Lee and Crockett and Hale and Helen Keller, are the ones denying and protesting in the newspaper headlines over mink coats and oil tankers and Federal indictments for corruption in public office. I believe that the true heirs of the old tough, durable fathers are still capable of responsibility and self-respect, if only they can remember them again. What we need is not fewer people, but more room between them, where those who would stand on their own feet, could, and those who won't, might have to. Then the welfare, the relief, the compensation, instead of being nationally sponsored cash prizes for idleness and ineptitude, could go where the old independent uncompromising fathers themselves would have intended it and blessed it.

Foreign Trends

If Ike Met Joe...

For the second time in a row, Europe's neutralists had the tough luck of seeing their dreams almost fulfilled. First, in sweeping the Republican candidate into the White House, the American voters seemed to agree with the European neutralists that the U. S. ought to reduce its participation in European affairs; and the neutralists immediately caught the blues (see "Foreign Trends," December 29). Second, so long as Eisenhower has not explicitly rejected Stalin's underhanded invitation to a *tête-à-tête,* there seems to be a chance that the neutralist clamor for a "Soviet-American dialogue" will be satisfied; and the neutralists are choking with dread.

For, if the price of fulfillment is dismay in most human affairs, it is bound to resemble annihilation in the cheap little game called neutralism. And Europe's neutralists know it. They have never been so dumb as to forget the totally parasitic nature of their business: to prosper at all, European neutralism presupposes an acute East-West tension and its corollary, precautionary U. S. entrenchments in Europe. Reduce either, or both, and there would be little future left in the pursuit of neutralism.

Consequently, its stock has hit a new low in recent weeks, at least on the operational level of European politics. The neutralist emotions in the Parisian cafés may even have been recharged by Stalin's barefaced "plea for reasonable diplomacy," but the professionals are approaching panic. When word came of Stalin's quasi-invitation to Ike, their automatic reflex was to curse the mere idea of direct Soviet-American conversations. "Bilateral arrangements," you see, are the proper exercise of sovereignty only when a European government makes a deal

"Keep Going!"

with the Reds against American advice—when, for example, Britain entertains friendly relations with Communist China. But let so much as a vague possibility arise that America, too, might take a walk on her own, and the same British government waxes lyrical over Allies being honor-bound to coordinate their policies, never to go it alone, and that sort of thing.

Of course, Churchill has hurried over to get into the act. Eisenhower could tell him that the U. S. government feels perfectly free to engage in any kind of bilateral policy so long as Great Britain feels free to recognize the Mao gang over U. S. protests. And this is precisely what those European politicians who have discovered the extortionist promises in neutralism are now so hysterically afraid of. None of them is stupid enough to anticipate a real Soviet-American rapprochement. But most of them (knowing too well what *they* would be doing in a comparable situation) expect President Eisenhower to take advantage of the Kremlin's recent switch and scare a few of the philandering European governments into line.

Britain's Trade with the Enemy

"Since April," recently mused the London *Economist,* "three separate organizations have been set up in London to foster trade with China and other Communist countries, and an impressive number of British businessmen have visited East Berlin to talk with the Chinese mission there. . . . Recent press reports about British trade deals with China have helped to create a belief that great things are happening, or about to happen, in that direction. Rosy forecasts have been made of huge new markets for British exporters—particularly if the United Nations embargo on shipment of strategic goods to China is eased."

The London *Economist,* much to its visible regret, is forced to report that this British trade with the enemy is by far less lucrative than had been generally expected. "Nor," it reassures its readers, "has it [this disappointment] been due to lack of initiative at the British end." The trouble is that the Chinese Reds, more dedicated to the cause of the Communist Empire than the British to that of the free world, prefer machinery and heavy equipment to the frilly consumer goods Britain would like to get rid of in depressed markets. And as Britain can sell the kind of merchandise Mao desires much more profitably elsewhere, business with Red China is not so good.

"There would be a stronger case," concludes Britain's leading business journal, "for meeting such demands [for strategic machinery] if China were still an important source of raw materials. But the third depressing element in the picture is that China is no longer such a source." Britain, in other words, may consent to supply only moderate quantities of strategic goods to a government at war with the United Nations, unless and until a way is found to make trading with the enemy a trifle more rewarding.

CANDIDE

British Reporters and U. S. Politics

By RAYMOND MOLEY
and RAYMOND MOLEY, JR.

What the British people learned about our election campaign through their newspapers' American correspondents was biased and far from factual, the authors' survey reveals.

The reporting of the recent Presidential campaign by correspondents in America for important members of the British press left so much to be desired that it has been the source of regretful comment not only by Americans who cherish friendly relations between the two nations, but by some British editors and publishers. Their regret is because prejudiced and incompetent reporting impairs international relations and is a reflection on the professional competence of the press itself. It can be clearly demonstrated that the British editors and proprietors far from the scene were badly served by some of the correspondents whom they have chosen to serve their public.

We are not concerned in this article with the Socialist press which has been hostile to the United States for a long time. We are concerned with responsible journals which have long been respected on both sides of the Atlantic. Specifically we are dealing here with the *Times,* the *Manchester Guardian* and the *Economist.* Casual items in the *Observer* and the *Sunday Times* have caught our eye, but space limits us to the three first mentioned. It ought to be said in fairness that our examination of the American reports in the *Daily Telegraph* revealed admirable journalism, both fair and accurate.

Our general indictment is that in much of the American correspondence of the *Times,* the *Manchester Guardian* and the *Economist* during the campaign and the aftermath there was error in factual information, miscalculation of American sentiment and opinion, and partiality. There were sins of omission, too, which can be ascribed to the narrow physical orbit to which these correspondents limited themselves. They could have written most of their reports within a mile of the National Press Club or of Times Square.

It ought to be noted further that, with certain exceptions, the examples which we offer are not from editorials. Editorials were presumably written in England by staff members who were mostly compelled to depend upon the correspondents in America.

On October 20 the *Times* published this:

> Last night . . . the Republicans had a pleasant surprise for the Democrats. They provided Mr. Herbert Hoover with half an hour on the radio to prove that the depression was really an invention of the New Dealers . . . If any but the faithful were listening last night, they must have wondered if the Republicans have learnt anything in the past 20 years.

The second sentence is false. The Hoover text proves that. The third sentence is a piece of plain, biased characterization.

After the election, the *Times* decided to make the best of Eisenhower but at the same time to retain all its prejudices against his party. On November 10 "Our Own Correspondent" in Washington said:

> General Eisenhower . . . owes his election to nobody—except those who helped him win the nomination at Chicago — and many senators and representatives owe their election entirely to him.

This rules out the half of the Republican Party which supported Taft. Texas, Tennessee and Florida were carried by Democrats for Eisenhower.

Mr. Cooke's Prophecies

The *Manchester Guardian* coverage was largely the reporting of Alistair Cooke, who in addition to his distinction as "Chief Correspondent in the United States" for that paper is "Commentator on American Affairs for the BBC." Recognition in the United States has more recently been accorded by the Ford Foundation, which has made him MC for the important "Omnibus" TV program.

On June 19, this appeared in the *Manchester Guardian* under the Cooke byline: "Taft's men, defying one of the few ethical customs discernible in the raw struggle of a convention, have managed to get two Taftites as keynote speaker and temporary chairman." What ethical custom he means is not clear to us.

On July 10 this appeared: "It is a question whether any sizable Republican vote can be corralled from the wounded remnants of the two snarling camps inside the party." This is not only a strange metaphorical mélange, but a distortion of the realities of American politics.

On September 4 Cooke was moved to prophecy:

> Eisenhower is going to have a hard time topping 200 votes. My own guess just now, for whatever its idle worth, would be that Stevenson would wind up with something like 309 votes.

All the clichés commonly used by the Taft-haters in our own press in Washington were accepted uncritically by Cooke. He asserted that Eisenhower really needed the Midwest Taft vote. But despite this acknowledged need, he belabored Eisenhower for making peace with Taft. It was a "humiliation" but a necessity. Hence, he reported that "the Deweys and Lodges and Saltonstalls . . . are sulking over Taft's swift return to power." Anyone who witnessed Dewey's incredible activity in New York might wonder at Cooke's conception of "sulking."

We now turn to Cooke's BBC broadcasts after the election. Election night was "a dance of death," an "orgy." He decided on November 7 that America just wasn't good