From: London
To: Secretary of State

London Times cable No. 124.

Wallace's BBC broadcast last night was well played in London press Monday morning. The TIMES ran two-thirds of a column made up of direct quotes of the BBC talk and a paraphrase of the Manchester speech, under the headline: "Want an end to war". Mr. Wallace's appeal in the TELEGRAPH carried nearly a third of a column of quotes under the headline: "World needs New Deal: Mr. Wallace on US power policy". The BIRMINGHAM BARONET ran over half a column under a two column head: "Wallace demands New Deal to free people from want". The MAIL front-paged a wrap-up of the BBC and Liverpool speeches under a stop press that Vandenberg was reported to have asked Truman to answer Wallace. The headline read: "Truman asked to answer Wallace". The Beverley Brook EXPRESS practically ignored the BBC talk, giving it only one paragraph. The HERALD had two-thirds of a column under the headline: "Wallace says Britain has threefold greatness". The pro-Labor MIRROR top played the broadcast under triple five column headline: "This is the power of Britain, says Wallace". The GRAPHIC had nothing. The DAILY WORKER carried a column in second news spot under the headline: "Wallace calls for New Deal in the world". The Manchester GUARDIAN carries a quarter column on the BBC speech, and gives over a column to a wrap-up of his weekend speeches in the north and Midlands.

2. Several papers carry dispatches today on Congressional and US editorial reaction to Wallace's speeches. The TIMES Washington correspondent in a main news page story writes that Wallace's attacks on the Truman policy has strengthened the President's hand and increased support in both Houses for the Greek aid bill. He adds: "What disturbs
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disturbs most Americans is the possibility that in Britain and Europe he may be accepted as being more influential than his editorship of a liberal weekly entitles him to claim. The TIMES correspondent says that while Wallace at one time had a large Liberal-Labor following, this has fallen away as they found him "blissfully unaware that communism in this country, as much as in other lands, was conspiratorial in its practice." He continues: "The more fact that he went to 'foreign parts' to say what he has said is quite obviously working powerfully against him.

It is one thing to speak of American 'imperialism' at home, but quite another to travel 3,000 miles to say it, and, as seems to have been the case, to win applause for saying it. The average American of today does not connect the security of his country with the conquest or subordination of others, but with their equal independence and security.

The Manchester GUARDIAN runs two-thirds of a column, mostly Congressional comment on Wallace's speeches gathered by Reuter, under head: "US criticizes Mr. Wallace". The Reuter correspondent says: "It is difficult to exaggerate the strength of feeling developing in Washington against a former member of President Truman's Cabinet campaigning to arouse public opinion in an allied country against the foreign policy of his own country, before the Parliamentary debate at home has been completed. The proper democratic procedure, it is argued, would have been for Mr. Wallace to fight as an American at home for the policy which he believes to be right.

The TELEGRAPH front-pages American reaction under a head: "Speeches by Mr. Wallace anger US". The dispatch is over a column long and quotes liberally from Senators and the press. Vandenberg is described as "sounding with indignation" over Wallace's attack and Truman's failure to reply. "Pressure will be put on Mr. Truman when he returns from Independence... this will put the President in an awkward position since, only a few days ago he expressed the hope that Mr. Wallace would be safely in the Democratic ranks in the coming Presidential election year. Competent political observers here consider that, in view of the almost universal disapproval of Congress at Mr. Wallace's present activities, Mr. Truman will be forced, once and for all, to drum him out of the Democratic Party."
The TELEGRAPH correspondent writes: "The fact that Mr. Wallace has been entertained by Mr. Attlee and given BBC facilities has created astonishment here. State Department officials find it incomprehensible that (be) should receive what appears to be official encouragement in Britain to attack a foreign policy which was itself a consequence of a belated SAS from the British Government... repetition in France of Mr. Wallace's attacks... may, it is considered here, have even graver consequences."

The DAILY WORKER runs a short piece on American critics under the head: "Waxing His", says US reaction". The lead begins: "Alarmed by the success of Mr. Wallace's visit to Britain... etc., in Britain, it concludes, "Friends of the US reactionaries displayed equal alarm at the weekend. They concentrated on a newspaper campaign to deny that Mr. Wallace is representative of any large body of US opinion."

3. There's little editorial reaction today to the Wallace weekend speeches. The Conservative DAILY MAIL says Wallace is "an honest and well-meaning man" with a "shining vision", but his "path to the stars is rather foggy". Much of his message makes a strong appeal to the British people, who are with him "heart and soul", in his plea for unity, security and prosperity, and who agree that the world needs a new deal and that peace can be fulfilled only by ploughs and machines rather than American tanks. The MAIL agrees, too, that Britain's task is to reconcile America and Russia, but Wallace should take his one-world message to Washington and Moscow. The MAIL reminds Wallace that he was the man who last September said it would be "the height of folly for America to follow Britain's lead in foreign policy. How he should try to explain in words that really mean something whether he thinks Britain should be 'the key' or not, and how it is to be done, and he should not make offensive remarks about members of one political party in the country where he is a guest... his personal political tragedy may be that he says the right things the wrong way."

The MIRROR has a short piece praising Wallace for saying that the
that the British people, afflicted like Job, refuse to
turn their faces to the wall and die. "Coming from a
country where unemployment threatens millions of homes,
he sees nothing disastrous in our shortage of manpower --
so long as we keep on the job."

The Glasgow HERALD, which gave a big play to the Central
Hall speech, carried an editorial on Saturday, saying:
"He would be a cold and callous critic who denied the
fervor and sincerity of Mr. Wallace's appeal last night
to Britain... This is a high and noble theme (the need
for Britain to mediate) and without endorsing Mr. Wallace's
questionable criticism of his President and Congress, it
merits and will obtain careful examination. But Britain's
experience at UNO doesn't lend much hope that Russia is
likely to recognize Britain "as a disinterested advocate".
While Wallace says that Britain stands midway between a
freely-enterprise America and a Communist Russia, the Soviet
regards Britain and America as tarred with the same brush.
What really matters is that Britain and America both
insist on freedom of speech, free elections to Parliament,
and an independent judiciary, and the Soviet system will
have none of these things. Until it is otherwise,
Wallace "speaks in vain, and his project of internation-
alizing the Dardanelles and other disputed areas is simply
a plaster for a pimple when the real cause of the trouble
is a fundamental difference as to the relation of man to
the state."

The Manchester GUARDIAN makes the same point in an editorial
on the refusal of exit visas or (*) saying that this test
case provides a sure test of the differences of
the two ways of life than all the five year plans, since
it concerns "the essential relations between the individual
and the state."

The GUARDIAN has done the most extended comment on Wallace.
In its first piece last Friday it said Wallace "brings to
politics a fine spirit of idealism, his aspirations are
lefty and inspiring; he kindles the imagination by his
brave and generous ideas. The trouble with Wallace's
criticism of the lack of global approach at Moscow is
that he doesn't relate his recommendations to the atti-
dudes of the Big Four. For example, he wants planning
for Germany directed toward the overall needs of Europe--
an aim of both Bevin and Marshall, but an aim toward
which Russia has contributed not at all. In the same
way, Russian aberration from FAD, the Bank and Interna-
tional agencies stands in the way of realizing Wallace's
global approach. Is it the fault of Britain and America
that Russia doesn't join in these plans? And if Russia
refuses, are we to be accused of having 'war plans' in
our mind? The over-simplifications Mr. Wallace indulge
in are dangerous because they delude people into thinking
that there is some magic way of getting world peace which
these stupid people, the British and American Governments,
cannot find, but which Mr. Wallace can... It would be a
change if he would forget his apocalyptic rhetoric a bit
and get down to the level of the mundane facts and figures
with which statesmen have to deal.

In an editorial following the Central Hall speech, the
GUARDIAN said Wallace needn't have been at such pains to
make his first address 'palatable to his audience'; that
while Britain is flattered to hear it is the hope of the
world, it is used to criticism -- even from Wallace -- and
it would have liked to hear in what ways it had erred.
Wallace's message is worth hearing and needs no such sauce.
The GUARDIAN shares his horror of a divided world and agrees
the best remedy is raising national standards of living.
It also believes Truman made a mistake in launching his
Greek aid program without reference to the UN. It is the
implications and simplifications of Wallace's message that
raise doubts.

In criticizing Truman's loan to Turkey for military purposes,
it is only fair to note that the Turkish Army is fully
mobilized because 'Russia has kept much bigger armies on
her frontiers'. The GUARDIAN finds the most questionable
part of Wallace's thesis the assumption that Britain can
stand between Russia and the States... Russia threatens
our interests in various parts of the world and America
does not, to stand half way between them becomes silly.

There are
There are also certain democratic principles, not economic but political, on which no compromise is possible. On nearly all of them America is a great deal closer to us than Russia.

In a third editorial Monday after the Midland appearance, the GUARDIAN finds Wallace's efforts 'disappointing', perhaps because he 'finds it difficult to translate his peculiar language of progressive generalizations into concrete terms'. How would he translate his hopes and aspirations -- which are largely shared -- if he were in Marshall's shoes? The GUARDIAN regrets that so much of his speeches was devoted to attacking the US Government without reference to the policies of Britain and Russia. One is left with the impression, which is certainly false, that... Russia remains passive and inert, the helpless victim of American expansion.' Much of the present criticism of Wallace at home, the GUARDIAN regards as 'exaggerated and even ridiculous'. 'For a man to criticize his own country in another is always legitimate and may be courageous, but it must be done with care. As an apostle of one world, Mr. Wallace seems a little clumsy'.

Note: (*) omission will be serviced on request.
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