

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1954

**'Shut, Shut The Door, Good John!'**

THE junior senator from Wisconsin is resting comfortably at Bethesda Naval Hospital. His elbow which, according to some of the senator's aids, was painfully bruised when banged against a glass table top by a heavy handshaker, is reportedly responding to treatment. Nevertheless the Senate has gone into an 11-day recess to permit Sen. Joe McCarthy to recuperate fully.

This latest development in the McCarthy affair raises several intriguing points.

For one thing, Sen. McCarthy has always been a vigorous, robust man. He is an ex-boxer. It is surprising that a mere bruised elbow could restrain this fighter on the eve of a crucial contest. In contrast, Sen. Arthur Watkins, his chief antagonist at the moment and a much older man, has been ailing for several days but has nevertheless been getting out of his corner each time the bell rang.

Too, one is curious to know whose was the hand that shook the arm that stopped the Senate. And there is the matter of appropriate recognition of the senator's indisposition. It is recalled that during World War II he obtained a Purple Heart for falling off a ladder—perhaps an Oak Leaf Cluster is in order.

But the remarkable feature of the senator's ailment is its timing.

Apparently there is something about the Washington atmosphere which incapacitates men who are under fire.

"The Dutchman" Grunwald refused to return to a subcommittee investigating him on the basis of a medical report that the appearance would be unsafe.

**Hi-Fi Bull In A China Shop**

A HUSHED hall waited in massed expectancy while members of the Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra lifted their instruments. Suddenly the air was filled with bleak, snaky music—the virgin chords and novel blends of POEM IN CYCLES AND BELLS by Vladimir Ussachevsky and Otto Loening. Then, as listeners leaned forward, the unearthly tones of a soloist split the air.

The soloist was a tape recorder. The music it played: Sounds, once beyond the reach of the human ear, that had been electronically transformed into tones no known instruments could produce.

Why should this have excited so many concert-goers? The answer is simple. America's music listeners had suddenly gone sound-happy. They have become high fidelity enthusiasts, dedicated to all kinds of prescribed periods of noise—some of them so elevated that they can only be seen on the screen of a cathode ray oscilloscope.

Any fragment of the sound spectrum, if it is unusual enough, will send hi-fi addicts into states of unbearable pleasure. To practice their quaint and restless rites, they usually put together a vast and expensive accumulation of phonograph equipment that, in appearance, vaguely resembles the cluttered cockpit of a Canberra bomber.

News that the Ussachevsky-Loening work may soon be available in a high fidelity recorded version undoubtedly has many a sonic aficionado trembling with excitement today.

**Don't Miss A Single Flaming Chapter**

AFTER a breathless examination of a serial fiction running currently in U. S. newspapers, we have come up with our own story—a sure-fire hit we shall call PASSION BELOW STARS or WHO PERYS THE ENVIRONMENT BY ROSEMARY STRONGOAK'S OVALTINE? A chapter-by-chapter synopsis of our serial, which we expect to sell to a syndicate for \$5,617, follows:

I. High society beauty Ophelia Hipp falls in love with the garbage man after seeing him (from seclusion) on six occasions pick up the refuse at her Fifth Ave. apartment building.

II. The garbage man, handsome Rodney Strongoak, falls in love with the scullery maid, gay, carefree, curvaceous, headstrong Hedda Hudda, who works and lives in the apartment house basement. She has been feeding him olives when he picks up the trash.

III. Ophelia tells Hedda about her desperate love for Rodney, not knowing that the scullery maid is her secret rival. Hedda, sensing the game is afoot, promises to lure the heretic refuse collector into a compromising position and then let the flighty society beauty step in.

IV. Hedda flirts with Rodney and promises him a raw oyster supper in her secluded basement apartment after the day's dirty work is done. In the meantime Ophelia has flung herself, clad in a sheer nightgown, out of her 17th story window into Rodney's garbage scow, seeking to attract his attention. She escapes from the truck only seconds before being dumped into the incinerator.

V. Fun-loving Hedda, in the meantime, has flirted with the rag peddler, Sam Sooner, and promised him a raw oyster supper in her secluded basement apartment that night after the day's rags are peddled. Sam does not love her, because she has secretly desired Ophelia for seven months after he sold her a

Daniel A. Bolch, former assistant commissioner of internal revenue under investigation in connection with tax frauds, told investigators that he could submit only to "limited questioning," on doctors' orders.

Carroll E. Mealey, a former deputy commissioner of internal revenue, resigned because of "ill health" shortly after irregularities were found in his department.

Former Commissioner of Internal Revenue Joseph D. Norton Jr. found that he had to go to a hospital for extended treatment when a subcommittee wanted to question him.

For some reason, the McCarthy indisposition reminds us of the famous Notre Dame-Iowa football game in '53. Iowa, you will recall, was leading 7 to 0, just before the half, with Notre Dame threatening. One of the Irish feigned injury, thus permitting time for a touchdown-scoring pass play. Just before the end of the game, with Iowa ahead 14-7, Notre Dame players groveled around the clock, and the time permitted another touchdown pass and point for a slightly-tarnished tie.

But we are willing at this point to give the senator the benefit of the doubt. Perhaps he just has the feeling Alexander Pope described in his EPITAPH TO DR. AMBROSE:

Shut, shut the door, good John!  
 Tie up the knocker! say I'm sick, I'm dead.

**Democrats Are Being Inevitably Impelled To The Left**

WASHINGTON  
 In The Wall Street Journal

WASHINGTON  
 "middle road" party, perhaps even more conservative than the Republicans of today. President Roosevelt led—or least symbolized—the political revolution of the Thirties. The Republicans, with the help of a big bloc of conservative Democrats, resisted many of the Roosevelt "reforms." But in recent years the Republicans have been drawing nearer to the Democrats.

It's reasoned that the parties now are too close together—that in the nature of politics there must ultimately be a wider gulf between them. If the Democrats moved toward the right the similarity would be greater still. Accordingly, the argument runs, the only course open to the Democrats is another shift to the left. And there are signs that process has already started.

Consider what's happening to the southern conservative faction. Only a few years ago Virginia's Sen. Harry Byrd led a recalcitrant band of Dixie Democrats on many an economic issue

in the Senate. Today, the number of backers he can count on is gradually dwindling. And no one is more aware than Mr. Byrd himself of the inroads his "liberal" Southern colleagues are making.

Former North Carolina Gov. W. Kerr Scott, who wears the "liberal" label, will take his place in the Senate. Sen. Sparkman of Alabama carries the "liberal" banner on most issues that don't involve the so-called civil rights question.

Perhaps equally significant is the tendency of some Disinclined who have always been considered conservative to drift with the trend instead of resist it as they once did. In their estimate, private political discussions these lawmakers freely express their belief that the Democratic Party's future lies in the promotion of "liberal" causes.

The occasional exceptions to this gradual change in the political complexion of Dixie's contingent in Congress does not alter the fact that the change is going on. The most notable exception in the recent election was the write-in Senate victory of former Governor Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, who headed the Dixiecrat ticket in an unsuccessful attempt to defeat Mr. Truman in 1948. Despite Mr. Thurmond's political comeback, the Byrd variety of southern Democracy does not flourish as it once did.

Outside the South, the "liberal" wing of the Democratic Party—though despite some exceptions—gained new heights in party councils as a result of the election. The Democratic Party of Fair Dealer W. Averell Harriman in his race for governor of New York puts him in a strong position both to help the Democratic national policies and to pick their candidates for President and vice president in the Senate.

Conservative Democrats are also being picked up by the "liberal" forces. The Democratic Party's complexion has changed so rapidly and dramatically as in the early New Deal months. But it seems to be safe to bet that the trend, though gradual, will be just as real and that resistance to it will weaken as the Byrd empire declines.

**Outcome Of Lattimore Case Will Affect U. S. Freedoms**

By MARQUIS CHILDS

Editor's Note: This is the last of a series of four articles tracing the history and appraising the significance of the Oves Lattimore case.

WASHINGTON

WHO IS OWEN Lattimore and why should he find himself at the center of a legal-political controversy attracting not only national but international interest? Recently the Lattimore case was the subject of questions in the House of Commons in London, with members expressing indignation that Scotland Yard had been "frivolous" to make queries of Lattimore's British publishers at the request of the American Embassy.

The Home Secretary, Lloyd George, replied that this had been done as a routine matter but that in the future any such request would be reviewed at a "high level." The Manchester Guardian, a spokesman for many years of liberal Britain, had a column-long editorial headed "Persecution" denouncing the Home Office and strongly criticizing the

American embassy for "trying to turn Scotland Yard into a branch of the Republican campaign organization." In the same edition the Guardian printed one of Lattimore's articles, written in 1947 under the heading, "What the United States Now Thinks Criminal."

This article, dealing with the relationship between the Chinese Communists and Soviet Russia, is cited four times in the second indictment brought against Lattimore for denying under oath that he was a "promoter" of Communist activities and a "follower" of the Communist line.

LATTIMORE ADVISED CHIANG Kai-shek, now 54, has spent much of his life in China, first in business, then as a writer and finally as a scholar studying remote peoples and customs in Inner and Outer Mongolia and other more or less inaccessible places.

His own wide reputation and eventually became director of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations at Johns Hopkins University. In 1942 he was political adviser to Chiang Kai-shek.

During the war years and immediately after he was drawn into the controversy over American policy in China. He expressed the view that corruption and feudal landlordism among those around Chiang would bring about the downfall of the Nationalists and the triumph of the Communists.

He was among the first to express the view that corruption and feudal landlordism among those around Chiang would bring about the downfall of the Nationalists and the triumph of the Communists.

He was among the first to express the view that corruption and feudal landlordism among those around Chiang would bring about the downfall of the Nationalists and the triumph of the Communists.

He was among the first to express the view that corruption and feudal landlordism among those around Chiang would bring about the downfall of the Nationalists and the triumph of the Communists.

He was among the first to express the view that corruption and feudal landlordism among those around Chiang would bring about the downfall of the Nationalists and the triumph of the Communists.

He was among the first to express the view that corruption and feudal landlordism among those around Chiang would bring about the downfall of the Nationalists and the triumph of the Communists.

From his writings Lattimore has produced a series of excerpts to show that he praised Chiang Kai-shek and urged a policy of splitting China off from Russia.

What makes the Lattimore case in many respects unique is that a jury is being asked to pass on legal matters of policy hardly disputed among the experts, some of whom have been Lattimore's acerbic critics.

The government in the second indictment listed 25 "topics" on which it is charged Lattimore followed the Communist line. Under Topic 25 the wording is: "Outer Mongolia is independent. It should be recognized by the United States and admitted to the United Nations."

Lattimore's attorneys said in their reply: "Outer Mongolia must be one of the most exacting subjects ever made the subject of an American jury trial."

As the attacks continued, John Hopkins asked Lattimore to take a leave of absence with pay until the issue should be determined in one way or another.

Accused before the McCarthy committee of being no scholar at all, many distinguished figures and specialists in the Asian field paid tribute to

Lattimore's scholarship including Arthur Hays Sulzberger's glowing work on the history of civilization is just now receiving wide attention in the United States.

Professor George Boas of Johns Hopkins a defense fund of nearly \$40,000 has been raised, most of it coming in small contributions from teachers and scholars all over the country.

Issues that transcend the fate of a single case are clearly involved. For example, the late Sen. Pat McCarran of Nevada in passing the second indictment of the attorneys general exacted a pledge that the Lattimore prosecution would be pushed. Was the legislative branch interfering with the executive? Have the United States attorney Leo Rover

acted in a manner interfering with the executive? Has the legislative branch interfering with the executive? Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

**Democrats Are Being Inevitably Impelled To The Left**

By ALBERT CLARK

In The Wall Street Journal

WASHINGTON  
 "middle road" party, perhaps even more conservative than the Republicans of today. President Roosevelt led—or least symbolized—the political revolution of the Thirties. The Republicans, with the help of a big bloc of conservative Democrats, resisted many of the Roosevelt "reforms." But in recent years the Republicans have been drawing nearer to the Democrats.

It's reasoned that the parties now are too close together—that in the nature of politics there must ultimately be a wider gulf between them. If the Democrats moved toward the right the similarity would be greater still. Accordingly, the argument runs, the only course open to the Democrats is another shift to the left. And there are signs that process has already started.

Consider what's happening to the southern conservative faction. Only a few years ago Virginia's Sen. Harry Byrd led a recalcitrant band of Dixie Democrats on many an economic issue

in the Senate. Today, the number of backers he can count on is gradually dwindling. And no one is more aware than Mr. Byrd himself of the inroads his "liberal" Southern colleagues are making.

Former North Carolina Gov. W. Kerr Scott, who wears the "liberal" label, will take his place in the Senate. Sen. Sparkman of Alabama carries the "liberal" banner on most issues that don't involve the so-called civil rights question.

Perhaps equally significant is the tendency of some Disinclined who have always been considered conservative to drift with the trend instead of resist it as they once did. In their estimate, private political discussions these lawmakers freely express their belief that the Democratic Party's future lies in the promotion of "liberal" causes.

The occasional exceptions to this gradual change in the political complexion of Dixie's contingent in Congress does not alter the fact that the change is going on. The most notable exception in the recent election was the write-in Senate victory of former Governor Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, who headed the Dixiecrat ticket in an unsuccessful attempt to defeat Mr. Truman in 1948. Despite Mr. Thurmond's political comeback, the Byrd variety of southern Democracy does not flourish as it once did.

Outside the South, the "liberal" wing of the Democratic Party—though despite some exceptions—gained new heights in party councils as a result of the election. The Democratic Party of Fair Dealer W. Averell Harriman in his race for governor of New York puts him in a strong position both to help the Democratic national policies and to pick their candidates for President and vice president in the Senate.

Conservative Democrats are also being picked up by the "liberal" forces. The Democratic Party's complexion has changed so rapidly and dramatically as in the early New Deal months. But it seems to be safe to bet that the trend, though gradual, will be just as real and that resistance to it will weaken as the Byrd empire declines.

WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON  
 "middle road" party, perhaps even more conservative than the Republicans of today. President Roosevelt led—or least symbolized—the political revolution of the Thirties. The Republicans, with the help of a big bloc of conservative Democrats, resisted many of the Roosevelt "reforms." But in recent years the Republicans have been drawing nearer to the Democrats.

It's reasoned that the parties now are too close together—that in the nature of politics there must ultimately be a wider gulf between them. If the Democrats moved toward the right the similarity would be greater still. Accordingly, the argument runs, the only course open to the Democrats is another shift to the left. And there are signs that process has already started.

Consider what's happening to the southern conservative faction. Only a few years ago Virginia's Sen. Harry Byrd led a recalcitrant band of Dixie Democrats on many an economic issue

in the Senate. Today, the number of backers he can count on is gradually dwindling. And no one is more aware than Mr. Byrd himself of the inroads his "liberal" Southern colleagues are making.

Former North Carolina Gov. W. Kerr Scott, who wears the "liberal" label, will take his place in the Senate. Sen. Sparkman of Alabama carries the "liberal" banner on most issues that don't involve the so-called civil rights question.

Perhaps equally significant is the tendency of some Disinclined who have always been considered conservative to drift with the trend instead of resist it as they once did. In their estimate, private political discussions these lawmakers freely express their belief that the Democratic Party's future lies in the promotion of "liberal" causes.

The occasional exceptions to this gradual change in the political complexion of Dixie's contingent in Congress does not alter the fact that the change is going on. The most notable exception in the recent election was the write-in Senate victory of former Governor Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, who headed the Dixiecrat ticket in an unsuccessful attempt to defeat Mr. Truman in 1948. Despite Mr. Thurmond's political comeback, the Byrd variety of southern Democracy does not flourish as it once did.

Outside the South, the "liberal" wing of the Democratic Party—though despite some exceptions—gained new heights in party councils as a result of the election. The Democratic Party of Fair Dealer W. Averell Harriman in his race for governor of New York puts him in a strong position both to help the Democratic national policies and to pick their candidates for President and vice president in the Senate.

Conservative Democrats are also being picked up by the "liberal" forces. The Democratic Party's complexion has changed so rapidly and dramatically as in the early New Deal months. But it seems to be safe to bet that the trend, though gradual, will be just as real and that resistance to it will weaken as the Byrd empire declines.

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON  
 "middle road" party, perhaps even more conservative than the Republicans of today. President Roosevelt led—or least symbolized—the political revolution of the Thirties. The Republicans, with the help of a big bloc of conservative Democrats, resisted many of the Roosevelt "reforms." But in recent years the Republicans have been drawing nearer to the Democrats.

It's reasoned that the parties now are too close together—that in the nature of politics there must ultimately be a wider gulf between them. If the Democrats moved toward the right the similarity would be greater still. Accordingly, the argument runs, the only course open to the Democrats is another shift to the left. And there are signs that process has already started.

Consider what's happening to the southern conservative faction. Only a few years ago Virginia's Sen. Harry Byrd led a recalcitrant band of Dixie Democrats on many an economic issue

in the Senate. Today, the number of backers he can count on is gradually dwindling. And no one is more aware than Mr. Byrd himself of the inroads his "liberal" Southern colleagues are making.

Former North Carolina Gov. W. Kerr Scott, who wears the "liberal" label, will take his place in the Senate. Sen. Sparkman of Alabama carries the "liberal" banner on most issues that don't involve the so-called civil rights question.

Perhaps equally significant is the tendency of some Disinclined who have always been considered conservative to drift with the trend instead of resist it as they once did. In their estimate, private political discussions these lawmakers freely express their belief that the Democratic Party's future lies in the promotion of "liberal" causes.

The occasional exceptions to this gradual change in the political complexion of Dixie's contingent in Congress does not alter the fact that the change is going on. The most notable exception in the recent election was the write-in Senate victory of former Governor Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, who headed the Dixiecrat ticket in an unsuccessful attempt to defeat Mr. Truman in 1948. Despite Mr. Thurmond's political comeback, the Byrd variety of southern Democracy does not flourish as it once did.

Outside the South, the "liberal" wing of the Democratic Party—though despite some exceptions—gained new heights in party councils as a result of the election. The Democratic Party of Fair Dealer W. Averell Harriman in his race for governor of New York puts him in a strong position both to help the Democratic national policies and to pick their candidates for President and vice president in the Senate.

Conservative Democrats are also being picked up by the "liberal" forces. The Democratic Party's complexion has changed so rapidly and dramatically as in the early New Deal months. But it seems to be safe to bet that the trend, though gradual, will be just as real and that resistance to it will weaken as the Byrd empire declines.

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON  
 "middle road" party, perhaps even more conservative than the Republicans of today. President Roosevelt led—or least symbolized—the political revolution of the Thirties. The Republicans, with the help of a big bloc of conservative Democrats, resisted many of the Roosevelt "reforms." But in recent years the Republicans have been drawing nearer to the Democrats.

It's reasoned that the parties now are too close together—that in the nature of politics there must ultimately be a wider gulf between them. If the Democrats moved toward the right the similarity would be greater still. Accordingly, the argument runs, the only course open to the Democrats is another shift to the left. And there are signs that process has already started.

Consider what's happening to the southern conservative faction. Only a few years ago Virginia's Sen. Harry Byrd led a recalcitrant band of Dixie Democrats on many an economic issue

in the Senate. Today, the number of backers he can count on is gradually dwindling. And no one is more aware than Mr. Byrd himself of the inroads his "liberal" Southern colleagues are making.

Former North Carolina Gov. W. Kerr Scott, who wears the "liberal" label, will take his place in the Senate. Sen. Sparkman of Alabama carries the "liberal" banner on most issues that don't involve the so-called civil rights question.

Perhaps equally significant is the tendency of some Disinclined who have always been considered conservative to drift with the trend instead of resist it as they once did. In their estimate, private political discussions these lawmakers freely express their belief that the Democratic Party's future lies in the promotion of "liberal" causes.

The occasional exceptions to this gradual change in the political complexion of Dixie's contingent in Congress does not alter the fact that the change is going on. The most notable exception in the recent election was the write-in Senate victory of former Governor Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, who headed the Dixiecrat ticket in an unsuccessful attempt to defeat Mr. Truman in 1948. Despite Mr. Thurmond's political comeback, the Byrd variety of southern Democracy does not flourish as it once did.

Outside the South, the "liberal" wing of the Democratic Party—though despite some exceptions—gained new heights in party councils as a result of the election. The Democratic Party of Fair Dealer W. Averell Harriman in his race for governor of New York puts him in a strong position both to help the Democratic national policies and to pick their candidates for President and vice president in the Senate.

Conservative Democrats are also being picked up by the "liberal" forces. The Democratic Party's complexion has changed so rapidly and dramatically as in the early New Deal months. But it seems to be safe to bet that the trend, though gradual, will be just as real and that resistance to it will weaken as the Byrd empire declines.

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United States attorney Leo Rover acted in a manner interfering with the executive?

Have the United