

Medford Mail Tribune
Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
33 North Fir St., P.O. Box 1141

1962 PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION

Flight o' Time
Medford and Jackson County History from the files of The Mail Tribune 10, 20, 30, 40 and 50 years ago.

10 YEARS AGO
June 22, 1952 (Sunday)
Two Rogue valley marines express their approval of new armored vests being used in Korean war.

20 YEARS AGO
June 22, 1942 (Monday)
Registration places listed by local draft board for all Jackson county men between 18 and 20 years old to register for draft.

30 YEARS AGO
June 22, 1932 (Wednesday)
Hottest day of the year recorded as the thermometer reaches 96 degrees.

40 YEARS AGO
June 22, 1922 (Thursday)
State highway commission announces that all advertising signs along highway right-of-ways must be removed at once.

50 YEARS AGO
June 22, 1912 (Saturday)
Twentieth annual assembly of Southern Oregon Chautauqua schedules opening in Ashland.

What's Your I.Q.?
Nine or ten correct is superior; seven or eight is excellent; five or six is good.

Answers: 1. Convex. 2. True. 3. Animal. 4. U. S. Indian tribe of S.W. 5. A drum. 6. Robert Louis Stevenson. 7. No. 8. Yes. 9. Wheat. 10. June 6, 1944.

The Senate's Investigator

The Senate Permanent Investigating subcommittee headed by Sen. John L. McClellan (D-Ark.) on Wednesday begins hearings on the affairs of Billie Sol Estes, Texas farm financier, and his dealings with officials of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

The Senate hearings in the Estes case, almost certainly, will be marked by thoroughness, sternness, fairness, and a kind of no-nonsense practicality you would associate with a "good" Southern conservative. This will be a reflection of the character of the man who will preside, Chairman McClellan, the old McCarthy committee.

McClellan, who took over when the Democrats won control of Congress in 1955, has restored to the subcommittee the prestige it had under Harry Truman, former Sen. James M. Mead (D-N.Y.) and the late Sen. Clyde R. Hoey (D-N.C.). Typically, he has assigned 46 investigators to check on the affairs of Estes. About 100 witnesses will be called. The hearings will run several weeks.

UNTIL John McClellan, by the osmosis of the seniority system, became the ranking Democrat on the Government Operations Committee and its unruly subcommittee in 1953, he had attracted little attention on Capitol Hill, although he had served in the House from 1934 to 1937 and in the Senate since 1942. Even then he seemed inclined at first to go along with Joe McCarthy, the subcommittee's flamboyant chairman.

But McClellan all the while was smarting under a series of improprieties. Finally, when McCarthy hired a discredited ex-preacher and ex-Red as subcommittee executive director, McClellan walked out, taking with him his Democratic colleagues.

THEY stayed off until December, 1953, and didn't come back without concessions from McCarthy. A few months later came the Army-McCarthy hearings. Overnight the morose, independent, always fair McClellan became known to millions of television viewers as the possessor of perhaps the only calm voice in what sometimes became a brouhaha of heroic intensity.

Investigation of government procurement of army uniforms led eventually to the establishment in 1957 of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field.

It promptly became known as the McClellan Committee. Its findings made possible the passage of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959. McClellan wrote the "bill of rights" amendment.

CRAGGY and judicial-mannered are words that frequently turn up in articles about McClellan. McClellan once explained his concept of investigative procedure thus: "When those who came before the committee resort to the Fifth Amendment they command no respect from me, as individuals. . . I respect their right to resort to it if they feel they must, but it carries with it an implication I am compelled to consider, and not favorably. . . At the same, I don't believe in permitting smears and slanders which can't be answered before the same tribunal."

Inevitably McClellan's subcommittee has occasionally been accused of headline-hunting—most recently in the rather pathetic questionings of B-girls and exotic dancers. But the criticism rarely applies to the chairman of the group—the Senate's top investigator.—E.R.R.

The Legion's Last Stand

The French Foreign Legion by the terms of its own charter may not be based in France proper. More than a year ago the Algerian rebels warned that the Legion would be asked to leave once independence was achieved. So the army of mercenaries faces a kind of dispersal among France's few remaining colonial possessions.

Legion headquarters will be moved from Sidi-Bel-Abbes to a camp near Marseilles. Units will be sent to Corsica, to the Sahara to protect French oil holdings, to French Guiana, and to French Somalia, Madagascar, a former French colony, has asked for troops; it will get a battalion of the third infantry.

THE French Foreign Legion considers itself a "great family." Some of France's greatest generals have served in the Legion. Often the highest and most distinguished officers of the Legion began their careers in its ranks.

Of late there has been a lull in recruiting, partly the result of complaints from other European nations that the Legion was recruiting minors—under 18 years of age—but more importantly because of the Legion's role in the generals' putsch in Algeria in April, 1961.

THE 25,000 Legionnaires in Algeria—14,000 of them Germans—formed the generals' basic military force. The First Parachute Regiment, which had been formed in 1949 and had fought gallantly at Dien Bien Phu, shouted defiantly "Algerie Francaise" while being driven to their dissolution.

And Legionnaire deserters have formed the hard core of Secret Army (OAS) insurgents. German Legionnaires directed sabotage by Algerian Jews. For over 130 years, Algeria has been the Legion's home and France its Mother. And wrong-headed and villainous as the OAS has been, the Legionnaires in it were stubbornly maintaining their dual loyalty as they saw it.—E.R.R.

"I'll Have It Filled In No Time"



Washington Report

By William S. White
(United Feature Syndicate)

NEW POLITICAL CLIMATE
Washington—It is not the heat that has got hold of us so slowly it is the official arrival of the summer time. It is the timidity.

More exactly, it is a pause not for refreshment but rather for reconsideration. It is a halt not for purpose of rest but rather for purpose of reorientation, for looking back down the road already traveled and up along the road leading to the congressional elections in November.

Washington has entered a new political climate that has nothing to do with the weather. And it is not really the formidable size of the congressional calendar that is giving an impression of a Senate and a House moving only fitfully and unwillingly about their jobs.

THE decisive factor in the current indecisiveness of congress is this: Congress wants to know—or to take a little time at least to try to guess—what the country now thinks before it commits itself to major parts of President Kennedy's unfinished legislative program.

For the impression is now widespread here that changes of unknown depth and meaning may be taking place in the political attitudes of the country. Has the President lost some of what has thus far been a consistently high popularity? The common congressional verdict is that undoubtedly he has.

A Gallup poll indicating that some 20 per cent blame the President for the stock market slump has been most carefully noted on Capitol Hill, even though it is accompanied by evidence that a vast majority of the country is by no means afraid of a depression.

BUT just how much of the President's popularity has gone, and for how long? And how much does this highly generalized factor of presidential popularity have to do anyhow with this or that specific issue before congress itself, having in mind that highly popular presidents (Eisenhower, for example) do not necessarily always carry con-

People Attracted To Personality Classes
Los Angeles—(UPI)—Poise, posture and personality classes for seniors in Los Angeles County are for the young in heart.

Senior citizens meet once a week in Plummer County Park for instruction in voice and diction, posture, color harmony, wardrobe, personality development, makeup and hairstyle techniques.

Try and Stop Me

By BENNETT CERF

A CLEAR THINKER is Mrs. O. Strickland, of Cleveland—and no nonsense about her. She recently descended from her station wagon to mail a letter. The station wagon rolled down a hill, picking up speed en route, and landed eventually at the bottom of a ravine.

Asked by the cop why she hadn't set her emergency brake before she got out of the car, Mrs. Strickland explained succinctly that she did not consider mailing a letter an emergency.

Reservists recalled for active service were griping about shortages in equipment and uniforms. They recalled a just current during World War I: a recruit mourning, "I reported at Yaphank Monday morning, and by Tuesday I had a uniform, hat, shoes, and puttees that fit me like a glove. I don't understand it. Can I be deformed?"

The status of the account executive has definitely improved since the day, in 1950, when adman pioneer Frank Pressby opened his agency in downtown New York. The morning he entered the building as a tenant for the first time he spotted this sign over the entrance: "Peddlers, book agents, and advertising men are not allowed in these premises."

Somebody made the mistake of asking Joey Bishop how his wife could cook. Bishop grinned, grabbed the inquirer by the arm, and implored, "Tell me, how can anyone burn lemonade?"

Khrushchev Puts Finger on Phase of Twin-Horned Dilemma of Red Rule

By PHIL NEWSOM
UPI Foreign News Analyst

"No one is born as a Communist. I know it from experience. In the Soviet Union farmers keep on looking in the barn for 'their horses' even after they have given them to the collective."

It was none other than Premier Nikita Khrushchev during a tour of collective farms in Romania.

In that one paragraph he put his finger on one phase of a twin-horned dilemma in which the Soviets find themselves and which is the cause of a note of desperation in the voices of Soviet leadership.

On the one hand is the stubborn peasant who refuses to produce as well for the state as he would for himself.

On the other is the European Common Market which not only is enriching the countries involved but is proving a brilliant reply to Khrushchev's challenge to the Western world to engage in peaceful economic competition.

The Soviets cannot abandon the collective. To do so would be to admit a fatal flaw in the whole theory of communism.

In the whole Soviet bloc, Poland stands as the only exception to a succession of agricultural failures.

Except in Poland where 87 per cent of the land remains in private hands, the only answer has been to increase collectivization of the farms and to heap on more hardship and more work for less return.

While the Soviet Union, East Germany, Bulgaria, Hungary and Czechoslovakia were suffering most shortages last year, the Poles were eating nearly 90 million pounds more meat than they did in 1960.

Poland's success with a capitalist-style agricultural system also led to a marked lack of Polish enthusiasm for another Soviet desperation plan.

Block integration. This plan proposed tight economic integration of the whole Soviet bloc, with each country to be assigned specialties which would be produced for the benefit of the bloc as a whole.

It received the enthusiastic endorsement of East German boss Walter Ulbricht whose regime has admitted concern over the anger of people who stand in line for meat, butter, eggs and other dairy products only to find at the end there are none.

Poland's food exports provide more than half her foreign income, with the United States and other Western nations her best customers. She is the sixth largest exporter of food in the world.

Poland's agricultural successes have given her a certain amount of independence within the Soviet bloc. They should also give Khrushchev cause to wonder about the efficiency of his own system.

Poland's success with a capitalist-style agricultural system also led to a marked lack of Polish enthusiasm for another Soviet desperation plan.

Block integration. This plan proposed tight economic integration of the whole Soviet bloc, with each country to be assigned specialties which would be produced for the benefit of the bloc as a whole.

Strictly Personal

By Sydney J. Harris
(c) Field Enterprises Inc.

ABOUT THE 'SNOB'
We all know that words change their meaning with the passing of time; but what is more fascinating to students of language and human behavior is the way in which some words reserve their meaning entirely. The word "snob" is a striking example.

We use it today to mean someone too acutely conscious of his social position, who looks down upon those he considers his inferiors.

But when the word was first put into currency, in England more than a century ago, it meant precisely the opposite. A "snob" was someone who was distinctly not a gentleman, someone of low social standing who imitated his betters and sneered at the rabble.

The word itself means "without nobility," and was put after the name of commoners at boys' schools, to indicate that they had no titles and did not come from noble families.

I thought of this while reading a news story out of Southampton, England, last month, which told of nine headwaiters on the liner Queen Elizabeth who quit their jobs "because they couldn't stand the lower classes."

The nine were all classified as headwaiters in the liner's first-class restaurant. When ordered to work the cabin and tourist class restaurants in rotation, they walked out in protest.

"Waiters Are Class Conscious" said the punning headline—which comes as no surprise to anyone aware of the British status system.

The biggest snobs in the Empire have always been the upper servant class. The aristocracy, in private, often makes fun of the peerage; and history records that even the Royal Families have been the object of derision from the gentry.

But the servants, properly trained from generation to generation, are the most precisely sensitive to subtle differences, the most conscious of caste, the most intransigently snobbish of all. To have worked for a duke, and then go into service with a mere baronet, is a shameful comedown in one's professional and personal status.

The dukes and the earls wear their titles lightly and, for the most part, with extreme diffidence. They are not snobs for the simple reason that their position is unassailable. The common denominator among all snobs—whether social or intellectual—is their personal insecurity. And by the way in which this insecurity reveals itself, they demonstrate (without knowing it) that they do not belong in the niche they so desperately aspire to.

liked our ol' time music that I, for one, got the "big head" and had to remove my hat. The rest of our group appeared happily smug, too. Best of all, they fed us: Those Rogues-er-I me! "people"—do make the best sandwiches, salads and pies I've tasted in a dog's age. Thanks, Friends.

Back to Ch'ck: I once owned a Barred Rock rooster, who was a noisy fellow, but he took exception to my crowing back at him and managed to take my knees from under me every time I entered the yard.

That tickled my other half prodigiously, but when he got the seat of his new overalls spurred into two parts, we had hot pie for dinner.

"Bye now, I'll be seeing yuh next 'Crowing' time if I should live so long. In the meantime—visit the Medford Fifty-Five club soon. Friday at 12:30 p.m., Fifth St. and Oakdale ave. (North East Corner).

Pearl Spackman, Jacksonville, Ore.

WEIRD note in the news: The suicide verdict still stands in the case of the mystery shooting in Texas last year of Henry H. Marshall, the department of agriculture agent who had been checking into the cotton allotment dealings of Billie Sol Estes.

After a month-long probe of the romance between the Texas grand jury decided that "the evidence was too inconclusive to substantiate any conclusion other than suicide."

LET'S see. Marshall was found dead on June 3, at a lonely spot on his ranch in Robertson county, near the town of Franklin. He had been shot five times with a .22 caliber bolt action rifle, which lay on the ground not too far away from his body. The verdict at an inquest by a justice of the peace was SUICIDE.

If, he must have been DETERMINED to die. Imagine shooting yourself FIVE TIMES with a bolt action rifle!

When the Senate rejected Strauss, old timers recalled two recent secretaries who had passed the Senate test: Harry L. Hopkins whose qualifications were slight, at most.

Henry A. Wallace whose disqualifications were such that the Congress reduced the authority of the Secretary of Commerce before giving him the job. They were two of FDR's cabinetiers.

Dr. Oppenheimer was not found to be disloyal, but lost on grounds that he was a security risk. The Oppenheimer incident was explosively controversial. Adm. Strauss' documented record is persuasive proof that the procedure against Oppenheimer was fair.

In Chapter 18, Strauss is accused. He was nominated by President Eisenhower to be Secretary of Commerce, succeeding Sinclair Weeks, resigned. After three months of committee hearings and Senate debate, Strauss was refused confirmation by a vote of 49 to 46, the 10th Cabinet nominee to be rejected in the history of the United States.

Was Senate Fair? The record of the Senate hearings and the circumstances of the Senate vote are adequately documented. This documentation leads inevitably to the conclusion that if Strauss had been dealt with as fairly by the U. S. Senate as Oppenheimer was fairly heard by the AEC, the admiral would have been confirmed.

Both incidents, Oppenheimer's sad experience and Strauss' humiliation, aroused national controversy lighted mostly by the prejudices, ignorance and angry passions of the controversialists. Strauss was clubbed with rotten wood.

"Men and Decisions" is a fascinating book from beginning to end. Chapters 14 and 18, however, are especially recommended reading because they illuminate two important political episodes that have too long been shadowed in bitter partisanship. These are Adm. Strauss' accounts, of course, and if his antagonists desire to challenge his facts, perhaps they will do so. Theirs will be no easy task.

When the Senate rejected Strauss, old timers recalled two recent secretaries who had passed the Senate test: Harry L. Hopkins whose qualifications were slight, at most.

Henry A. Wallace whose disqualifications were such that the Congress reduced the authority of the Secretary of Commerce before giving him the job. They were two of FDR's cabinetiers.

Dr. Oppenheimer was not found to be disloyal, but lost on grounds that he was a security risk. The Oppenheimer incident was explosively controversial. Adm. Strauss' documented record is persuasive proof that the procedure against Oppenheimer was fair.

In Chapter 18, Strauss is accused. He was nominated by President Eisenhower to be Secretary of Commerce, succeeding Sinclair Weeks, resigned. After three months of committee hearings and Senate debate, Strauss was refused confirmation by a vote of 49 to 46, the 10th Cabinet nominee to be rejected in the history of the United States.

Was Senate Fair? The record of the Senate hearings and the circumstances of the Senate vote are adequately documented. This documentation leads inevitably to the conclusion that if Strauss had been dealt with as fairly by the U. S. Senate as Oppenheimer was fairly heard by the AEC, the admiral would have been confirmed.

Both incidents, Oppenheimer's sad experience and Strauss' humiliation, aroused national controversy lighted mostly by the prejudices, ignorance and angry passions of the controversialists. Strauss was clubbed with rotten wood.

"Men and Decisions" is a fascinating book from beginning to end. Chapters 14 and 18, however, are especially recommended reading because they illuminate two important political episodes that have too long been shadowed in bitter partisanship. These are Adm. Strauss' accounts, of course, and if his antagonists desire to challenge his facts, perhaps they will do so. Theirs will be no easy task.

When the Senate rejected Strauss, old timers recalled two recent secretaries who had passed the Senate test: Harry L. Hopkins whose qualifications were slight, at most.

Henry A. Wallace whose disqualifications were such that the Congress reduced the authority of the Secretary of Commerce before giving him the job. They were two of FDR's cabinetiers.

Dr. Oppenheimer was not found to be disloyal, but lost on grounds that he was a security risk. The Oppenheimer incident was explosively controversial. Adm. Strauss' documented record is persuasive proof that the procedure against Oppenheimer was fair.

In Chapter 18, Strauss is accused. He was nominated by President Eisenhower to be Secretary of Commerce, succeeding Sinclair Weeks, resigned. After three months of committee hearings and Senate debate, Strauss was refused confirmation by a vote of 49 to 46, the 10th Cabinet nominee to be rejected in the history of the United States.

Was Senate Fair? The record of the Senate hearings and the circumstances of the Senate vote are adequately documented. This documentation leads inevitably to the conclusion that if Strauss had been dealt with as fairly by the U. S. Senate as Oppenheimer was fairly heard by the AEC, the admiral would have been confirmed.

Both incidents, Oppenheimer's sad experience and Strauss' humiliation, aroused national controversy lighted mostly by the prejudices, ignorance and angry passions of the controversialists. Strauss was clubbed with rotten wood.

"Men and Decisions" is a fascinating book from beginning to end. Chapters 14 and 18, however, are especially recommended reading because they illuminate two important political episodes that have too long been shadowed in bitter partisanship. These are Adm. Strauss' accounts, of course, and if his antagonists desire to challenge his facts, perhaps they will do so. Theirs will be no easy task.

When the Senate rejected Strauss, old timers recalled two recent secretaries who had passed the Senate test: Harry L. Hopkins whose qualifications were slight, at most.

Henry A. Wallace whose disqualifications were such that the Congress reduced the authority of the Secretary of Commerce before giving him the job. They were two of FDR's cabinetiers.

Dr. Oppenheimer was not found to be disloyal, but lost on grounds that he was a security risk. The Oppenheimer incident was explosively controversial. Adm. Strauss' documented record is persuasive proof that the procedure against Oppenheimer was fair.

In Chapter 18, Strauss is accused. He was nominated by President Eisenhower to be Secretary of Commerce, succeeding Sinclair Weeks, resigned. After three months of committee hearings and Senate debate, Strauss was refused confirmation by a vote of 49 to 46, the 10th Cabinet nominee to be rejected in the history of the United States.

Was Senate Fair? The record of the Senate hearings and the circumstances of the Senate vote are adequately documented. This documentation leads inevitably to the conclusion that if Strauss had been dealt with as fairly by the U. S. Senate as Oppenheimer was fairly heard by the AEC, the admiral would have been confirmed.

Both incidents, Oppenheimer's sad experience and Strauss' humiliation, aroused national controversy lighted mostly by the prejudices, ignorance and angry passions of the controversialists. Strauss was clubbed with rotten wood.

"Men and Decisions" is a fascinating book from beginning to end. Chapters 14 and 18, however, are especially recommended reading because they illuminate two important political episodes that have too long been shadowed in bitter partisanship. These are Adm. Strauss' accounts, of course, and if his antagonists desire to challenge his facts, perhaps they will do so. Theirs will be no easy task.

When the Senate rejected Strauss, old timers recalled two recent secretaries who had passed the Senate test: Harry L. Hopkins whose qualifications were slight, at most.

Henry A. Wallace whose disqualifications were such that the Congress reduced the authority of the Secretary of Commerce before giving him the job. They were two of FDR's cabinetiers.

Dr. Oppenheimer was not found to be disloyal, but lost on grounds that he was a security risk. The Oppenheimer incident was explosively controversial. Adm. Strauss' documented record is persuasive proof that the procedure against Oppenheimer was fair.

In Chapter 18, Strauss is accused. He was nominated by President Eisenhower to be Secretary of Commerce, succeeding Sinclair Weeks, resigned. After three months of committee hearings and Senate debate, Strauss was refused confirmation by a vote of 49 to 46, the 10th Cabinet nominee to be rejected in the history of the United States.

Was Senate Fair? The record of the Senate hearings and the circumstances of the Senate vote are adequately documented. This documentation leads inevitably to the conclusion that if Strauss had been dealt with as fairly by the U. S. Senate as Oppenheimer was fairly heard by the AEC, the admiral would have been confirmed.

Both incidents, Oppenheimer's sad experience and Strauss' humiliation, aroused national controversy lighted mostly by the prejudices, ignorance and angry passions of the controversialists. Strauss was clubbed with rotten wood.

"Men and Decisions" is a fascinating book from beginning to end. Chapters 14 and 18, however, are especially recommended reading because they illuminate two important political episodes that have too long been shadowed in bitter partisanship. These are Adm. Strauss' accounts, of course, and if his antagonists desire to challenge his facts, perhaps they will do so. Theirs will be no easy task.

When the Senate rejected Strauss, old timers recalled two recent secretaries who had passed the Senate test: Harry L. Hopkins whose qualifications were slight, at most.

Henry A. Wallace whose disqualifications were such that the Congress reduced the authority of the Secretary of Commerce before giving him the job. They were two of FDR's cabinetiers.

Dr. Oppenheimer was not found to be disloyal, but lost on grounds that he was a security risk. The Oppenheimer incident was explosively controversial. Adm. Strauss' documented record is persuasive proof that the procedure against Oppenheimer was fair.

In Chapter 18, Strauss is accused. He was nominated by President Eisenhower to be Secretary of Commerce, succeeding Sinclair Weeks, resigned. After three months of committee hearings and Senate debate, Strauss was refused confirmation by a vote of 49 to 46, the 10th Cabinet nominee to be rejected in the history of the United States.

Was Senate Fair? The record of the Senate hearings and the circumstances of the Senate vote are adequately documented. This documentation leads inevitably to the conclusion that if Strauss had been dealt with as fairly by the U. S. Senate as Oppenheimer was fairly heard by the AEC, the admiral would have been confirmed.

Both incidents, Oppenheimer's sad experience and Strauss' humiliation, aroused national controversy lighted mostly by the prejudices, ignorance and angry passions of the controversialists. Strauss was clubbed with rotten wood.

"Men and Decisions" is a fascinating book from beginning to end. Chapters 14 and 18, however, are especially recommended reading because they illuminate two important political episodes that have too long been shadowed in bitter partisanship. These are Adm. Strauss' accounts, of course, and if his antagonists desire to challenge his facts, perhaps they will do so. Theirs will be no easy task.

When the Senate rejected Strauss, old timers recalled two recent secretaries who had passed the Senate test: Harry L. Hopkins whose qualifications were slight, at most.

Henry A. Wallace whose disqualifications were such that the Congress reduced the authority of the Secretary of Commerce before giving him the job. They were two of FDR's cabinetiers.

Dr. Oppenheimer was not found to be disloyal, but lost on grounds that he was a security risk. The Oppenheimer incident was explosively controversial. Adm. Strauss' documented record is persuasive proof that the procedure against Oppenheimer was fair.

In Chapter 18, Strauss is accused. He was nominated by President Eisenhower to be Secretary of Commerce, succeeding Sinclair Weeks, resigned. After three months of committee hearings and Senate debate, Strauss was refused confirmation by a vote of 49 to 46, the 10th Cabinet nominee to be rejected in the history of the United States.

Was Senate Fair? The record of the Senate hearings and the circumstances of the Senate vote are adequately documented. This documentation leads inevitably to the conclusion that if Strauss had been dealt with as fairly by the U. S. Senate as Oppenheimer was fairly heard by the AEC, the admiral would have been confirmed.

Both incidents, Oppenheimer's sad experience and Strauss' humiliation, aroused national controversy lighted mostly by the prejudices, ignorance and angry passions of the controversialists. Strauss was clubbed with rotten wood.

"Men and Decisions" is a fascinating book from beginning to end. Chapters 14 and 18, however, are especially recommended reading because they illuminate two important political episodes that have too long been shadowed in bitter partisanship. These are Adm. Strauss' accounts, of course, and if his antagonists desire to challenge his facts, perhaps they will do so. Theirs will be no easy task.

When the Senate rejected Strauss, old timers recalled two recent secretaries who had passed the Senate test: Harry L. Hopkins whose qualifications were slight, at most.

Henry A. Wallace whose disqualifications were such that the Congress reduced the authority of the Secretary of Commerce before giving him the job. They were two of FDR's cabinetiers.

Dr. Oppenheimer was not found to be disloyal, but lost on grounds that he was a security risk. The Oppenheimer incident was explosively controversial. Adm. Strauss' documented record is persuasive proof that the procedure against Oppenheimer was fair.

In Chapter 18, Strauss is accused. He was nominated by President Eisenhower to be Secretary of Commerce, succeeding Sinclair Weeks, resigned. After three months of committee hearings and Senate debate, Strauss was refused confirmation by a vote of 49 to 46, the 10th Cabinet nominee to be rejected in the history of the United States.

Was Senate Fair? The record of the Senate hearings and the circumstances of the Senate vote are adequately documented. This documentation leads inevitably to the conclusion that if Strauss had been dealt with as fairly by the U. S. Senate as Oppenheimer was fairly heard by the AEC, the admiral would have been confirmed.

Both incidents, Oppenheimer's sad experience and Strauss' humiliation, aroused national controversy lighted mostly by the prejudices, ignorance and angry passions of the controversialists. Strauss was clubbed with rotten wood.

"Men and Decisions" is a fascinating book from beginning to end. Chapters 14 and 18, however, are especially recommended reading because they illuminate two important political episodes that have too long been shadowed in bitter partisanship. These are Adm. Strauss' accounts, of course, and if his antagonists desire to challenge his facts, perhaps they will do so. Theirs will be no easy task.

When the Senate rejected Strauss, old timers recalled two recent secretaries who had passed the Senate test: Harry L. Hopkins whose qualifications were slight, at most.

Henry A. Wallace whose disqualifications were such that the Congress reduced the authority of the Secretary of Commerce before giving him the job. They were two of FDR's cabinetiers.

Dr. Oppenheimer was not found to be disloyal, but lost on grounds that he was a security risk. The Oppenheimer incident was explosively controversial. Adm. Strauss' documented record is persuasive proof that the procedure against Oppenheimer was fair.

In Chapter 18, Strauss is accused. He was nominated by President Eisenhower to be Secretary of Commerce, succeeding Sinclair Weeks, resigned. After three months of committee hearings and Senate debate, Strauss was refused confirmation by a vote of 49 to 46, the 10th Cabinet nominee to be rejected in the history of the United States.

Was Senate Fair? The record of the Senate hearings and the circumstances of the Senate vote are adequately documented. This documentation leads inevitably to the conclusion that if Strauss had been dealt with as fairly by the U. S. Senate as Oppenheimer was fairly heard by the AEC, the admiral would have been confirmed.

Both incidents, Oppenheimer's sad experience and Strauss' humiliation, aroused national controversy lighted mostly by the prejudices, ignorance and angry passions of the controversialists. Strauss was clubbed with rotten wood.

"Men and Decisions" is a fascinating book from beginning to end. Chapters 14 and 18, however, are especially recommended reading because they illuminate two important political episodes that have too long been shadowed in bitter partisanship. These are Adm. Strauss' accounts, of course, and if his