is a part of mobilization. Can we afford to spend eight and one-half billion dollars on the people of Europe? Can we spend other money elsewhere in the world and still carry on a garrison state and welfare state in our own country? I am beginning to have grave doubts about that.

Moderator Granik: Senator Humphrey?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Now we are getting down to the issue, and I am happy at long last that we have joined it, instead of talking in generalities.

At the peak of World War II, we spent 45 per cent of our national products for the purpose of the military. At the present time, as of July 31, 1951, we are spending 10 per cent of our national product for national defense. By the end of 1952, December 31, we will be spending at the rate of 18 per cent of our national product.

Now, I submit that a country that is fighting for its freedom against a nation that will destroy our freedom, destroy our very economic system and political system, can afford to spend 18 per cent of its gross national product for national defense and security. And may I say that includes the money that goes for foreign aid and for military assistance.

Moderator Granik: How do we accomplish this guns and butter production? By higher taxes?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think that Charles E. Wilson did a pretty good job when he stated in his report on July 31, 1951, the following:

He said: "In the United States our mobilization program seeks simultaneously a growth in military power and an expansion of the basic economic strength which supports and underlies military strength."

What have we been doing? We have increased the steel production by 10 million tons. We are doubling our aluminum production by the end of 1952. We are increasing our electrical power output by 40 per cent. We have increased the productivity of our farms. We have increased the average productivity of our workers. So in fact what we are doing is putting on top of our whole national economy an 18 per cent by 1952 which goes out as a life insurance premium for the life of free people. But we have so built up the base of our economy that we can take it, and we can take it in stride.

Moderator Granik: Can we take it, Senator Dirksen?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: You know, Mr. Granik, statistics are wonderful things. I remember when Mr. Wilson was before the Senate Banking Committee, I said, "What you are asking here, of course, in this mobilization program, is for the American people to surrender all of their freedom, virtually, until June 30, 1952. And if they are good boys and girls, and everything comes out lovely, maybe they will get their freedom back at the end of a couple of years."

Now, you can say what you like about the capacities, this, that, and the other thing. The thing I know is that we are up to \$55 billion in taxes right now, and there is a \$7.2 billion tax program that is before the Senate Finance Committee at the present time. It is \$2.8 billion short of the first touch that the President wants to make upon the people.

Moderator Granik: Do you favor higher taxation?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Why, obviously, there has got to be taxes, if you are going to balance your budget, and that gives coin to the fact that if there is any waste in this program, it certainly is unfair to the American people. That is why I am for security, for national defense, and for a mobilization program. But I am not for the kind of waste that I saw with my own eyes in other days. I do believe that there is money that can be taken out of those military estimates at the present time without hurting the efficiency of the military operation one bit.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Granik, I want to join with my friend in saying that if there is any waste, of course, let us get it out.

While the Senator has been proposing doing away with waste here on this broadcast, I proposed in a committee of the Congress that was set up to investigate it, a complete investigation of our procurement policies. But I want to point out that the Senator can not have his cake and eat it, too. He wants national security, he wants national defense, but he says it costs money. Taxes are going to have to go up 7.2 billion dollars. In fact, they will have to go up more. But I still point out, and whether the Senator likes statistics or not, statistics are more pointed, and let me say that they represent the truth closer than just broad general statements. And I say to the Senator, and I ask him to contradict it, that according to present estimates and present budget requests of our Government, that by the end of fiscal year 1952, we will only be taking 18 per cent of our gross national product.

Does the Senator think we can afford that, or doesn't he?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: What difference does it make what you take out of the gross national product on the basis of inflated prices today? It is what finally hits the average family in the pocketbook that really counts. If you look at the taxes in 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943 and 1944, and then look at the taxes under the Truman Administration, you will find that we are getting into a bracket that almost puts Great Britain to shame.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I just want to say to the Senator if he is so interested in taxes, I want him to join with the Junior Senator from Minnesota, because I have a tax policy which is not going to attack the lower brackets, but will gather in the upper ones that have been doing all right on the defense program. But the Senator has still not said what he is going to do about the defense program. Does Mr. Dirksen want to cut it back? Because, if he does not, then he is going to have to pay the price. He voted against the Defense Production Act. He voted against the Act that would have controlled the prices, which would have stabilized prices.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I am glad my friend brought that up. Let me get a word in here. I am glad he brought that up. There are 5,000 cases pending before the Wage Stabilization Board right now. Does that look like wage control? There are 5,000 enforcement cases on which there have been very few indictments, if any. Does that look like control? I contended to the Banking Committee that indirect controls should first be broadened. The record today is that the only effective control we have had so far is in the field of financing and credit for housing, and that came through the Federal Reserve Board. It is the only one thus far that has done any good.

Now, I want to say this to my good friend from Minnesota —

Moderator Granik: I want to get to the audience, Senator.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: — Spending is the essence of this thing, because you are going to have to tax so long as you spend. If my friend will join me in cutting down expenditures on the floor of the Senate, we will get somewhere. But I am not forgetting that I had to take the floor the other day and oppose him on a request for \$7 million for rural electrification in the State of Minnesota. Everything gets a defense tag on it today. Spend riotously and then you will have to tax. But that is the road to insolvency, too.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: May I just say that while the Senator is so happy about the indirect controls, he knows that the price of the cost of living went up 9 per cent before the direct controls were applied. It went that high up to February 1, 1951. It is a matter of record, and if the Senator wants to see it, he can take a look at the Midyear Economic Report, and there it is.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Let me tell my good friend this.

Moderator Granik: May I get a word in here? I want to get to the audience.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Yes, but that needs to be answered.

If you look at the report of the Federal Reserve Board, the first impact on credits was at the time when prices became stationary, and controls had virtually nothing to do with it.

Moderator Granik: In a moment we will take questions from the audience, but first, here is an important message.

The Announcer: You've heard and read about what happens to a Communist who disagrees with Kremlin policies. Sooner or later he accidentally falls out of a window or he is swallowed up in the Siberian Salt mines.

Thank God for America. Here we can still openly agree or disagree without fear of personal persecution.

Here we can tell our representatives how we feel about the important issues that affect our future. As a matter of fact, your congressmen urge you to write them. They represent you. And they can serve you best only when they know your own individual thoughts and ideas.

Have you written your congressmen recently? Have you ever written them? It is not only your privilege as an American, it is your duty. Why not write them tonight. It is the American way of keeping America free.

The Bohn Aluminum and Brass Corporation returns you now to the American Forum of the Air.

Moderator Granik: We will get to the audience now for questions. Does the gentleman have a question over there?

MR. HAYWOOD BELTON: This question is directed to Senator Humphrey. My name is Haywood Belton, Student.

Can we reduce non-military expenditures to help out with the general mobilization program?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, I think we can, and I think we have. The President's Budget which was submitted to the Congress was based on the principle of reducing certain non-military expenditures. May I say that the Congress of the United States, both the House and the Senate, has seen fit to further reduce those appropriation requests. In general, I would say that the budget today will be pared down from the present defense request about two and a half billion dollars to three billion dollars. That seems to me the basic minimum you can pare it down without injuring it.

Moderator Granik: Senator Dirksen, do you want to talk about paring it down?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Yes, I do. I certainly would not be content with a cut of \$2 or \$3 billion. I think it has got to be infinitely more. I think it should be more. We can get a good deal out of foreign aid, some out of military, and more to be taken out of the non-military functions in the budget. As a matter of fact, I think some criticism can be placed at the door of Congress in not going along with a robust economy program. I have had a taste of it not so long ago, as a matter of fact.

Moderator Granik: May we have another question?

MR. EUGENE POWELL: My name is Eugene Powell, Research Physicist. My question is for Senator Dirksen: What do you believe is the probable effect upon the ways in which Communist expansion will be carried out supposing that we do reduce our mobilization to any extent?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I do not know just exactly what the questioner has in mind — whether he means by reducing foreign aid there will be an expansion of the Communist ideology in other sections of the world, and if that is going to be the case, let us answer that by asking another question: How long do we keep other countries on our

apron strings. Is it going to be something like the canard that I heard in Europe when some people in a small country asked:

"Do you get any money from America?"

"No, we don't."

And they said, "Haven't you any Communists? You know, they are worth \$35,000 in American money. Just tell them about it and you can get money out of the Federal Treasury of the United States."

I think if we can take the European cooperation administration report at face value, and the investment is an industrial production and agricultural production, it is just about time to call a halt now, and find out whether there is spirit and will and determination enough for those countries to be in our corner, because if they are not, they probably will not be in our corner later.

Moderator Granik: Senator Humphrey, do you think it is time to call a halt?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I do not. I also enjoy these analogies and fine stories that my friend tells, they are most entertaining, but they do not get down to the issue. As a matter of fact, what the Senator is simply saying is that he wants security, but he does not want to pay for it. He is saying these people in Europe are not important to our welfare. Yet he knows that if Western Europe is lost, the balance of production, the proportionate balance, goes to the Soviet Union. He knows that if Western Europe is lost, the steel production goes to the Soviet Union which makes her more powerful than the United States. He knows that if Western Europe is lost which has 80 per cent more people than the United States has, the balance of the population goes to the Soviet Union.

All I am saying is that the request that has been made for foreign aid today is predicated on the basis of \$6 billion for military assistance. That means for tanks, for guns, for aircraft, and those tanks and guns and aircraft are there because the Soviet has 175 divisions and 14,000 planes.

I want the Senator to tell me what he wants to do over in Europe?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I shall tell my friend: First of all, he must not forget there are 2 billion 300 millions of dollars in economic aid in that program. That means for building roads and bridges and plants. And the interesting thing is that that aid which should have filtered down to the grass roots never got there. ECA comes along now for the first time with what they call "a daring program," to get down to the grass roots. Well, what have we spent \$9, \$10, \$11 billion for, I would like to know? It certainly has not boosted the will to resist. When you look at the British situation today, with Aneurin Bevan moving away from the Attlee government, and if he should prevail, I wonder if it is not all lost?

Moderator Granik: I know we have many more questions, but we just have time for brief summaries by our speakers.

Senator Dirksen, will you continue?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Any prudent person, if he is in his right mind, is for defense and security of his country. I think every prudent

person wants an efficient defense, a defense that is purchased with the people's money on an economical basis. Squeeze out the waste and let us not do on the assumption that all the brains and all the wisdom are reposed in one mind or a small group of minds. When all is said and done, this country belongs to the people of the United States. They fork over the taxes, and in so far as I can bring it about, I am going to do my best to see that waste and extravagance are taken out of this program, whether it be in the form of foreign aid or what it is, to make sure that the people get their money's worth.

Moderator Granik: Thank you, Senator Dirksen. And now your summary, Senator Humphrey?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: My conclusion is that defense is not cheap nor is freedom cheap. As a matter of fact, it costs a great deal in sacrifice. It costs a great deal in dollars. And the American people are prepared to pay that cost. All of us want it done efficiently, and there are those of us who are working to see that it is done efficiently. But I point out that as we face the monster of the Kremlin, and the power of Communist aggression, that we need friends, and we need allies, and they need to be strong just as we must be strong. This means not only national security at home and defense at home but it means the strengthening of our allies with their efforts and our efforts in a joint effort and in a cooperative effort of the free peoples of the world. And I say to the Senator from Illinois, that whatever that cost may be it is cheaper than enslavement; and whatever may be the sacrifice, it is cheaper than to live under the regimented atheistic system that may be upon us.

Up until now the Senator has not shown the waste. He says he wants no waste, but has not shown it. I have pointed out a minimum program that will give us the kind of security we need with the tooling up process that will make it possible for us to go ahead for all-out mobilization when and if the hour comes that that need must be faced.

Moderator Granik: Thank you, gentlemen. You have been listening to a discussion on "What's Going to Happen to Mobilization?"

Our speakers have been Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, and Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Republican of Illinois.

Thank you very much, gentlemen.

(Applause)

The Announcer: For reprints of this discussion, send ten cents to Ransdell Incorporated, Printers and Publishers, Washington 18, D. C. That is ten cents to R-A-N-S-D-E-L-L Incorporated, Washington 18, D. C.

This is the American Forum of the Air.

Next week the Bohn Aluminum and Brass Corporation, one of the Nation's largest producers of aluminum and brass products, will again present the American Forum of the Air in a discussion on "Should West Point Be Abolished?" Our speakers will be Senator William Benton, Democrat of Connecticut; Senator Lester C. Hunt, Democrat of Wyoming; Brigadier General Charles E. Saltzman and Captain Lowell Limpus, noted newspaper columnist.

Each week at this time the American Forum of the Air, dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues is presented so that you in your home may enjoy the authoritative discussion of the many topics of our time.

The American Forum of the Air, founded and moderated by Theodore Granik, has been presented by the Bohn Aluminum and Brass Corporation.

This program has come to you from the NBC Television Studios in Washington, D. C.

This is Ray Michael speaking.

The American Forum of the Air is sponsored each week on N.B.C. Television by the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation, one of the nation's largest producers of aluminum and brass products.

The Proceedings of

THE AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR

As broadcast simultaneously over the coast to coast radio network and through the television network facilities of the National Broadcasting Company, Inc., are printed and a limited number are distributed free to further the public interest in impartial radio discussions of questions affecting the public welfare.

by

PRINTERS RANSDALL INC. PUBLISHERS

810 Rhode Island Avenue, N. E.

WASHINGTON 18, D. C.

(When requesting copies by mail, enclose ten cents to cover mailing)

The proceedings of the American Forum of the Air are held every Sunday evening from 10:00 to 10:30 p. m., E.D.T., in the National Broadcasting Company Television Studios in the Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C. The public is cordially invited to attend these broadcasts and to submit questions from the floor to the participants.

17  17

J-11328



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org