

Editorial-Opinion

The Public Interest Is The First Concern Of This Newspaper

Alden H. Spencer, Publisher and General Manager

Rusty Garrett, Managing Editor

4 • Monday, February 4, 1985

Yalta Treaty

The coming months will be filled with observances tied to the 40th anniversary of events that brought World War II to a close — the unconditional surrender of Germany and Japan, the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and much more. But how to commemorate the Yalta Conference of Feb. 4-11, 1945? This fateful meeting of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, British Prime Minister Winston S. Churchill and Soviet leader Josef Stalin remains a source of bitter controversy to the present day.

In an address to Congress on his return from Yalta, Roosevelt said the conference "was a successful effort by the three leading nations to find a common ground for peace." He added, "It ought to spell the end of the system of unilateral action, the exclusive alliances, the spheres of influence, the balance of power, and all the other ingredients that have been tried for centuries — and have always failed."

At the time FDR spoke, only some of the agreements reached at Yalta were publicly known. These mainly concerned the partition and demilitarization of Germany, the establishment of a broadly based, democratic government in Poland, and the creation of an international organization to maintain peace and security. These goals commanded wide support in the United States.

The same could not be said of the secret Yalta agreements, details of which began to reach print in 1946. It was revealed then that Stalin had agreed to enter the war against Japan "two or three months" after Germany's defeat. In return, Roosevelt and Churchill acceded to Stalin's demands for (1) transfer of southern Sakhalin Island and the Kurile Islands from Japanese to Soviet control; (2) Soviet port privileges at Port Arthur and Dairen China; (3) joint Chinese-Soviet control of two railroads leading to the ports; (4) preservation of the status quo in Outer Mongolia.

Criticism of the Yalta agreements mounted as the Soviets consolidated their hold on Eastern Europe, including Poland, during the Cold War period. When the State Department made public hitherto secret papers from the conference in 1955, a heated partisan dispute erupted. Democratic leaders claimed the release of the documents by the Republican Eisenhower administration was aimed at gaining political advantage. But Secretary of State John Foster Dulles insisted that nearly everything in the papers had been disclosed previously.

Churchill, the last survivor among the Yalta Big Three, offered this apologia in 1953: "It is easy, after the Germans are beaten, to condemn those who did their best to hearten the Russian military effort and to keep in harmonious contact with our great Ally, who had suffered so frightfully. What would have happened if we had quarreled (at Yalta) with Russia while the Germans still had two or three hundred divisions on the fighting front? Our hopeful assumptions were soon to be falsified. Still, they were the only ones possible at the time." (Richard L. Worsnop)

How Time Flies

10 Years Ago

The city of Fayetteville will receive an additional \$45,199 in Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) funds for new personnel.

The Fayetteville High School debate squad took their eighth tournament victory of the year at Parkview High School in Springfield, Mo.

50 Years Ago

A meeting is being held in Springdale to sign corn-hog contracts according to County Agent O. L. McMurray.

"South in Sonora," a Mexican operetta will be presented Tuesday at the Ozark by the city high school.

100 Years Ago

We call attention to the announcement of W. F. Russell, new barber, who has located in our city.

Walter D. Parks and Sam Gibson were up from Illinois township Friday. They called on the sheriff and discharged their obligations to the county and state government.

Today In History

By The Associated Press

Today is Monday, Feb. 4, the 35th day of 1985. There are 330 days left in the year.

Today's highlight in history:

On Feb. 4, 1945, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, British Prime Minister Winston Churchill and Soviet leader Joseph Stalin began a wartime conference at Yalta.

On this date:

In 1783, Britain declared a formal cessation of hostilities with its former colony, the United States of America.

In 1789, presidential electors unanimously chose George Washington to be the first chief executive of the United States.

In 1801, John Marshall was sworn in as Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

In 1861, delegates from six southern states met in Montgomery, Ala., to form the Confederate States of America.

In 1932, New York Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt opened the Winter Olympic Games at Lake Placid.

In 1938, the play "Our Town" by Thornton Wilder opened on Broadway.

In 1941, the United Service Organization (also known as the USO) was founded.

In 1948, the island nation of Ceylon, now Sri Lanka, became an independent dominion within the British Commonwealth.

In 1974, newspaper heiress Patricia Hearst was kidnapped from her apartment in Berkeley, Calif., by members of the Symbionese Liberation Army.

In 1976, more than 22,000 people were killed by a severe earthquake that struck Guatemala and Honduras.

Ten years ago: Former British Prime Minister Edward Heath yielded the leadership of the Conservative Party after losing the first round of a party election to former education official Margaret Thatcher.

Five years ago: Congressional leaders promised full investigations of charges that some members of the House and Senate had accepted bribes in the FBI's Abscam undercover operation.

One year ago: U.S. space experts were searching for a missing Westar 6 communications satellite that disappeared after it was launched from the space shuttle Challenger the day before.

Today's birthdays: Actress Ida Lupino is 67. Author-activist Betty Friedan is 64. Actor Conrad Bain is 62. Sen. Donald Riegle, D-Mich., is 47. Comedian David Brenner is 40. Rock singer Alice Cooper is 37. Actress Lisa Eichorn is 33.

Thought for today: "The first and final thing you have to do in this world is to last in it, and not be smashed by it." — Ernest Hemingway (1899-1961).

"WELL, YOU PROTECTED YOURSELF BETTER THAN YOU PROTECTED US"



Consumers Unprotected From Bell System Breakup

WASHINGTON — Few Americans need to be told that the Justice Department's breakup of the Bell System was a blunder that is costing average consumers both money and inconvenience. Rates have gone up; monthly bills are almost indecipherable.

For the pure sport of attacking a monopoly, the department's antitrust division disrupted the best telephone system in the world simply because it was big, efficient and profitable. President Reagan, with his unerring feel for the pulse of America, expressed the consumer's bewilderment succinctly when he was briefed on the divestiture order. He asked: "If it isn't broken, why are we fixing it?"

THE SITUATION, now, unfortunately, is beyond repair. Like Humpty Dumpty's sad case, there's no way the Bell System can be put back together again. It's now the formidable chore of individual telephone customers to decide which service or combination of services is best for them.

Buy a phone? Lease if from the telephone company? Pay Ma Bell a monthly fee for maintenance or take a chance that nothing will break or wear out? Stick with the company's long-distance service or opt for one of the competitors that, like American Telephone & Telegraph, make their slick pitches on television? Whom do you believe — Burt Lancaster? Cliff Robertson? Andy Griffith? What do they know?

I have another question: Where is the government now that we need it? Having caused the problem, the Justice Department's irresponsible trustbusters have offered consumers absolutely no help in solving it. A government that instructs its citizens on everything from burping a baby to building a back porch somehow hasn't found the time or the energy to give telephone users proper guidance on dealing with the AT&T breakup.

"THERE SHOULD HAVE been the largest consumer information campaign in the history of the country to go along with the breakup of the largest consumer service in the country," Sam Simon, executive director of TRAC, the Telecommunications Research and Action Center, told my reporter Scott Barrett.

Long-distance service is hopelessly

confusing. Pity the poor consumer who tries to check out the various possibilities. In three calls to Western Union, for example, TRAC was given three different answers to a fairly simple and important question: "What is the number of cities from which your service can be used?" The answers TRAC got were "20," "269" and "128." If the providers of a service don't know what they're offering, how can the poor consumer make a sensible decision?

The confusion over long-distance options is probably hardest on the elderly. Not only do they generally have less money to throw around, but they grew up in an era when the English language was more straightforward than the obfuscatory, pseudo-scientific jargon favored by the phone companies' hucksters today.

IRONICALLY, the confusion has been to the advantage of the Big Bad Wolf the Justice Department set out to defang. According to the American Association of Retired Persons, the perplexing options have helped convince more than nine out of 10 elderly phone customers to give up the quest for an alternative and stick with AT&T's long-distance service.

The chaos in the marketplace is being exacerbated by the Reagan administration's anti-regulatory philosophy. According to sources, the competing companies are banking on lax or non-existent enforcement of the law by the Federal Communications Commission.

This confidence is not misplaced. When 17 senators signed a letter to the FCC asking it to develop a standard disclosure form for long-distance companies, commission Chairman Mark Fowler replied with a lecture on "the concept of a competitive, unregulated marketplace."

THE ATTITUDE at the Justice Department — the original source of all the trouble — is equally laissez faire. "We want to make this as

non-regulatory as possible," said Rick Rule, a top antitrust official. Suing action to words, the staff that handles complaints about the divestiture has been cut from about 12 to three in recent months.

The results of this relaxation of enforcement efforts are predictable: The customer will be left pretty much defenseless.

One illustration of this involved Allnet, the fourth largest long-distance company in the country. For several months last year it maintained a double billing system for its business and residential customers. During the period, business customers got a new, lower rate while residential customers paid the old rate. The company insisted there was no discrimination, because residential customers could have switched simply by calling the company. The rub is that the company didn't tell its existing residential customers about the bargain rate until several months after it took effect for business customers.

WHETHER ALLNET was in violation of the Federal Communications Act, which requires rates to be "just, fair and not unduly discriminatory," may never be determined. Though a consumer group plans to file a complaint with the FCC this month over the incident, the agency's attitude hardly encourages any hope that it will pursue the case with vigor.

Footnote: The one discernible effort the government has made to cope with the problems it unleashed with the Bell breakup is a modest booklet entitled "A Consumer's Guide to Telephone Service." It was put together by Bell Atlantic for distribution in its area. A Bell official said candidly that something like that "usually has more credibility" with the government's backing. "Otherwise, people say it's self-serving and not objective," he said. (c)1985, United Feature Synd.

Recession Talk Remains Inevitable

By JOHN CUNIFF AP Business Analyst

NEW YORK (AP) — Sometimes a survey produces news it isn't expected to, like the small-business survey that showed nearly one-half the respondents expect a major recession in the near future.

The respondents were members of Congress, 83 of them, most of them senior members — to the degree that they have served two terms or more.

TOUCHE ROSS, the big accounting firm, conducted the survey near the end of the year mainly to determine congressional attitudes toward small business, as if a survey were needed to determine that Congress was for it.

The recession response was much more interesting, especially in view of the Republican affiliation of more than 40 percent of the respondents, most of them supporters of a president who hardly mentions the word.

In fact, the word "recession" has almost been officially banned in both

public and private sectors, which makes the congressional response even more interesting.

If, for example, you look through the Reagan battle plan for the next few years you'll find almost all economic projections are based on the avoidance of serious downturns, such as occurred in 1981 and 1982.

IN FORMAL BUSINESS circles they also try to avoid the word.

The explanation for such avoidance isn't complex: There simply isn't much to be gained by talking about recession.

There might also be very little to gain in planning for a recession since, if one doesn't ensue, a company might find its competitor far ahead, as a negative-thinking Montgomery Ward learned from a positive-thinking Sears after World War II.

Why then does the unutterable word nevertheless cling on?

The most obvious answer is "because one is inevitable."

Through economic history recessions have recurred. Almost never can straight lines be found in plotting the course of economies. They are cyclical, expanding and contracting.

Perhaps a second explanation lies in the recent experience of people who, in less than a decade, were bounced about in the turbulence of two of the nastiest recessions of all — in 1973-1975, and 1981-1982. How can they forget?

ECONOMISTS EXPLAIN that such economic unevenness — booms and busts in the extreme — are in the very nature of the marketplace. Expectations produce more production than can be consumed, or more consumption than can be sustained.

Psychologists have sometimes claimed that light can be shed on economic ups and downs by studying the mass mind and seeking to determine why it goes through periods of exuberance and depression.

What seems to be agreed upon



Jack Germond
Jules Witcover

Time Lost More In Libel Trial

WASHINGTON — The split decision rendered in the Sharon vs. Time case — and that's what it was in a practical if not legal sense — has been met with claims of victory and vindication on both sides, which is not surprising. Losers on split decisions always think they've been jobbed by the judges.

But although former Israeli defense minister Ariel Sharon won't collect a dime of the \$60 million in libel damages he was asking, he has clearly gotten more out of the case than Time, for all the crowing about "winning" from the news magazine's lawyers and executives.

SHARON NOW HAS an American jury on record as establishing that Time defamed him with a false account — it, "lied," is the way he likes to put it. And what Time has is the same jury's judgment that in doing so, the news magazine didn't act with blood in its eye — that is, with recklessness and malice as required by libel law.

Sharon has come away with millions of dollars of free publicity, the bottom line of which was that powerful Time mistreated him. And Time comes out of the trial with a red face, whether it wants to admit it or not, for a piece of shoddy professional journalism.

The jury specifically castigated "certain Time employees," particularly the prime reporter on the story purporting to link Sharon to the 1982 massacre of Palestinians, for having "acted negligently and carelessly in reporting and verifying the information" in the Time account.

THAT REPORTERS and editors make mistakes is like saying football referees do. There is no denying it, and that certainly goes for newspapers, television news shows and — let's face it — even (some might say especially) columnists. The objective always is, or should be, to get it fast and get it right, but first get it right.

For all the insistence from news magazine executives that their fabled system of checking and rechecking facts before publication comes as close as humanly possible to avoid making errors, the jury has been out on that contention for years.

The old saying that there's many a slip between the cup and the lip may be particularly applicable to the news magazine formula for reporting a story. Whereas the average newspaper story is researched and written by a single reporter, the

news magazines do reporting, on major stories anyway, by committee. Correspondents submit lengthy "files" on the information they have gathered and they are digested by a writer in New York who may not have spoken to anyone directly involved in the story.

ANY NEWSMAGAZINE reporter will tell you about the times he or she has been put on the spot with a valued news source because the information provided by that source and submitted in a file to the New York office has come out distorted or even flat wrong in the story.

Blaming it "on New York" can be a convenient dodge, certainly. But there has always been a legitimate debate within the news gathering business about whether reporting by committee doesn't lose in nuance, color and accuracy what it gains in volume over the reporting of a single reporter of a single reporter on the scene who can in the old journalism textbook phrase see, feel, taste and smell the story himself.

In any event, the Time approach of having a kitchenful of cooks making the broth didn't save it from having the jury call it dishwater in the Sharon case. So it's hard to see how the Time lawyers and brass could say they won in any serious meaning of the word simply because the jury didn't find malice in its performance.

Still, if Time didn't win, the American press as a whole did, in the sense that its First Amendment guarantee is protected by the verdict that Sharon, though defamed, was not libeled under the law. What the jury was saying, if anything, to the press in general was, be more careful, and we in the news media can always stand being given that caution.

IT REMAINS TO be seen whether the Sharon case, and the pending case of Gen. William Westmoreland against CBS News, will lead to more such big-name libel suits. Time in its "victory" statement said the Sharon case "never should have reached an American courtroom," and wouldn't have had not Sharon attempted "to recoup his political fortunes" through it. Presumably others in the same political situation may choose the same vehicle.

But at the very least, the verdict does say that while the press has strong legal protections in pursuit of its job, it has no license to be loose with the facts, either.

(c)1985, Tribune Media



Jack Anderson



John Chamberlain

Returning Values To Public Education

William J. Bennett, who is scheduled to take over the Department of Education after leaving his job as chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, will shortly discover that his basic mission has not been changed in the least. For the whole question of "endowing" the humanities is bound up with schooling. If education has no humanistic content, what we know as civilization will collapse in jungle fighting. There would be nothing left to "endow."

Bennett takes office at a critical point. We have had two generations in our schools of so-called value-free teaching. Testing has been frowned upon as culturally unfair. There has been tremendous fear of religious indoctrination. The track system has been regarded as fundamentally undemocratic. History has been subordinated to social sciences that lack any element of precision. The literary imagination has been downgraded; Dick and Jane and Spot are dull replacements for Hiawatha or Tom Sawyer.

THINGS HAVE been changing lately, however, and Bennett will find allies in some very unusual places in promoting his humanistic views. For example, Albert Shanker, the president of the American Federation of Teachers, has recently joined the crusade against moral relativism in the classroom. "The pendulum," Shanker has written, "has swung too far. Absolutism distorts reality, but so does the kind of relativism by which we train kids to make no value judgments at all... indeed, to have no values."

The biggest change seems to have occurred at Teachers College of Columbia University, which was once the great supporter of the relativistic approach associated with the name of John Dewey. President George Roche of Hillsdale College in Michigan calls attention to recent Teachers College attacks on "garbage curricula."

"It is certainly true," writes Teachers College history professor Diane Ravitch, "that history cannot be taught in elementary schools as it is taught in junior high or high school, but young people are fascinated and challenged by the incredible but true stories of human history... History provides the framework within which the elementary teacher can use myths, legends and fairy tales. Why shouldn't children read the fabulous Greek myths while learning about Greek history, culture and society? Education is debased when the curriculum is stripped of its content and when skills, free of any cultural, literary or historical context, are all that is taught."

IN HER PLEA for good literature Professor Ravitch echoes the late Max Rafferty, who led the assault on the Dick and Jane basal readers for many years. "Did anyone ever love a basal reader," asks Professor Ravitch, "did anyone ever take a flashlight to bed to read a basal reader under the covers?"

As head of the Department of Education, William Bennett will not feel called upon to prescribe a federally-dictated content for our school curricula. But he is free to open some adventurous discussions. The constitutional separation of church and state forbids the teaching of any one religion in the schools. But courses in comparative religions are certainly permissible. And no good course in Western civilization can be taught without reference to Judeo-Christian values that have made the West what it is. Just so, no good course in English prose can avoid some acquaintance with the rhythms of the King James Bible.

William Bennett should have no trouble in pushing his humanistic views on states that are hungry for excellence in education. The time is ripe for what one particular humanist with the ear of Ronald Reagan has to offer.

(c)1985, King Features Synd.

Write Us About Things

What's been bugging you? Why not let everyone know about it? The Times provides space on the editorial page each week for you to do just that. Write us a letter to the editor and share your feelings with the public.

Bible Verses

"But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed." Isaiah 53:5

Nothing was left out or overlooked. He met all of our needs at Calvary. All we need to do is believe and receive.