

# DAILY OPINION SUMMARY

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DECLASSIFIED

GPO-SSO-5711

Authority E.O. 10501

No. 1618

May 3, 1953 *U.S.A.*

## FAR EAST

President Truman's speech, as well as Secretary Marshall's "quiet-spoken" testimony on the Administration case, prompts a continuation of the "Great Debate" along the lines that have already developed. The defense by the Administration leaders draws both proponents and critics among press and radio observers. The Administration supporters generally stress that the President and Secretary present a "global view" of the Far Eastern conflict, and share their concern over the risk of war and the loss of allies. The critics emphasize the "unreliability" of the UN allies and the need to reach a solution of the "bloody" Korean conflict.

"The Administration's advantage over MacArthur is that it can argue from a far wider fund of fact and influence about Russia and the world at large", Eric Sevareid (CBS) observes, continuing: "This is, after all, a global issue, as MacArthur freely agreed, though he would not argue the global aspects of it." Taking a similar view, Raymond Swing (IBS) concludes that MacArthur, "at the end, by refusing to be drawn into a discussion of global policy, hurt his case for an extended war against China since it must rest on being globally sound." Clifton Utley (NBC), also sympathetic to the Administration policy, makes a similar point.

The New York Times believes the President and Mr. Marshall "spoke not as commanders of a local theatre of war, but as men upon whom has been thrust the leadership of the free world in a global struggle against Communist imperialism." The Washington Post commends the President for "rising to the occasion" in the speech. According to the Post, "He rested his case upon a common policy with our Allies. He is abundantly right". Walter Lippmann muses that the question of "America's destiny" lies behind the debate--whether the US is to become a great imperial power or the "protector and promoter of the Atlantic community and of the Western civilization which is at home within it" as the Administration would have it. Lippmann leans strongly toward the latter "destiny".

~~RESTRICTED~~

## FAR EAST (Cont'd)

Meanwhile, James Reston (New York Times) declares: "The Truman Administration has risked splitting the entire republic in order to demonstrate its determination to defend a policy accepted by all its allies. But it now appears that the allies not only are failing to do what they can to support that unified policy in Korea, but are selling extraordinary quantities of strategic materials to the enemy." Reports of the allied trade with Red China, and their "coolness" toward an embargo are deplored by many observers, including the Baltimore Sun, San Francisco Chronicle and the leading MacArthur supporters. But the Washington Post suggests that Americans remember how much help the Chinese Communists got from the US through Chiang "before we loose hot words upon our Allies," and Joseph Harsch (Christian Science Monitor) contends that the China trade is one way of providing Chinese guerrillas with arms.

However, the attitude of the Allies serves as a point of contention with the Administration policy from several observers. The Washington Star remarks: "If one has helpful Allies, it is desirable, of course, to retain them. In the Korean war, however, they have been something less than indispensable. The President must realize that the trade with Red China, coupled with the failure of our Allies to make larger contributions to the actual fighting in Korea, explains why a good many Americans look with a fishy eye on the usefulness of the UN in the Korean war." The Philadelphia Inquirer protests that Secretary Marshall's position "leaves America still at the behest of Allies whose attitude is a major factor of a gigantic problem for the US which is highlighted, day by day, by the shocking American casualties in Korea."

David Lawrence takes strong issue with the testimony of Secretary Marshall, claiming it reveals "that America, although contributing the bulk of the military forces and the supplies, has surrendered her independence of action and her leadership and has abandoned 350,000 American boys to the whim of foreign cabinets." The Scripps-Howard press is unimpressed by the views of either the President or Secretary Marshall, and maintains: "Would it be more hazardous to go it alone than to continue to let ourselves be hamstrung against our better judgment, by so-called allies who insist on working both sides of the street? Can we depend on them in Europe if we can't in Asia?" Edwin C. Hill (ABC) charges that the Secretary "follows the familiar line of appeasement," and Henry Taylor (ABC) and Fulton Lewis (MBS) are critical of the Administration's case.

~~RESTRICTED~~