THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

THOMAS L. ROBINSON.....Publisher
J. E. DOWD.....General Manager
B. S. GRIFFITH.....Executive Editor
C. A. McKNIGHT.....Editor

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 1951

Alice Seeks For Light In Wonderland, D. C.

* * * * * * *

THE MAD HATTER TELLS WHY EVERYBODY IS SO ANGRY WITH EVERYBODY ELSE

(The following article by James Reston, New York Times diplomatic correspondent in Washington, originally appeared in the April 15 edition of The Times. It is reprinted here by special permission of The New York Times and the author. Editors, The News.)

* * *

By JAMES RESTON

"In that direction," said the (Cheshire) Cat, waving its right paw around, "lives a Hatter; and in that direction," waving the other paw, "lives a March Hare. Visit either you like: they're both mad."

"But I don't want to go among mad people," Alice remarked.

"Oh, you can't help that," said the Cat. "We're all mad here. . . ."—**From "Alice's Adventures in Wonderland."**

WASHINGTON

THE Mad Hatter was sitting on the big black couch in the Senate press gallery this morning when Miss Alice walked in.

Alice: Why is everybody here out of sorts with everybody else?

Hatter: It's the war, child. The Chinese are killing our soldiers in Korea. The Russians are threatening our friends all over Asia and Europe, so the Republicans are naturally angry and the Democrats and the Democrats are angry with the Republicans. Surely you understand that?

Alice: No, I don't think I do. For if our men are being killed and our countries threatened, everybody should be working together.

Hatter: The Supreme Commander's been dismissed. That's what disturbs and divides us. Man by the name of MacArthur. Great general.

Alice: Oh, dear, that is a pity! But if he was really the "supreme" commander, who could dismiss him?

Hatter: It's the Constitution, Miss! The Supreme Commander in this country is not really "supreme." The "supreme" commander is the Commander in Chief. That is President Truman, and he has an absolute right to dismiss General MacArthur if the general is not carrying out his orders.

Alice: Wasn't he carrying out the President's orders?

Hatter: Apparently not, so under the Constitution, the President replaced him.

Alice: Then why are the Republicans angry? Don't they believe in the Constitution?

Hatter: Of course they do. The Republican Party is the party of Abraham Lincoln and Senator Taft. It is devoted to the Constitution. Anybody knows that. It prides itself in the conservation of great principles of Government procedure. If you had been here earlier you wouldn't have to ask. For four months the Republicans fought in the troops-to-Europe debate for the constitutional principle of civilian control of the military. Good show, too!

Alice: Then what made them change so quickly? If they wanted civilian control of the military for four months, why don't they want civilian control of General MacArthur now?

(This young woman is taking a decidedly un-American attitude, thought the Mad Hatter.)

Alice: And why, if things are so serious, couldn't the Commander in Chief and the Supreme Commander get together?

Hatter: This naive confidence in reason is entirely out of the question. General MacArthur was 7,000 miles away. He had a war to direct. He had communiques to write and cablegrams from correspondents to answer and Senators to receive, and trips to far-off places such as Formosa to make.

Alice: When was he back here last?

Hatter: In 1937.

Alice: I'm sorry, but I don't see why, if the President had the power to dismiss him, he didn't have the power to order him home for a little chat. Does the President always dismiss men who are naughty?

Hatter: Certainly not! But he always dismisses men who are naughty to him.

Alice: What do the Republicans think he should do?

Hatter: You must simply read the statements of Senators Taft and Wherry and Representative Martin. The one from Massachusetts. They're all in the papers.

Alice: That's precisely what confuses me.

Hatter: Now see here. Here is a detailed account of a speech by Senator Taft at the Yale Club Thursday night. No Yale man would seek to deceive another Yale man. The speech is entirely clear. The Senator says the war in Korea has "no purpose whatsoever." He points out that the influence of freedom in the Far East can be built up only by the believers in freedom among the Far Eastern powers themselves. And Senator Wherry says . . .

Alice: Just a minute, please. Senator Taft also says in that same speech that he favors extending the Korean war to China. If it has no purpose, why make it bigger?

Hatter: The way to end a war is to end it. Bomb the "privileged sanctuary" in Manchuria, I say!

Alice: Wouldn't that make the Communists cross? And wouldn't they then bomb our "privileged sanctuary" in Japan? I am confused about all this. The only advantage I can see in the whole thing is that we must be stronger than the Russians now.

Hatter: What do you mean stronger than the Russians now? We are far weaker. They can take Korea or Japan or Western Europe anytime they like. We won't be strong enough to deal with them for fifteen months or two years.

Alice: Then why do we want to provoke them now? If we are silly enough to risk a big war, why not wait a couple of years?

Hatter: Confound it, because these little untidy wars are the very mischief! Partial war, partial peace, partial controls, partial mobilization, total inflation, total fiddlesticks! Appeasement's the trouble. That's what causes the confusion. When you get into any kind of war you must use all the power you have; otherwise you're an appeaser!

Alice: I suppose that's what we should have done with the Russians when they blockaded Berlin and with the Yugoslavs when they shot down the American planes, and the . . .

Hatter: Don't make foolish remarks. Korea is not Berlin and Communist China is not Yugoslavia. . .

Alice: Wouldn't it be nice if they were?

Hatter: Appeasement is what we were talking about. Mr. Wherry charges the Truman Administration with appeasement. So does Mr. Taft. So does Mr. Martin. They want an end of this slaughter in Korea. They want a second front in South China. They want to cut our losses and they want to operate in Manchuria. They want peace and unconditional surrender. And no more nonsense! What more could you ask?

Alice: A little common sense wouldn't hurt! And, incidentally, whatever happened to the United Nations?

Hatter: The United Nations is a failure. Senator Taft said so Thursday night. He said . . .

Alice: Could I please have a drink of water? . . . There! . . . Now let us begin at the beginning. And you correct me when I'm wrong. There is a war going on in Korea.

Hatter: Right.

Alice: The Chinese Communists and the North Korean Communists are on one side (with the Russian Communists just behind) and fourteen members of the United Nations have troops fighting on the other side.

Hatter: Right.

Alice: Western Europe is more important than Korea.

Hatter: Gen. MacArthur said . . .

Alice: Excuse me, Western Europe is more important than Korea! And Western Europe is also threatened by Communist aggression, right?

Hatter: Right. But Western Europe can hardly live without Southeast Asia.

Alice: So both Europe and Asia have to be protected.

Hatter: Right.

Alice: The United States is not the United Nations.

Hatter: Half-right.

Alice: If we keep going as we are in Korea, things could go on like this for years. But if we put in a lot more men and bomb Manchuria, maybe the Chinese and the Russians would quit.

Hatter: Right.

Alice: But maybe they wouldn't, too. Maybe they'd take Japan or Western Europe. Isn't that the rub?

Hatter: You're a persistent and tedious child. You want growing and learning. The Orientals love aggressive, resolute and dynamic leadership. General MacArthur said so last year.

Alice: I'm sorry. I just thought maybe little wars were better than big wars. Do all the soldiers agree with MacArthur on fighting in Manchuria and putting Asia first?

Hatter: Agree? Soldiers fight, they don't agree. Generals Marshall, Eisenhower and Bradley all think Europe is more important than Asia. But, of course, they've been tainted by experience.

Alice: Just the same, the Republicans are backing MacArthur?

Hatter: Well, not precisely. You see, they want to take advantage of all the fuss without really going along with General MacArthur's ideas.

Alice: I say, this is a peculiar country, isn't it? Tell me one other thing before I go. Mr. Martin said that the future of this country was at stake now and that if America was to be saved Congress must do it. You don't really believe that, do you?

Hatter: Oh, no child. I'm not that mad.

Security May Be Threatened In Truman-MacArthur Battle

MARQUIS W. CHILDS

THIS is Gen. MacArthur's week. Thanks to the magic device of television, the Pacific hero's homecoming will be viewed by more of his fellow citizens than anyone's in the past.

The TV screen will bring MacArthur into millions of homes with all of his sense of the dramatic. When the other military leaders — Eisenhower, Bradley, Nimitz, Halsey — returned, they could be heard on radio but television was then in its beginning. The effect this can have is as incalculable as was the reaction to the crime committee hearings.

How MacArthur will carry on his side of a contest with Truman and the Truman policies probably even the General, himself, does not yet know. Certainly all avenues of publicity will be open to him with editors and publishers outbidding each other to buy his every word.

Such a contest could take one turn that might work particular harm to this country's future security. It could become a battle of the documents — who said what and when as spelled out on the teletypes between Tokyo and the Pentagon.

President Truman opened up that possibility when the White House made public at the 1 A. M. press conference three official exchanges with MacArthur's headquarters. The President had unquestionably the right to declassify those documents.

But his action startled and alarmed some officials in the Pentagon who have been conditioned to regard those messages as the very top of top secret. Most secret cables coming into the Defense Dept. are automatically circulated among the small group with special clearance to see them.

Not so, however, the exchanges between MacArthur and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

These top-secret files are known to contain much more ammunition to fire up the controversy. And significantly there is ammunition for the Truman side and for the MacArthur side.

Undoubtedly MacArthur has with him a file of those all-important exchanges with Washington. But whether he has a right to release them or not is another matter. The Administration would have an unfair advantage if it had the power to release the documents if chose to release, which is why Republican Senators backing the General have demanded that the whole exchange be made public.

This demand will grow and it may well be that the only way for the public to make a fair judgment is to put all the documents on the record. If this is not done, then the likelihood is that parts of these messages will be disclosed by the familiar Washington system of leak and counter-leak. If the last be the case, the net result will be to fan the controversy with those who really want to know the truth finding themselves further frustrated in the bitterness engendered by both sides.

To make the full exchange public will in all probability tell the enemy some things he did not know before and which he would like to know. But since the whole angry ruckus is written up large for the world to see, with the emphasis on America's divisions and dissensions, perhaps this would be a small price to pay for some objectivity in what threatens to be a battle of passions and personalities.

People's Platform

Letters should be brief, written on one side of the paper. The writer's name must be signed, but may be withheld from publication in the discretion of the Editor. The News reserves the right to condense.

Truman Was Right

CHERAW, S. C.

Editors, The News:

I HAVE a job in a textile plant, and, if I refuse to do what I am told by those placed over me, I expect to lose my job, regardless of how long I have been employed. If I can't take orders I should not have authority to give orders.

I have great respect for General MacArthur, but I believe he overstepped his authority as a military man. I have served in three branches of our military forces and I was never supposed to obey the orders of our superiors, regardless of whether we like the man who gave it or not. We did not question the order to see if it was right in our opinion. We were taught to carry out the orders of our superiors regardless.

Therefore, I congratulate our President for his step. I have to clip my chickens' wings when they fly out of the chicken wire to keep them shut up and in their proper place. That's why the President had to take steps regarding the General. He was losing control of his household.

He's the President and he has to take the blame of those who disagree with him, but I admire him for his courage. If all turn their backs on him, he stands his ground on his constitutional rights and the trust placed in him by the majority of our people who elected him President and Commander-in-Chief of all the armed forces. I don't agree with him in everything, but I believe in right. He's a human and only man in the flesh.

And as for the Republicans in the Senate and House who are talking so much about this and that. What have they done in the last eighteen years for the country? Nothing that I know of. But they nearly ruined the entire nation before 1932.

Who was President when some of the bonus army that went to Washington was fired on by the Army? Who was Chief of Staff?

—J. A. GRAHAM.

Truman Action Scored

ROCK HILL, S. C.

Editors, The News:

I THINK that by his action in removing General MacArthur of his command in Korea President Truman has shown to our country he is more of a Communist than Joe Stalin ever was.

If he only had half the ability and judgment General MacArthur has shown, this country would not be in the shape it is today. We believe that he and some of his aides are only interested in prolonging the war in Korea to keep taxes and prices high.

I believe that the American people are so far ahead of Mr. Truman in thinking that he can not even see their tail light. I only hope General MacArthur runs against him in the next election and gives the people a chance to show you how bad he can be beaten.

If our Congress doesn't do something about this wrong Mr. Truman has done General MacArthur, I don't believe many of them will be around after the next election.

—J. T. McABEE.

No Letters Today

KOREA

THIS letter is intended to help boost our mail, which we receive very little of. We have written to many people in hopes of receiving mail, but it seems to be to no avail. I wonder if your paper could help just a little?

No one realizes just how important mail is to a lonely GI in a foreign country. We are beginning to wonder if the people at home even remember us. We would all appreciate anything you can do for us. Please do try to help.

—S-SGT. BILL TAYLOR
SGT. E. J. LORENCE
CPL. BURT GUNN
CPL. MERRILL BARTO
SGT. FRANK ZULAICA
S-SGT. GARY HARM
SGT. EDDIE PROBST
605 TC SQDN
APO 970
C/o P. M. San Francisco, Calif.

Pogo's Charm

CHARLOTTE

Editors, The News:

BLESSINGS on you for removing "Ozark Ike" and replacing it with "Pogo". It seems a perfect natural with the Nature Museum. Pogo has a charm all its own and is as refreshing as Kefauver.

—LEON K. GUTMANN.

A WAY TO DISPEL THE FOG

FOR more than two months, the United States Senate argued a weighty proposal to endorse the sending of ground troops to Europe. In that Great Debate, the point was made over and over by Republicans that Congress should approve any such action before it is taken by the President. That view finally prevailed, and a resolution expressing the "sense" of the Senate was adopted.

Such a resolution does not force the President to send the troops, nor is it legally binding upon him if he decides to send more than the stipulated four divisions. Nonetheless it is of some useful purpose, since it places the stamp of Congressional approval on U. S. participation in General Eisenhower's international defense force.

Why wouldn't a similar resolution on the Far Eastern issue be of equal, or even greater, service? Senator Cain of Washington introduced yesterday a resolution calling for a declaration of war against Communist China and against that part of Asiatic Russia being used by the Communists for supplying men and materiel for the Korean War.

The Cain proposal, we believe, goes too far. A declaration of war is not needed at the moment. But a resolution saying that it is the sense of the Congress that the President should carry the war to Communist China more realistically and more aggressively would be in order.

It should cover everything that has been proposed:

1. Bombing of Chinese and Manchurian airfields, railroads, highways, bridges, factories, troop concentrations wherever they are found to be contributing to the Communist effort in the Korean War.

2. Complete air and naval blockade of the entire Chinese coast.

3. Use of United States officers and technicians and U. S. war materiel to train and equip Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist troops, employment of U. S. landing craft and transports to carry the Nationalists to the Chinese mainland, full support from U. S. air and naval units to cover a Nationalist invasion, and a pledge to throw U. S. ground troops into the fight if Chiang's forces are sent reeling back.

Such a resolution would not force Mr. Truman and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to change current Far Eastern military policy. But it would free their hands to do so.

A resolution like that would quickly dispel the fog of confusion that has welled up in the wake of President Truman's dismissal of General MacArthur. It would alert the American people to the full potentialities of an all-out war with Communist China—a war that would gobble up hundreds of thousands of our young men and billions of dollars of defense production without seriously weakening the real source of Communist power, Soviet Russia. It would awaken them to the catastrophic results of a Russian invasion of Western Europe—an invasion that would logically follow a major commitment of our strength to the Far East. It would serve notice that we are taking over the policing of the world by ourselves, and to heck with our U. N. allies.

A resolution like that, in brief, would put an end to much of the loose talk and loose thinking about war in China. It would force some of the Administration critics out into the open and make them stand and be counted as favoring officially that for which they agitate unofficially. We believe that most of them would run for cover, and that the resolution would be voted down by a majority much larger than the Democratic margin in Congress.

The American people don't want another major war, in China or anywhere else, if it is humanly possibly to avoid it. Given time to recover from the emotional shock of the MacArthur dismissal and an opportunity to rest their eyes away from the glittering pageantry of MacArthur's long overdue return to his native land, they will show the same good sense and clear vision that they have displayed at every other critical stage in this nation's history. Of that we are confident.

PUBLIC APATHY AND HIGHWAY SAFETY

JOHN A. PARK SR., chairman of the Governor's Advisory Committee on Highway Safety, kept close watch over highway safety legislation during the recent session of the North Carolina General Assembly. And we'll take his word for it that anti-Scott bias in the Assembly contributed to the doom of all major bills offered by his committee and others.

Mr. Park, who has opposed the Governor on many issues, believes that His Excellency was "entirely sincere" in his desire to do something about highway safety, and that the various bills were not, by any stretch of the imagination, "pet legislation" of the Governor.

But Mr. Park has only told a part of the story—and a small part. The big reason why effective highway safety laws are not written and not enforced is public apathy. There is simply no groundswell of militant public opinion in behalf of such legislation.

Many techniques have been used to build public sentiment for highway safety, but all of them have failed. There are a few champions here and there, of course, but all the letters and telegrams sent to the General Assembly this year in favor of stricter laws and stricter enforcement would scarcely overflow a cigar box. In the absence of militant public opinion, lawmakers and law enforcement officers can hardly be expected to overextend themselves.

We are a strange people. We go into veritable convulsions of emotion over war, but we are utterly complacent when told that the automobile has killed as many Americans in 50 years as *all of our wars put together*. We will breathe fire over the legalizing of fireworks or cap pistols because a handful of people might get fingers blown off, but we ignore the near-thousand deaths from automobile wrecks in North Carolina each year. A drive to raise money to combat polio will put legions of volunteers to work, but you'd have a dickens of a time getting more than two people to ring doorbells in behalf of highway safety.

Perhaps someone, some time will find the right technique for getting our minds to the great hazards of the highways and charging our emotions with the will to eliminate them. That technique has not yet been found, and until it is, we will zip merrily along killing thousands and injuring hundreds of thousands each year.

LET'S TAKE A WALK

LET'S take a walk. While it hasn't been a hard Winter, it's been an unpleasant one, not conducive to hikes. Now the sun shines neatly on the new trees and the air is fresh enough to wash the dust of Winter from our lungs.

Try this path. It's pebbly and clean and cuts through a wide green field. Dandelions border it and there are some violets, looking fragile and virginal, off to the right.

On the edge of the field, near the pond, there is a thin grove of birch trees, silver-pale and yellow-green.

There is a flat white rock by the path; a lizard lies in the sun like a fissure in the rock. It floats away like quicksilver at the vibration of our feet.

A white butterly poses in mid-air. A bird whistles in the birch grove. A bee sings over a blue flower. A fish surfaces in the middle of the pond, sending out ripples.

Across the water the hill climbs green and smooth to the rounded summit. A brown-and-white cow is painted against the green, its head raised. White cumulus clouds are piled up far beyond the hilltop like a powdered wig.

The sun sparkles on the still blue water. The birch bark behind our back is warm and fragrant. The bird whistles again, an invitation to sleep.

Let's take a nap.

Ralph McGill in The Atlanta Constitution

LET'S TURN CHIANG LOOSE?

GENERAL M'ARTHUR'S friends are saying it was his insistence on allowing Chiang Kai-shek's troops to be "turned loose" which chiefly brought about his dismissal. That is not quite true, but it was one of the reasons.

The more unreasoning are saying the Administration prefers to have Americans killed, rather than Chinese.

Let's patiently examine it.

In the first place Chiang was chased to the island of Formosa. Presumably those who chased him there are able to do so again.

Therefore, how would Chiang be "turned loose"?

He would have to be provided with a great fleet of invasion craft. The United States would have to supply and man them.

Ammunition, food, equipment and transport would have to flow to him steadily, day after day. The United States would have to provide all these, across long sea-route lines from this country.

He would need daily air protection, which only the United States Air Force could give. Tremendous naval strength would of necessity be concentrated there.

And, finally, if he should make a landing and then meet with reversal, as he almost surely would, having been chased out before, it would be only American troops thrown into the Chinese mainland which would sustain Chiang there.

Now, maybe that's what we should do. General MacArthur thought so. If Americans want, or think necessary, the opening of a second front on the mainland of Asia, then by all means Chiang's troops should be employed.

But, let us have none of this empty and wishful thinking that all that needs to be done is to "turn Chiang's troops loose". There is no chance of turning them loose unless they are made merely a part of an invasion by the Army, Navy and Air Force of the United States.

Margaret Truman says she gets so excited at baseball games she yells and strains her voice. She should lay off the umpires and have her father write them.—*Ellisville (Ga.) Sun.*

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

GOP Fears MacArthur Fuss May Backfire

WASHINGTON

CAPITOL HILL cloakrooms have been buzzing as never before over the MacArthur incident. This is true of Republicans perhaps more than Democrats. The Democrats are glum, the Republicans elated—though not all of them.

Here are highlights from some of the most significant of these backstage conversations:

Bob Taft expressed concern to Senator Wherry of Nebraska that the GOP might get stuck with MacArthur as its 1952 Presidential candidate. Of course, this would eliminate him, though Taft didn't mention this to Wherry. Taft has been noticeably irritable, has snapped at Senate functionaries and fellow Senators. He got in a private wrangle with Kerr of Oklahoma over Kerr's statement criticizing MacArthur.

GOP Senator Millikin of Colorado also expressed worry that Eisenhower would oppose MacArthur, which would split the Republicans down the middle. Bridges of New Hampshire replied that Eisenhower was too smart to get into the middle, that Eisenhower also might differ with Truman and run the risk of being fired.

Bridges has been bustling around GOP cloakrooms more than anyone else. He told one group joyfully: "This is the biggest windfall that has ever come to the Republican Party."

On one occasion, Virginia's Senator Robertson, a Democrat, remarked to Bridges: "Well, you have a new candidate for President."

"He's better than the present President," the New Hampshire Senator shot back.

"I guess there's a lot of life left in him even at 71," piped up Lodge of Massachusetts.

Actually, Lodge, Duff of Pennsylvania and Ives of New York have held some worried huddles about the MacArthur boom and how it would affect their Eisenhower boom. During one of these huddles, Ives snorted: "How in the hell are we going to get any unity around here!"

Smith of New Jersey, the former Princeton professor, has been quite critical over the fact that MacArthur wasn't left in Japan to keep the occupation intact and complete the peace treaty. But privately Smith seemed to approve of removing MacArthur from military command.

Senators Knowland and Nixon, both California Republicans, are eager-beavers on the MacArthur bandwagon. But Nixon had an interesting conversation with Duff of Pennsylvania just before MacArthur was fired.

"What party does Eisenhower belong to?" Nixon asked.

Duff, one of the strongest boosters for Eisenhower, assured him that Ike was a Republican.

"I hope so," declared Nixon. "He's the man for us."

Nixon, however, is now beating the bass drum on the MacArthur bandwagon.

Taft Discouraged Impeachment

DURING the first Republican meeting in ex-Speaker Joe Martin's office on the morning MacArthur was fired, Congressman Charlie Halleck of Indiana demanded that Republicans immediately press for Truman's impeachment.

It was Bob Taft, however, who demurred. Such a move, he said, was asinine. It would be much smarter, he advised, to bring MacArthur back to the United States and build up sentiment for his case before the Republican Party went all-out for him.

The impeachment idea was then dropped, though Joe Martin told GOP colleagues to keep talking about it. "We've got to keep the fire burning," he said, half joking.

Martin's Ultimatum

IT WAS Joe Martin who adroitly masterminded the drive to invite MacArthur to a joint session of Congress. At first Democratic leaders were decidedly lukewarm, argued it would set a bad precedent for Congress to roll out the red carpet for a general, especially one ousted for insubordination. They also felt it would be an affront to President Truman.

However, Martin handed a virtual ultimatum to his old friend, Speaker Sam Rayburn. He gave him until 2:30 Friday to agree to invite MacArthur to a joint session of Congress.

"MacArthur has been away fourteen years," Rayburn drawled sourly. "What's all the rush?"

So Martin extended the deadline to four o'clock.

Martin didn't say so, but the reason he pushed Rayburn was because MacArthur's office in Tokyo had given him a veiled ultimatum that the general might not speak in Washington at all unless conditions were to his choosing; also that he had to know in a hurry in order to plan his itinerary. It was also made clear that MacArthur was not anxious to answer questions before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

After getting his ultimatum from Martin, Speaker Rayburn called the White House, cautioned the President that MacArthur might be made a martyr by snubbing him, so it was decided the general would be given a chance to address Congress.

Rayburn then went back to Joe Martin, suggested they give MacArthur the same treatment given Eisenhower — namely, a meeting of both Houses of Congress in the auditorium of the Library of Congress.

Whereupon Martin issued another ultimatum. He demanded a full-dress meeting in the House chamber. Otherwise, he warned, the Republicans would rent the vast Uline Arena—an ice palace where the circus is held—and announce to the world that the Democrats would not permit MacArthur to address Congress.

Wearily, Rayburn gave in.