THE CHARLOTTE NEWS

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

FRIDAY, APRIL 20, 1951

THE MACARTHUR ADDRESS

GENERAL of the Army Douglas MacArthur added another star to his galaxy yesterday,with a forceful, lofty, and moving address to a joint meeting of the U. S. Congress and to the people of the United States.

Speaking without a trace of bitterness over his recent dismissal by President Truman, and scorning the partisanry that has motivated some of his more vocal admirers and critics in Congress, the General gave a restrained, well-organized defense of the views that cost him his Far Eastern command.

It was undoubtedly the high spot of his illustrious career, and he measured up to the drama and significance of the moment in every respect.

• • •

THAT having been said, an examination of the address itself is in order. In analyzing the speech, however, it should be kept in mind that the General may subsequently expand on his ideas, or present other ideas, in the coming days and weeks. Thirty-six minutes is hardly time enough for a complete exposition of his views on one of the great issues of our nation's history.

To us, one of the most meaningful aspects of General MacArthur's talk, an aspect that was ignored in early Congressional reaction, is that there is a surprisingly large area of agreement between his over-all diplomatic and military philosophy and that of the Administration with which he has presumably been at such great odds.

He agreed that international Communism is a global threat, and that Europe and the Far East are inextricably tied together. He said that the successful advance of Communism in one sector threatens the destruction of freedom in every other sector—a theory that prompted our resistance to the North Korean aggression.

His exposition of the growth of nationalism among the peoples of the Far East after the grip of colonialism was broken in World War II, and his stressing of food, shelter, clothing and a better standard of living for these underdeveloped peoples were squarely in line with Administration policy. There was a wry irony in the enthusiasm with which the Republican side of the hall greeted the MacArthur endorsement of the basic philosophy behind the Point 4 program—a program most of them have voted against in the past just as enthusiastically as they applauded it yesterday.

MacArthur's outline of the new strategic situation in the Pacific, following our World War II victories, is basically in line with all informed military thinking. The line from the Aleutians to the Marianas is, as he said, a sound defense against aggression from the Asiatic continent. It has not been so much as hinted by the Administration that any portion of this line, with the single exception of Formosa, would be surrendered. And the fact that Formosa was successfully neutralized and by-passed in the conquest of Japan raises some question as to whether MacArthur is overrating its strategic importance.

Though the Administration may have assessed the Chinese Communist revolution inaccurately in its early stages, it is undoubtedly true that MacArthur today would find agreement with his estimate of China's growing aggressiveness and its lust for conquest. And certainly he will find only praise for his administration of the Japanese occupation, and agreement that the Philippine people have measured up to their responsibilities.

The General devoted about three-fourths of his speech to these general topics. The fact that there is such a large area of agreement makes it all the more tragic that he was not brought back to Washington months or years ago for long and thorough discussions that might have cleared up disagreements, preserved national unity, and made unnecessary his recent break with President Truman.

• • •

IT IS NOT the area of agreement, however, but the area of disagreement that has engrossed the minds and inflamed the emotions of the American people. Mainly that disagreement is over the military strategy for fighting the Korean War.

General MacArthur explained quite emphatically that the original decision to resist the North Korean aggressors from a military standpoint was a sound one—a gracious endorsement of President Truman's action last June. Proof, he said, was the crushing defeat inflicted on the North Koreans. But the entry of Communist China, despite MacArthur's opinion that the Chinese would not intervene, created a new war and a new situation not originally contemplated. Without adequate reinforcements, without authority to bomb Chinese bases north of the Yalu, without the use of the Chinese Nationalist troops (which would have to have American logistical support), without a tight economic and naval blockade of the Chinese mainland, he found it impossible to bring about a quick victory over the new enemy.

And then he tossed in the biggest bombshell of his address. "For entertaining these views . . . I have been severely criticized . . . despite my understanding that from a military standpoint the above views have been fully shared by practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, including our own joint chiefs of staff." The implication there is that the Joint Chiefs have recently reversed their opinions, although the key may be found in the phrase—"from a military standpoint". The Joint Chiefs, occupied with global strategy, are not free to make every decision on purely a military basis. General Bradley's remark in Chapel Hill last night that "the question of General MacArthur's relief is primarily a political one" sheds light on this point.

MacArthur disagreed with the Administration in one other major respect—the possibility of Russia's entry into the Far East conflict. He believes that Russia will go to war when it is to Russia's advantage to do so, and that U. N. attacks on the Chinese mainland will neither speed nor delay Russian participation.

There you have the basic conflict between the Administration and General MacArthur. It is not new. Everything the General has said and written in recent months has set forth the same convictions. What assures a thorough Congressional examination of the issue at this time is the dramatic exposition of the MacArthur views yesterday.

• • •

IN PASSING, it should be noted that the General made virtually no mention of Soviet Russia and the threat to Europe posed by the 125 Red divisions drawn up behind the Iron Curtain. Yet in his now-famous letter to Rep. Joseph Martin, he had spoken of fighting "Europe's war"—a description somewhat at variance with his definition yesterday of the United States' stake in the conflict. He also made no mention of the complexities facing the Administration because it is engaged in a joint enterprise with U. N. partners rather than an exclusively American campaign. He also ignored a basic tenet of Administration policy—that the ultimate objective of the Korean War is not only a military victory in that sector, but also the avoidance of a Third World War.

And finally, it is pure sophistry to dismiss as "defeatism"—as General MacArthur did—our present inability to wage an effective war against Russia in Europe and the Far East simultaneously. It is true that we could do so after a lengthy all-out mobilization program. But we have not yet undertaken such a mobilization effort, and there is little zeal among members of the Congress to do so at present. On the contrary, there is interminable haggling over such questions as drafting 18-year-olds, there is outright opposition to universal military service, and there is great reluctance to levy the taxes to pay for our more modest defense program. Our relative military weakness stems from our hasty demobilization following World War II—a "bring the boys home" campaign that General MacArthur's Republican supporters led eagerly.

• • •

IN CONCLUSION the basic issue between the Administration and General MacArthur remains unchanged. The Administration hopes to achieve an honorable peace in Korea without committing our limited forces more than absolutely necessary, and to build up defenses against Communist aggression in Europe, the Mediterranean, and the oil-rich Middle East, in the belief that Russia is the source of Communist power and that any major war, if it comes, should be directed primarily at Russia.

General MacArthur believes that the struggle has already been joined in the Far East and that it cannot be decided successfully without aggressive offensive action against the mainland of China. He implies that such action should be undertaken immediately, with or without the support of the United Nations.

That is the issue before the Congress and before the people. As it is threshed out in the high councils of our National Government, it might be well for the American people to remember that a measure of the system that all of us are trying to preserve is the tumultuous reception given a military leader stripped of his command by a civilian President. There has not been in recent years so wholesome and refreshing a demonstration of the freedom we all enjoy.

From The Christian Science Monitor

GOLOMYANKA

WHAT a headline writer calls a "transparent fish story" has appeared in the newspaper *Evening Moscow*. It relates that numbers of fish called the "golomyanka" have been pulled from the 1,200-foot depths of Lake Baikal in Siberia and that the fish are so transparent that newspaper print can be read through their bodies.

The story does not say that the meaning of articles in *Pravda* or *Izvestia* can be made clearer by reading them through a golomyanka. Nor is it asserted that the golomyanka that got away did so because it was actually invisible.

However, the story is quite credible. In fact, the Russians would not have to yank up a golomyanka to illustrate their apparent point. Many of the narratives related by their diplomats and propagandists have been perfectly transparent ever since the North Korean Communists dashed south across the 38th parallel under inspiration of the Stockholm Peace Appeal.

'You Mean They Disagree And Nobody Goes To Jail?'

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.

A Vote For Paul Douglas!

CHARLOTTE

Editors, The News:

THE work of Senator Paul H. Douglas of Illinois in Washington has been of great interest to me as I share his views on economy and efficiency in government, and especially as it now becomes clear that the morality of some of the central figures of the present Administration collapsed some time ago, and we are just beginning to see some of the more odoriferous results of that collapse.

I don't know anything about the recent United Press survey of the Democratic leaders, but Mr. Alsop in The News on March 20 pointed out the results of that poll which showed, he said, that "Douglas is now far and away the first choice of the professional Democrats for the Presidential nomination, if President Truman does not choose to run . . ."

I don't know either what a professional Democrat is, but I believe that there are a lot of people who are not professional Democrats who would consider it a major triumph for American democracy if Douglas were to become President. I have been a Republican all my life, but I would become a Democrat and ring doorbells in Charlotte if he were to become a serious Presidential possibility. My interest in that possibility is purely personal, as I have no ambitions or connection except to take some active part in restoring the souls of our politicians. I think a good way to begin is to have a politician as President who will set an example to those around him, who will be honest with himself and with his country, and whose name is Paul H. Douglas.

—S. C. HAIR.

Use Of 'The Big Lie'

ST. PAULS

Editors, The News:

HITLER, a past master in the art of deception, knowing the stupidity and gullibility of his audience, had only to resort to the simple process of continuously repeating his fabrications, in order to convince his listeners that his statements were the Gospel truth.

We in America, everlastingly boasting of our superiority in everything under the sun, are now striving with all our might, and it seems with success, to wrest from the dead Hitler his most cherished asset, namely, telling a lie so convincingly and so often that it fools the elect.

For instance, the "Big Debate" here in the United States in regard to international affairs was nothing more or less than a camouflaged attempt by the Washington administrations, aided and abetted by London, to put across a "Big Lie"—and, it now seems, a successful endeavor to convince the American people that our future national existence depends altogether on an agreement for the United States to accept Red China into the United Nations (the "U.N." being only another "big lie") thus bringing to a face-losing halt the miserable Korean fiasco. Thereby enabling "Uncle Shylock" to concentrate all his energies and forces "somewhere in Europe", preferably at some point which would give the British Lion the most protection against the onslaughts of the Russian fear.

Twice in three decades we have been cajoled into accepting the role of a cat's paw with which to rake Europe's international chestnuts out of a fire, a conflagration started by her own stupidity and grasping blunders.

And now that we have almost exhausted our resources in two futile attempts to save "European Civilization" and, at the same time, by the gift of untold American dollars, tried to cram "Western Democracy" down their decadent throats, we are again—at the behest of the advocates of "World Federalism" who have the blessings of Truman, Acheson, et al—being asked to act in the role of "fall guy" in a third fiasco.

Why has MacArthur, who beyond doubt has kept Japan out of Stalin's clutches since World War II, been humiliated beyond description? Why do the American people allow this man to be made a scapegoat for Truman's comical "rat race" in Korea, unceremoniously kicked out? In the past thirty years, hundreds of thousands of American lives have been sacrificed on the altar of "mythology", that is, "world democracy".

Will we continue to listen to the voice of the sirens, courtesans, sychophants and political demagogues until we are totally destroyed? God forbid.

—J. L. WALKER.

Down With The Lobbyists!

DURHAM

Editors, The News:

WHO runs North Carolina? Not the people, though they are supposed to do so. We elect men to the Legislature. But they do not run the State, though we pay them $15 per day. They take practically two days off each week but they draw full pay. They are supposed to enact the laws. But the Lieutenant Governor and the Speaker of the House, by stacking committees, which they do, largely control legislation.

Lobbyists must be curbed, and that sharply. The people are going to do that very thing, once they are aroused. If they are going to run things it would be cheaper to leave the legislators at home. The lobbyist has no more right to influence a legislator privately than he would a juryman. A lawyer addresses a jury when they are together in the presence of the court. If he were to do that privately a mistrial would result and he would be disbarred.

The same rule should prevail in the Legislature. Legislators should be as competent as jurors. They should know their rights and, knowing, should dare maintain them. If they are not competent to legislate, then let them stay at home. Every lobbyist should be made to register with the Secretary of State and then should be made to wear a red coat and red, white and blue striped trousers, with the stripes horizontal rather than vertical. When he appears before any committee he should be made to swear that he has not spoken or written to any member of the committee or any legislator privately as to any pending legislation and that he has not given any liquor or anything else to anybody to influence legislation. The members of the committee should be sworn also to ascertain if he is telling the truth.

This would add considerable color to the Legislature but it might decrease the stink. All dogs should have the privilege of chasing any lobbyist day or night. This would pull the tail feathers of the lobbyists considerably. The lobbyists must be stopped. Unless we are slaves we are going to stop this infamous thing; and the sooner the better.

—REV. C. T. THRIFT.

U. S. Editors Comment On General MacArthur's Talk

By ASSOCIATED PRESS

The nation's newspapers today voiced commendation of General MacArthur's sincerity and patriotism in his address to the joint meeting of Congress. Some expressed doubt of the wisdom of the military policy he advocated.

Some editorials called the speech the greatest of his services to the nation.

Others termed it proof that the President was right in relieving him of his command.

Still others welcomed it as the first step of a re-examination and a clarification of American foreign policy.

Most praised the General's attitude and manner before Congress while questioning his arguments.

The New York Times said the General's speech bore out his claim that he was not the advocate of a partisan cause or a political aspirant.

But, it continued: "The issue here is not one of appeasement but of choosing the ground on which we wish to fight.

"General MacArthur himself agrees that his proposals are based on two assumptions — namely that the actions he advocates will crush Communist China and that Soviet Russia will not 'necessarily' join in the war. But the General himself seems to have doubts on the latter all-important point. And if his assumptions should prove wrong, as they did in the case of Communist China, the actions he advocates would not only lead to the catastrophe of a new World War; they would also put the onus for that war on us, even in the eyes of our friends."

The New Orleans Times-Picayune observed that "it came as a surprise to many that General MacArthur expressed his 'understanding' that the joint chiefs of staff favored the course he outlined against China. . . His declaration that we can and must hold both fronts — Far East and Western Europe — against the aggressor Soviet likewise will jolt our high politico-military command which was wondering how we may do even one of those chores at a time, and had concluded that we must choose one of the two."

The Chicago Tribune said MacArthur showed Congress its duty "to abandon the U.N. program of drift and delay, the Acheson program of bestowing a loving embrace, of consigning Americans to the meatgrinder of a never-ending war, the British program of using the United Nations and our own State Dept. to hold the arms of the American fighting man while the Reds slug him."

The Rocky Mountain News, of Denver, Colo., declared: "Here was a man fit to stand with Lincoln."

The Minneapolis Tribune commented that the nation "is indebted to MacArthur for a vigorous statement of conviction, but has yet to be presented with proof that he is right."

"It was one of the best reasoned, most forceful, most cogent speeches ever delivered in the United States Capitol," said **The Los Angeles Times.**

The New Orleans Item said it was sure MacArthur had not satisfied "all Americans when he said that if we expand the war outside Korea Russia 'will not necessarily' join the conflict."

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat asserted that "when the aura of adulation and semi-hysteria abates, we should expect a more reasoned presentation of the MacArthur policies and a calmer assessment of military-foreign policy decisions."

The New York Daily News declared, "MacArthur yesterday slapped every card in his hand down on the table for the world to see and consider — and for little Harry Truman and his military and political yes-men to top if they can."

Other sample editorial comment:

The New York Daily Mirror: "General MacArthur gave the lie today to the outrageous accusation against him that he, who has been a soldier for 52 years, disobeyed instructions. Good soldiers never are disobedient; and Douglas MacArthur is a perfect soldier. He said that no military leader had differed with the strategy and logic of the Pacific situation as he described it to the Congress, not even the Joint Chiefs of Staff. That means that what Gen. Omar Bradley said in public last Tuesday night was something quite different from what he said as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

Kansas City Star: "It was a magnificient presentation of the arguments for a policy . . . It may reasonably be asked of MacArthur on what evidence he founds his assumption that, in case we blockade Red China and bomb her shore bases, the Soviet Union will refuse to honor her explicit treaty obligation to come to the defense of the Chinese Communists. . . . Here, then, is the great dilemma which confronts the American people. Both the Asiatic policy advocated by MacArthur and the ambiguous policy now being pursued by our Government entail a gamble."

The New York Herald Tribune: "There are pros and cons here; what must be recognized, and what MacArthur's address makes very plain, is that these are essentially issues of military technique. There are no real issues of underlying policy or patriotism; in this debate there are no traitors or devils, but only sincere men who may have different views as to method but are as one in their loyalty to the great ideal of freedom. General MacArthur in leaving that deep impression behind his moving words made perhaps his greatest contribution to this difficult hour of our history."

San Francisco Chronicle: "The principal spokesman for the Government's opposition . . . General MacArthur . . . has stated his case in the Great Debate, and with so much of the evidence in, the American people can now at least gain a clear picture of the central issue. . . . That is the issue then — to decide which among the alternatives offered is the course best calculated to preserve an honorable peace, or, failing that, to win a decisive victory upon which an honorable peace may later be built."

Jacksonville, Fla., Times-Union: "MacArthur's speech constituted a strong attack on an American policy that has prevailed since the beginning of World War II—that is, to let Europe take precedence in all matters over the Far East. In effect, the general gave support to the belief of many people that while the nations of the Western world are keeping their eyes glued on the continent of Europe, Communists may be slipping in through the back door of Asia."

Newark, N. J., Star-Ledger: "Here was no strutting militarist, but a man whose great pride was in his faithfulness to democracy and civilian principles . . . We should now turn to the great questions raised by MacArthur and establish the true facts. When we have done that, we will be ready to go forward in our defense against aggression."

Portland, Ore., Oregonian: "We think the American people will agree with the fundamental logic of General MacArthur's position, so far as it concerns the war in Korea (but) we need not subscribe wholeheartedly to his global policies."

Oakland, Calif., Tribune: "The thought must surely occur to many that a great deal of controversy and indecision would have been avoided had the general, some time ago, been invited to Washington. We might then have had an earlier start on the necessary task of clearing the atmosphere which surrounded the Far East policies. We might have saved lives and prestige had there been a decision to let the public and Congress hear all sides from the best-qualified spokesmen."

Chicago Sun-Times: "We doubt his prediction that he will 'fade away.' He would not fade away, even if he really wanted to. For in his triumphal return to the United States after a fourteen-year absence, MacArthur has become an almost indispensable figure in a great debate that promises to last for some time. In telling his own story, MacArthur did nothing to abate the bitter controversy which has raged ever since he was fired by President Truman ten days ago."

Providence, R. I., Journal: "General MacArthur's speech to the Congress as a personal achievement was magnificent. Whether he has been right or wrong in his past and present recommendations, he emerges every inch the hero the American people have so long conceived him to be."

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

GOP Leaders Won't 'Sponsor' MacArthur

WASHINGTON

AT an explosive Republican Senatorial strategy meeting this week, the big GOP guns warned against tieing the Republican Party too closely to MacArthur's kite.

One of those who led the warning was Senator Taft, whose friends have been worried that MacArthur might crowd him as the GOP Presidential candidate in 1952.

"We don't know what MacArthur is going to say when he gets here," Taft told the strategy meeting. "As a political party we should keep out of this."

Senator Millikin of Colorado chimed in that occasionally past "conquering heroes" had come home and put their foot in their mouths. He recalled that Admiral Dewey, the conqueror of Manila, got a hero's reception and was presented with a free house, then transferred the house to his wife. Millikin also cited Charles Lindbergh, who came home to a hero's welcome and later made some remarks that offended religious groups.

However, the sharpest Republican fire was concentrated on Senator Cain of Washington for putting the Republican Party on the spot with his resolution declaring war on China. His colleagues agreed it was politically ill-advised, and ripped into him unmercifully.

Senator Wherry of Nebraska, who has been Secretary of State Acheson's bitter foe, actually snorted: "As far as the Cain resolution is concerned, I am on Acheson's side."

Senator Young of North Dakota warned that declaring war on China would do "more damage than anything that has happened in the Republican Party in five years."

Senator Aiken of Vermont pointed out a "slight technical" obstacle. He brought out that "we can't declare war against a government that we have refused to recognize."

Cain Argues

HOWEVER, Cain tried to defend his position by arguing that his real purpose was to "pin this war on Truman as Truman's war."

He pointed out that the President in his April 11 speech mentioned war 21 times. However, Cain's colleagues failed to follow his reasoning.

In the end, Cain insisted that he had promised to introduce the resolution and intended to go through with it. However, he agreed to make a statement that his only purpose was to focus attention on the China issue, since Truman had already got the country into war.

The most explosive outburst of the closed-door meeting came from Indiana's wild Senator Jenner. He was spurred out of his seat by a remark from Senator Taft that "no responsible Republican Senator would advocate impeachment."

To this Jenner shouted angrily: "I may not be part of the responsible Republican leadership, but I have my own opinion."

He demanded immediate impeachment of President Truman and used considerable profanity in demanding it.

Senator Ecton of Montana tried to soothe Jenner by explaining that it was up to the House to bring impeachment proceedings and that he was supposed to act as a jury. Ecton cautioned that it would be improper for a Senator who was supposed to sit on the jury to express advance opinions about impeachment.

In response to a suggestion that the Republicans appoint a welcoming committee, Millikin declared, "MacArthur must be left in the hands of the public. It shouldn't look like the Republicans are sponsoring him."

Beating Enlisted Men

IT has been hushed up by the Navy, but the Norfolk, Va., shore patrol has been officially accused of kicking and beating servicemen and throwing them into the brig without shoes.

These shocking charges were made in a confidential report by Rear Adm. F. N. Kivette, who was skipper of the aircraft carrier Midway until his promotion to admiral last month.

Kivette ordered his own investigation of the Norfolk shore patrol and sent a sharp report to the Navy, charging that the Norfolk SP's were "arrogant, dictatorial, arbitrary, sometimes abusive and occasionally brutal."