

U. S. NAVAL ENGINEERING EXPERIMENT STATION

Annapolis, Maryland

February 7, 1952

File No.

Serial

Dear Ron,

Do you realize that your last letter had no news of yourself whatsoever? I am always greatly interested in your doings, honors bestowed upon you, etc. You did go to India for the I.S.I. and Biometric Congresses? Were they well-attended and interesting? Did you enjoy the trip?

I haven't seen the book you mentioned as yet but with your recommendation shall get a copy. Kempthorne's book is just off the press - The Design and Analysis of Experiments - I suppose Snedecor is sponsoring this one. I shall be interested in your reaction to it.

Office of Naval Research - which has a finger in all sorts ^{and types} of research. Yesterday, I spent the day in Washington ^{politicking} & I'm always glad of an excuse to sleep late. Getting the promise of funds to support me

U. S. NAVAL ENGINEERING EXPERIMENT STATION

Annapolis, Maryland

File No.

Serial

little outfit was almost too easy -
to be true - they promised more
than I asked for. I came back to
find the Director had lowered my
ceiling by one clerk - 500.0 I shall
have to put up another fight then.
It shouldn't be too hard with the
money practically in my hands.
The next problem (cloud) on the horizon
is that the great Westinghouse Corp.
is about to steal one of my staff -
a young man with an M.A. and one year's
experience - with a possible offer of \$6000.
That shows the trend in this country.

I am due to spend Feb 11 at this
company's atomic energy plant - also will
talk to a group that evening at Carnegie
Inst. of Tech. on Experimental Design.

My part in next summer's N.C. seminar
is shaping up very nicely. It should
be fun as well as profitable!

(over)

You asked about my reactions
to Ike. "I Like Ike." and I thoroughly ^{delight} ~~enjoy~~ -
I think he, ^{has} gone daft in his desire to be
President. The enclosed clipping will
give you a notion as to how a lot
of folks are thinking. There are many
of us who believe a party change would
be good provided it wasn't reactionary
and isolationist. Key-fawer in the
Democratic camp might be satisfactory

^(I mean from U.S.A.)
Americans ~~generally~~ are deeply
sympathetic over the loss of your
very fine King. Elizabeth, the Queen,
was so completely liked by
everyone with whom she came in
contact here in ^{the} United States.

Sincere good wishes
Beess.

Working Post
King George VI

The United States and other republics would be fortunate if they had more public servants of their own as devoted as the late King George VI. In his young manhood he did not know that he would be King; he was not especially talented or trained to bear the unique responsibilities that fall upon a British sovereign. Yet from the moment he came to the throne, through the accident of his brother's abdication in 1936, he showed a sense of modest, self-effacing duty that is as rare in commoners as in kings. Like his father, but like few other monarchs of history or legend, he sought only to be a good and faithful servant of his people.

King George was successful, too, in showing a flawless understanding of his constitutional role. The King in Britain must be above party and above controversy—which means, among other things, that his private opinions, his whims and desires, his personal comfort and safety, must always be subordinated to the public interest. Because George VI understood his place in the British system, he became an ideal symbol of Commonwealth unity in the successive crises of the abdication, the war, and the stresses of the postwar years.

To Americans the British monarchy will always be an enigma; to British people all over the world, and to millions of other nationalities within the Commonwealth, the monarchy conveys a feeling that they are members of one great family. A king or a queen is the head of the family—their living link with a glorious past. This, we think, accounts for the sorrow of millions in the Commonwealth today.

For a few days we shall hear the beat of muffled drums from London, but thereafter we may see a lifting of the spirit such as the British have not known in many a year. After all, their "finest hour" was only a decade or so ago. Is it not possible that under Queen Elizabeth II the British people can enter another Elizabethan age of creative achievement?

New Game: Pick a Taft Cabinet

By Joseph and Stewart Alsop

A FAVORITE political parlor game in Washington these days is composing imaginary Cabinets for President Taft. Under the rules, the theoretical Taft Cabinet of the future is chosen by the usual method, from among the leading men who have most valuably supported the Taft forces in the grim pre-election struggle. Some typical results of this new pastime are perhaps worth recording.

For Secretary of State, General MacArthur has the lead. No one has played so eminent a role in the Taft pre-convention campaign. No one, seemingly, has contributed more importantly to the mature Taftian theory of foreign relations. As the leading global thinker in the Taft camp, the general has a prescriptive right to this post.

For Secretary of Defense, Col. Robert R. McCormick wins hands down. The self-confessed inventor of the rifle, a noted student of military strategy, and above all, the owner of the crucial Illinois delegation, Colonel looks like a natural.

FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL, Senator McCarthy is strongly favored. The McCarthy campaign against alleged Communist plotters in the Government has greatly strengthened the public support for Taft. As Attorney General, McCarthy will make sure that no subversives infiltrate the new Administration, and even if his methods of pursuing this approved objective become a trifle excitable, President Taft will be there to hold him in check.

For Secretary of Commerce, Sen. Owen Brewster is first choice. As the great senatorial friend of Pan-American Airways, Senator Brewster takes a lively interest in civil aviation, control of which centers in the Commerce Department. And as the leading Taft lieutenant in the Senate, Brewster ought to have his pick of jobs.

For Secretary of Labor, Rep. Fred Hartley, coauthor of the Taft-Hartley Act, is almost automatically named.

About other places there is some dispute. Many favor Sewell Ayer for Secretary of the Treasury, as a conspicuous meeter of payrolls, but it is also objected that this will make two members of the Cabinet from Illinois. Again, most players of the game agree that the Interior Department ought to go to the right-wing Western Republican who can break Governor Warren's control of the California delegation in Senator Taft's favor. And there is argument about who this will be.

While some predict that the chief of the China

lobby, Alfred Kohlberg, will be called to serve as Undersecretary of State, others assert that Kohlberg will only receive the Assistant Secretaryship for Far Eastern Affairs. Again there is debate about whether Brig. Gen. Hanford McNider or Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley ought to be Secretary of the Army.

And although John Marshall, who has learned the South's problems at the auctions of Southern Republican delegates, is widely favored for chairman of the proposed voluntary Fair Employment Practices Commission, others assert that Marshall's faithful services merit a higher reward.

THESE NAMES, at any rate, are enough to convey the general idea of the Taft Cabinet game, which is strongly tinged with the customary malice of politics in an election year. Obviously no one really expects Senator Taft to construct a Cabinet of the sort listed, although some of the men mentioned, such as General MacArthur, might well be called to serve under President Taft.

Nonetheless, this imagined list of Taft Cabinet members conceals a point of enduring meaning for the coming election. The truth is that all of the men named above will have most important claims on Senator Taft if he wins the Presidency. The further truth is that at the moment, these men and others like them are the most conspicuous figures in the Taft camp. And this in turn must constitute a serious dilemma for Senator Taft.

On one hand, the Senator does not really agree, so far as the record shows, with all that is said and believed by these eminent supporters of his, even including MacArthur. He can proclaim his independence of all of them; he can even repudiate some of them, before convention time. He will then stand forth as an unusually capable middle-of-the-road leader, particularly with regard to domestic policy, and his great experience and visible integrity will have full value.

On the other hand, it will be immensely hard for Taft to take this course, of edging away from many of the chief men in his camp. But if he does not do so, it will also be very hard for independent voters, and even for large groups of Republicans, to support a candidate who has been carried to the presidential nomination on this particular group of shoulders.

This is the biggest single problem that Taft has to face, and next to General Eisenhower himself, it is also the biggest asset of the Eisenhower movement.