

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

MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1952

WHY DIDN'T MAC TALK UP BEFORE?

IT IS POSSIBLE, of course, that despite his chosen selection and preoccupation of late with business, rather than military matters, Gen. Douglas MacArthur has a clear and definite solution to the Korean conflict.
But it is most unlikely.
Other military men, up-to-date on events in Korea, and political leaders of both parties, emphasize their belief that there is no clear and definite solution.

"I could not have served any man first indirectly and then directly for six years as I did General MacArthur without gaining a tremendous respect for his intellectual and professional capacity.
"If I had to have any position of great responsibility in this country there is nothing that I would like to do more than from access to the finest brains, experience that I could find on any subject of importance to us and anyone with the palpable knowledge of the Far East were available I should certainly want to know what the invitation is clear. It does not behoove President-elect Eisenhower to dispatch a special invitation at this late date.
Furthermore, the late strich was hanging out during the recent election, but MacArthur conspicuously refused to give it a tug.
Certainly if MacArthur has a suggested solution he has to have put it in the hands or ears of the next President. If he does not expedite this matter, some persons may suspect that he has no solution save the one which was rejected following his recall.



TIME TO WEAR THE U. S. HAT

IN 1939, 11 per cent of the wheat produced in this country was exported.
By 1951, wheat exports had more than tripled 1939 figure, accounting for 35 per cent of production.
In 1952, 28 per cent of our cotton was exported.
By 1951, cotton exports had increased to 41 per cent of production.
Also last year, over one-fourth of our truck crop, a fifth of the tractors manufactured in the U. S., and a sixth of our trucks were exported.
Those figures are heartening. They mean jobs at home, markets for what we produce.
But the trend is reversing, drastically.
Statistics released by the Agriculture Department last week for a three-month period July-September 1952 show that agricultural exports are 31 per cent below last year's level.
Wheat, flour and tobacco are down 32 per cent.
Cotton is down 40 per cent.
Some of this decrease is the result of slackening off of foreign aid. We aren't giving away as much this year.
But—and this is what is important to the cotton and tobacco farmer of the South, and the wheat farmer of the Northwest—the market has shrunk. That means surplus, which, if long continued, means lower prices.
There are other reasons, besides the decrease in foreign aid, for this export drop-off. For one thing, some foreign buyers have difficulty selling goods in this country, thus obtaining dollars with which to buy our goods, because of our tariffs.

For another thing, Communist countries are underselling us, purposely losing money in a desperate attempt to regain their Western European markets and throw a monkey wrench into the world's economic system.
This trade problem, if it isn't worked out, and soon, will have severe repercussions on the tobacco warehouses of Robeson County and cotton fields of Cleveland County for 18 years and factories of Europe.
The new Secretaries of State and Agriculture, Dulles and Benson, will find this problem in their lap. So will Congress. Reciprocal trade agreements come up for renewal next year. They will have to rough it out.
Senator Millikin of Colorado, who'll head the Senate Finance Committee, voiced the sentiment of many of his influential colleagues the other day when he addressed the National Conference of Editorial Writers. He said he thinks much of the reciprocal trade agreement act. He said it's "wrecked" so much U. S. industries.
Maybe it has, but we haven't noticed many of these past 18 years.
Some of this decrease is the result of slackening off of foreign aid. We aren't giving away as much this year.
But—and this is what is important to the cotton and tobacco farmer of the South, and the wheat farmer of the Northwest—the market has shrunk. That means surplus, which, if long continued, means lower prices.
There are other reasons, besides the decrease in foreign aid, for this export drop-off. For one thing, some foreign buyers have difficulty selling goods in this country, thus obtaining dollars with which to buy our goods, because of our tariffs.

People's Platform

Letters should be brief. The writer's name and address must be given, but may be withheld from publication in the discretion of the Editors. The News reserves the right to condense.
Remember Sanitary Men
CHARLOTTE
Editors, The News:
The thinking mothers and housekeepers of Charlotte: Let's stop a moment and try to realize just how much the sanitary men of our city mean to us. They are faithful in Summer's heat and Winter's ice, sleet and snow. We could not exist comfortably or happily without them.
Let us of us remember them this Christmas—and generously.
—L. CRANE SCOTT.

Questions On Bond Election

CHARLOTTE
Editors, The News:
As a parent and a city-county property taxpayer, I would like these possibilities investigated before I decide how to vote on the coming bond issue.
1) Is it better to have million dollar school buildings and mediocre teachers? Would it not be to the citizens' advantage to hire more teachers at higher salaries and use the existing buildings with two daily shifts. The buildings are here, heated and equipped. More and better paid teachers would allow smaller classes with no teacher-teaching at the expense of the taxpayers?
2) Has Dr. Frank F. Jones' proposal for the Public Library to acquire the old Charlotte Sanatorium building been fully explored by the trustees and interested taxpayers of the city and county? If not, why not? If so, what are the findings? This year \$12,000 was spent on repairs to the not so old Charlotte school. Within two weeks after the Myers Park High School was opened in 1951, the roofs were leaking. Was this new building "leaked" at the expense of the taxpayers?
Before I vote to increase my property taxes—already increased nearly 13% by the recent revaluation—I like to see more discussion on the above questions. I prefer "million dollar teachers" to million dollar buildings for my children. Wouldn't you?
—MRS. S. J. SOLDATI.

City Needs Technical Institute

CHARLOTTE
Editors, The News:
I THOROUGHLY agree with your editorial of Dec. 1, Subject: "We Need Industrial Balance, Too."
Not only does the state of North Carolina need industrial balance, but it also needs State-supported college balance. There are, at present, twelve state supported colleges. The three closest to Charlotte are located, one in Winston-Salem and two in Greensboro. The great Charlotte area is entirely neglected and somewhere in this vicinity is the

Whoa, There, Marlow

FLORENCE, S. C.
Editors, The News:
IN HIS AP story in The News on Dec. 2, James Marlow says that the Marlow family, one of the Southern states which went Republican, already has said he won't accept Stevenson as president.
South Carolina did NOT go Republican, Jimmy Byrnes wanted it to, but he got beat. Tell Marlow that. If he can't stand the name of the Democratic Party, Byrnes and the rich boys who got rich under the Democrats—wanted it to go Republican, but it didn't.
—FRANK BARNWELL.

Clark's Tough Tactics

Clark happens to be a commander who got no good grades in Italy, and he doesn't want to repeat in Korea.
Landing in North Africa under the command of Eisenhower, Clark pulled a quick master-stroke by the French African leaders—a stroke which materially aided the early fall of North Africa.
The rest of his record, pending up the rough, rugged peninsula of Italy was one of Clark's worst experiences, and he doesn't like the idea of getting bogged down in a similar, slow-moving operation in Korea.
After he left Italy, furthermore, Clark had important experience in Vienna, where after V-E Day, he commanded

Who Faces A Heart-Rending Decision Regarding Korea

WASHINGTON
THE BASIC decision which President-elect Eisenhower must now make can be very simply defined. It is whether to mount a major offensive in Korea, or to attempt to inflict a decisive defeat on the Communist armies there.
Hope for a negotiated truce is now dead. Eisenhower has certainly not even seriously considered an evacuation of Korea, simply because this would be the equivalent of the Yalu check-and-jowl world. And everything else—whether to blockade the China coast, to arm, whether nuclear weapons can be usefully employed in the Korean war, whether Chinese Nationalist troops should be used—hangs on the central decision on an offensive.
There are, therefore, three basic questions to which Eisenhower will try to find the answers in Korea. The first is: Do we have the power available to mount a successful offensive? The second is: Can a successful offensive be mounted without extending the war over the Korean borders? The third is: If we do mount a successful offensive, will it either cause a new war, or at the very least materially improve our position?

According to those who have been in recent contact with the commanders on the spot, including General Clark and James Van Fleet, Eisenhower has a unanimous agreement on the answer to the first question. Eisenhower has the power to mount an offensive. He has the power to extend the war over the Korean borders, rather than a terribly costly smash through the center.
ATTACK REHEARSED
Some weeks ago, in fact, there was a successful rehearsal for just such an end-run, when troops were actually embarked in the harbor off the North Korea coast. This rehearsal convinced the command on the spot that a successful offensive could be done, and provided the U. N. forces, especially the Chinese reinforcements, it is agreed, could be completed by next Spring, without the military power elsewhere below the level of the calculated risk.
On the second point—whether such an offensive operation would succeed without extending the war beyond the Korean borders—Ei-

senhower will find less agreement. There are differences, at least of degree, between Clark and Van Fleet on this matter, with the latter reportedly more inclined to support the Air Force view that the Yalu is not to be subject to attack, if an end-run operation is to succeed.
Clearly this is a question which Eisenhower will have to answer. The very grave risks involved in an extension of the war beyond the Yalu are already being thoroughly canvassed in the MacArthur hearings. One risk, of course, is a break with our allies, on the grounds that "Eisenhower has succumbed to MacArthurism." If he decides on an offensive, Eisenhower may well try to reach agreement in advance with key allies like the British, on a possible position that extension of the war will be avoided if possible, and the Manchurian bases will be removed. If military requirements dictate this course.
CONFLICTING OPINIONS
On the third point—whether a successful offensive in Korea will bring the war to a end, or at least greatly improve our position—Eisenhower will find no agreement at all. Certain Air Force leaders doubt that extension of the offensive, on the grounds that a successful offensive would simply bring the U. N. troops within easy range of the Communist air force. Other commanders, reportedly including Clark and Van Fleet, believe that a successful offensive could seal off and destroy the Korean War, and that it is an effective fighting force.
This is, of course, a political as well as a military question. State Department experts take fairly strong views on the matter. It is a conceded split between the Chinese and the Russians on the Korean War, the Indian claim to have evidence that the Chinese wanted to accept their "true" plan, and the Russians to agree that this evidence is inconclusive.
Clearly this decision on a Korean offensive, which Eisenhower must now make, is heart-rending at least to the extent to expect Eisenhower to return with a magic solution, or even to announce that he has no plan to do so. But at least the Eisenhower administration will have the positive advantage, however, which the Truman administration lacked. And at least Eisenhower has been tested with heart-rending difficulty since before, and has chosen wisely.

EDUCATION ON THE LIVING ROOM SCREEN

FOR SOME TIME now, the proposal that a limited number of television channels be used for state-supported education has been kicking around. The time for favorable decision on this matter is short—if these channels are not assigned to education by next June, they will be made available to commercial telecasters.
The continuing argument over assignment of these channels, some commercial telecasters use the free enterprise argument. Why, they ask, use public money for these channels, when private investors are eager to develop them? Let's examine that argument.
Commercial telecasters have to make money, or at least not lose too much, in order to stay on the air very long. Education, on the other hand, is not measurable in dollars and cents. Few serious attempts to popularize education on TV have been made, but it is easier to sell products on a program which features Berle or Godfrey than on one

which stresses education. Programs which bring big money from advertisers thus are preferred by commercial telecasters.
TV has wondrous potential as an educational medium. In particular, all Congressmen should take this as an opportunity to use this outlet as it is to permit education the use of printing presses and the mails, to use at state expense. Few would argue that our state universities be abolished, because they "compete" with privately-financed educational institutions. But that is the same reasoning which some of the commercial telecasters are using.
If educational channels are activated, it may develop that some of the programs carried over them will prove so popular that advertisers will want to sponsor them, and they can be telecast over commercial networks. This would be a welcome lesson to the usual TV fare. But by all means, these relatively few channels set aside for education should be used for their intended purpose.

WOW—WHAT LOGIC

OUR faith in the common sense of American businessmen was rudely shaken the other day when we read about a speech delivered by Adm. Ben Moreell, chairman of a board of Jones and Laughlin Steel Corp.
Mr. Moreell read his audience excerpts from Marx and Engels Communist Manifesto written in 1848. He noted that some of the things advocated by Marx and Engels have come to pass in this country. Thus, he concluded, "we are deeply indebted to him with the virus we intend to fight against."
Here are some of the things advocated in the Manifesto, with which the admiral "documented" his charge:
"Free education for all in public schools.
"Bringing into cultivation waste lands and the improvement of soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
"A heavy progressive or graduated income tax."
He could have mentioned other things which, according to the Manifesto, were generally adopted as advanced nations became Communist:
"Abolition of child factory labor in its present form." And "gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country, by a more equitable distribution of the population over the country."
If Admiral Moreell had spent just a little

time reading history, instead of concentrating on becoming a tip engineer, he would have first put the Manifesto in proper historical perspective. When it was written, things like free education and soil conservation were dreams instead of realities.
Americans and some other democratic peoples, say that they are just as good as we started them. But had the simple good sense to know that just because someone you don't always agree with says something is good, it isn't necessarily bad.
And if he'd just read the papers carefully he'd note that those countries which have adopted things like progressive taxation and public education, and abolished child labor, are the ones least threatened by internal Communism.
If he applied his political reasoning to his steel business, he'd have cut out production, because the Communists advocate expansion of heavy industry.
How silly can some persons get?
A good way to get some people to vote would be to tell them they can't—Kingston (Tex.) Times.
One writer has described a taxpayer as a "government worker with no vacations, no sick leaves, and no holidays."—Sweeney's Morning News.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON
EVEN before Gen. Eisenhower's trip to Korea, Gen. Mark Clark in Tokyo had to have a few weeks of happy for ending the Korean war. None of them were happy solutions.
However, the alternatives have not changed and unquestionably are what Clark and his former World War II commander in Italy discussed.
These alternatives are:
1. Launch an all-out offensive with no holds barred. This would include bombing beyond the Yalu River, also the use of atomic artillery; perhaps also blockading Chinese ports.
Korean Complications
THESE last alternative carries the greatest political cost. In fact, it would be a long way from the pre-election pledges to go to Korea and work out an early peace. Second it would bring G.M.s. of which, if not actual warfare, from our U.N. Allies. Third it would risk the possibility that Russia would retaliate in other parts of the world—Iran, Indo-China, Yugoslavia—where we were concentrating on Korea.
However, this all-out offensive is what General Clark favors, and of course, so did his more spectacular predecessor, Douglas MacArthur.

General Clark Wants Showdown In Korea

Furthermore, some political strategists figure that, given the famed Eisenhower luck, the threat of such an offensive might not be fully started.
Behind this reasoning is the Communist tendency not to court a showdown when faced with superior numbers. The rest of his record, pending up the rough, rugged peninsula of Italy was one of Clark's worst experiences, and he doesn't like the idea of getting bogged down in a similar, slow-moving operation in Korea.
After he left Italy, furthermore, Clark had important experience in Vienna, where after V-E Day, he commanded

U. S. forces in Austria check-and-jowl with a Red Army of the size of Clark's. It was just the kind the United States and Russia came closest to grips, and where Clark's the Soviet was with a determined, that the only way to handle Clark did not have to worry about U.N. allies at that time of course; and he did not have to worry about politics. Clark did not have to worry about the military which is extremely tired of a far-off battle in Korea.
But his advice to the man who will have to make historic decisions on the Korean War, Jan. 20 may well have been to risk an all-out offensive. There is nothing more deadly to morale, whether to an army of nations, than a long drawn-out war which gets nowhere.

Washington Pipeline

SHORTLY before the Taft-Durkin bill, Eisenhower was important ambassadorial appointments and the Navy. He may still do so, though a passage... Sen. Harry Cain, retiring soldier from Washington State, is pulling wires to become Secretary of the Navy. He's been talking to Senator Bridges of New Hampshire, who, as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, will pack a lot of weight.
Clarky Kress, ex-commander of the U. S. Navy, got a magic master-stroke by the U. S. Navy, was a Coast Guard commander and the U. S. Navy got a commander home from Europe. "When you get to the U. S. Navy, you can use it for the front door of the White House."

BETTER ENGLISH

- 1. What is wrong with this sentence: "It looks like it will snow before too very long."
2. What is the correct pronunciation of "constable"?
3. Which of these words is misspelled: Constable, divisible, inscrutable, conceivable.
4. What means the word "impediment"?
5. What is a word beginning with "W" that means "exercise of the will"?
ANSWERS
1. Say, "It looks as if (or, as though) it will snow before long."
2. Pronounce non-const-able, or as in ball, with the accent on last syllable, 2. Divisible.
3. "Impediment."
4. "Let us not be discouraged by such impediments." S. Volition.