General MacArthur's three days of testimony before the Joint Senate Committee prompts heavy and largely thoughtful comment among press and radio observers. The following points are highlighted in the weekend contributions to the “Great Debate”:

1. The debate itself remains inconclusive as commentators await the testimony of the Administration leaders and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. There remains praise for the “high tone” of the hearings, and particularly for the “forceful” and eloquent presentation of MacArthur.

2. However, the General’s basic thesis concerning the Korean war again is opposed by most of the leading Eastern commentators.

3. These observers use America’s “global strategy” as the chief point at which they take issue with MacArthur. A main argument appears to be developing among them that while the General makes recommendations having a global effect, he does not assume the responsibility for judgments on any area outside of Asia.

4. Meanwhile, those who have consistently supported MacArthur again rally behind him, warmly applauding his presentation and endorsing his thesis.

5. In other comment on the Far East, there is considerable dismay at the lack of support among the UN allies for an arms embargo against Red China.

Among the leading critics of the MacArthur thesis, the New York Times contrasts MacArthur’s scope with that of the Administration, which “is compelled to take into account all the military, political and moral factors of a global struggle”. According to the Times, MacArthur “insists on the measures he proposes while disclaimering responsibility for their consequences on either the global struggle itself or even the future of the countries directly affected by his proposed measures”. The Times again emphasizes its stand: “We cannot afford to risk a break with our allies by pursuing a course of action which might well bog us down in an unlimited war in Asia.”
James Reston (New York Times) lists a series of the "paradoxes" in the General's testimony. Reston observed that MacArthur "proposed a strategy in the Far East which he conceded might bring about a major war, but at the same time he conceded that global strategy was not his responsibility." The Christian Science Monitor asserts: "It was when questioned on global strategy and relations with other anti-Communist peoples that the limitations of his view appeared."

The Washington Post takes a similar view though more sharply critical. "What MacArthur totally fails to argue is the relations of China and Korea to what is a global struggle. His is a one-theater myopia," the Post maintains. The New York Herald Tribune seriously questions whether the General's course offers advantages commensurate with the risks involved."

Walter Lippmann, considering what the global strategy of Moscow and Peking is in the Korean struggle, takes the commonly-held view that the Soviets are seeking to bring about a "showdown" with the US in the Far East—where it would be considerably to the Kremlin's strategic advantage. The test of this theory, says Lippmann, will be in finding out if Moscow wants to continue the Korean war; and he proposes a US request for an armistice based on the restoration of the status quo in Korea. Others, in contrast, distinction to MacArthur's view, who oppose expanding the Korean war and hope for a settlement are Stewart Alsop and Lowell Maltz (Washington Star). The General's thesis also is questioned by Eric Sevareid (CBS), Drew Pearson (ABC), Thomas Staggs (Washington Star),ARUN N. KHANNA, LEE H. DOOGAN, and Boston Baldwin of the New York Times.

The Washington Star believes that the whole controversy has boiled down to a dispute over Soviet intentions in Korean policy. MacArthur, the Star observes, "does not believe we should let the fear of a possible bigger war keep us from fighting and winning the savage, bloody war that we are already in. That is an attitude which makes sense." To the Star, the "doctrine of buying time is to get prepared for a war with Russia by fighting a limited war in Korea is one that should be given a little thought."

The Scripps-Howard press strongly backs MacArthur's view, contending: "The prevailing tendency of official Washington has been to view everything Russian or Communist through the magnifying glasses of timidity."

George Sokolsky, the McCormick press and David Lawrence are among others who support the General's testimony. In the limited Congressional comment available thus far, Sen. Bresmer (R., Maine) reportedly predicted that MacArthur's program would be adopted in a month, and the General's views won approval from Senator Boggs (R., O.) as well as Representatives Cain (N.C.), Ferguson (N.C.), Kerr (Okla.) and Hornaday (Okla.) again warned of the "risks" involved in the General's recommendations.