

The Indianapolis Times

ROY W. HOWARD, President.

WM. A. MAYBORN, Bus. Mgr.

Member of the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance • • • Client of the United Press and the NEA Service
• • • Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations
Published daily except Sunday by Indianapolis Times Publishing Co., 214-220 W. Maryland St., Indianapolis
Subscription Rates: Indianapolis—Ten Cents a Week. Elsewhere—Twelve Cents a Week • • •
PHONE—MA 3500

No law shall be passed restraining the free interchange of thought and opinion, or restricting the right to speak, write, or print freely, on any subject whatever.—Constitution of Indiana.

Keep Him Here

It is rather deplorable, and more than unfortunate that Senator Watson, in the one speech he says he will make in his primary campaign, did not answer the question raised by his magnificent organization when they broadcasted the slogan "Why Watson?"

It is fortunate that he came back to Indiana and made that one speech, because his coming will do much to dispel that illusion so carefully created by his backers that the men and women of his party are solidly in favor of his candidacy.

His meeting at Kokomo on Friday evening, demonstrates that there is no enthusiasm for Watson.

The scant crowd and the colder applause reported by those in attendance indicates that the people are not so thoroughly sold on the idea that this Nation will be wrecked if Watson should fail to return to the United States Senate.

His organization, put under the political microscope, is found to be composed of those for whom he obtained jobs.

It lacks voters who are for him because of what he has done. It lacks followers of any cause. The supporters of his army, not fighting men, have become the generals and colonels.

The Senator can and should change this situation. He could do it easily if he would but tell the people of even one great cause for which he made a fight, even one great principle for which he has been steadfast.

He really owes it to the men and women who have kept him in public office for thirty years to be come somewhat specific in his report on what he has been doing with his time and power except to grab a little Federal patronage.

No sense of modesty should prevent him from bragging of his achievements. For the people are becoming a trifle curious and inquisitive. They really would like to know and understand the secret of Watson's greatness. Its so mysterious.

Is there no way that the friends of Watson can prevail upon him to remain in the State until May? Or is such a suggestion under suspicion of being inspired by the backers of Charles Adams?

Trial by Jury

The first concrete suggestion made to the senatorial committee investigating prohibition is that trial by jury be abolished for those accused of violating the Volstead act.

It comes from the Federal district attorney of New York, who has made more than a gesture in attempting to enforce that law in our largest city. He insists that the law must be modified to be effective, but that if it be retained, will require seventy-five millions of dollars and one hundred and fifty new judges to even attempt to enforce it in the one State of New York.

It is because of the appalling expense that he makes the suggestion that the ancient safeguard of life and liberty be abolished and that American citizens relinquish their one protection as an expedient to one law.

In plain words he suggests that the bill of rights be taken out of the Constitution and that the only part of that document to be retained is the eighteenth amendment, which calls for prohibition.

It does not take the senatorial inquiry to demonstrate to those who think at all that prohibition has been a lamentable failure, and that the Volstead act has been worse than a farce.

The people had seen communities which had been temperate flooded with poison masquerading under the name of liquor. They had seen crime increase instead of disappear, as the proponents of prohibition had predicted. They had seen their prison overflowing where they had expected that they would be empty and tenantless. They knew that they were mistaken when they believed that by merely passing a law against liquor they would automatically abolish crime and poverty or drunkenness.

They had seen other strange and undesirable consequences through the passage of the Volstead act. They had seen drinking in homes and by women where before there had been temperance and abstinence.

They had seen drinking condoned at social gatherings where before it would not have been tolerated.

They had found hip flasks in possession of their own sons and had seen their daughters not only not turn with disgust from drunken youths, but actually preferring the smart boy who had a supply.

They had seen, most of all, corruption enter the government on so colossal a scale it appalls and terrifies.

These are the things that have made thinking people question not the desirability of temperance and sobriety but the effectiveness of the present system.

Now we are faced by the very tangible proposition that we are to throw away the right of trial by jury, the right which was obtained by revolution, for which many had sacrificed their lives; for which others had willingly revolted against rulers in order to escape tyranny.

If we are to discard the jury in liquor cases, it is but a short step to discarding it for every other crime. It means that the liberty of every citizen is in jeopardy and that he remains free only because of the permission of some judge.

Are we ready to take this step?

Says the Professor

The young professor smiles gently at the assembled Senators and hurls his brick.

"Briefly, gentlemen," says he, "briefly, my proposal is that this Government aid the farmers by giving them each year several million dollars of the national tariff revenue."

They blink, the grayheads around the committee table. Is the young man mad?

But Prof. Charles L. Stewart of Illinois University continues the outline of his farm-aid plan:

Farmers lose money on their crops because they produce surplus. The surplus must be sold abroad. Foreign prices are always lower than home prices. The result is that home prices tend to fall to the same low level.

One way to remedy this situation, says the professor, is for the Government artificially to raise

foreign prices by making up the difference; by actually paying farmers a premium on all surplus produce shipped to foreign lands.

"You see," he explains, "it's the tariff idea reversed. Manufacturers are aided by an import tariff which collects a premium on all foreign factory products brought in. The farmers, under this plan, would be protected by an export tariff which would pay a premium on all home-grown products shipped out."

"But where would the money come from to pay this premium?" asks one bewildered Senator.

"Out of the tariff revenue," says the professor.

"The tariff revenue may be looked upon as a trust fund, to be used in any way that will best benefit the industrial and commercial life of the Nation as a whole."

But to give away several million dollars of tariff revenue would mean that the Government must raise that much extra revenue from some other source!

Not necessarily, suggests the professor. The Government might merely lower tariff rates a bit. The present rates are too high to bring in maximum revenue. An adjustment would easily increase the total revenue several million dollars and such an adjustment would be anything but a misfortune to American consumers.

"I estimate," says the professor, "that \$250,000 paid as premium on exported farm products each year would put at least \$1,500,000,000 in the farmers' pockets."

The professor sits down. The committee meeting ends. The Senators slip out the door, their mouths agape.

And the worst of it, if you ask the Senators, is that the professor's plan is sponsored in a bill introduced by no less a person than the conservative Senator McKinley of Illinois!

On Holding Husbands

A new decalog is given the world of women by one Mrs. Ruth Maurer, head of a national chain of beauty schools—ten "thou shalts" in order to lose a little Federal patronage.

There is no way that the friends of Watson can prevail upon him to remain in the State until May?

Or is such a suggestion under suspicion of being inspired by the backers of Charles Adams?

The decalog is couched in ironic vein. What the worthy lady wants to say with a loud, firm voice is really, "For the love o' Mike and Pete, if you want to keep your man, don't do any of this fool stuff!"

Said "fool stuff" includes the use of soap and hot water on the face instead of cleansing creams which make the skin too soft to touch, no face powder, bleaches and poor hair dyes, exposure to wind and air and sun.

"This rules, if followed carefully, will cause any woman to look a 'fright and end up in the divorce court," the lady summarizes her decalog.

There's a nice social question tied up here. One of women's most ancient grievances is a deep-rooted belief that a husband demands in a wife those very qualities which make her lose him and seek interest elsewhere, but which, if defied by her, make her lose him anyway.

In other words, wives, many of them, have always believed that a husband turned thumbs down on a wife who beautified herself and stooped to the follies of cream and powder rouge, but solaced himself by looking upon somebody else's wife's cheek when it was red.

"My husband won't let me bob my hair," many a wife of this type complains to the secret and finish amusement of her audience, who know very well that "my husband" enjoys the company and sight of bobbed-haired ladies not his wife.

Is today's wife really given a fairer deal than her predecessor? Is it true that she can hold a husband by doing what he wants other wives to do, or does she still play the winning hand when she is sedately old-fashioned, letting him get his esthetic satisfactions elsewhere?

The trouble with our music is it originates in New York, where every one is in such a hurry.

Practice makes perfect. It takes quite a bit of practice to kiss like an amateur.

Accidents will happen. That's why there are so many different kinds of salads.

We don't know who will get the credit for cutting taxes. And we don't know who will get the cash.

Lots of bad things happen. But there are so many more bad things that don't happen.

These are the days the city man buries a quart of onion sets and considers himself a farmer.

Inferiority Complex Defined Here

You can get an answer to any question of fact or information by writing to The Indianapolis Times, Indianapolis, Indiana. D. C. inclosing 2 cents in a stamp for reply. Medical advice cannot be given nor can research be done. Unsolicited requests cannot be answered. All letters are confidential.—Editor.

What is meant by an "inferiority complex?"

In psychology, the term "complex" refers to association of ideas; mental elements knit together. The inferiority complex is a group of ideas centering around certain experiences of thoughts which make the individual keenly conscious of his own lack of ability, power, etc., and gives him a certain sense of hurt or inferiority. Those suffering from the inferiority complex often try to cover the fact by being more self-assertive, opinionated and disagreeably self-centered than others.

What is the easiest way to kill an oak tree?

The simplest way is to ring or girdle the tree, cutting in deep enough to cause it to die. The tree can be allowed to stand without danger and cut down when desired.

If a World War soldier carried insurance for his wife during the war and is killed in service and his widow remarries will she lose her insurance?

No. The payments of insurance to a widow of a man killed in the World War continue until all the insurance is paid regardless of whether she remarries or not.

Can a woman whose son was killed in the World War draw his insurance. His mother is the widow of a veteran of the Civil War drawing a widow's pension of \$30 a month. Can she draw both?

Yes. If the insurance was made out to the mother as beneficiary she will continue to receive the monthly payments until the entire amount of the insurance is paid. The fact that she is drawing a widow's pension has no effect whatever on the payment of war risk insurance.

One way to remedy this situation, says the professor, is for the Government artificially to raise

RIGHT HERE IN INDIANA BY GAYLORD NELSON

PALE PINK PERSONS

Col. G. L. Townsend, chief of staff of the 84th Division, organized reserves, professes alarm because Indiana youth are not enrolling as rapidly for the citizens' military training camp at Ft. Harrison this summer as the young men in other States in the 5th Corps area. He blames pacifist propaganda.

Pale pink persons are getting our boys to take a slacker's oath never to bear arms in any war," declares the doughty colonel.

Is he right? So far Indiana has only 23 per cent of her training camp quota, while West Virginia has enrolled 78 per cent of her quota. Perhaps that shows that the insidious campaign of pacifism is corrupting the patriotic Hoosier youths. More likely the figures mean nothing at all.

In spite of his varnished hair, his Charlestoning and sleek accomplishments probably the young Hoosier this year has as much patriotism and as many red, fighting corpuscles as the Hoosier who followed Sherman to the sea, or who fought vin rouge and vin blanc in dewy France. By and large he is just about as pale pink as a chunk of raw beetsteak.

Last year at this time there was the same complaint that Indiana was far behind sister States in filling her training camp quota.

Ownerless strays and animals allowed to run at large, that bark and snap at people and generally make a nuisance of themselves.

Some animal lovers say that a real case of rabies is very rare. And any wholesale execution or muzzling of dogs because of a "mad dog" scare unjustified. That may be. But, even if the dog isn't mad, when he bites the seat of the trousers or a chunk out of a passing pedestrian it makes "the latter, at least, mad. That sort of thing should be stopped, even if it inconveniences the dogs.

IF I HAD A CHANCE'

Andrew Johnson Carr, the "midgit" bandit, who specialized on drug store hold-ups, drew a ten to twenty-one year sentence in the State Reformatory and a \$1,000 fine in Criminal Court, Thursday, despite his plea for clemency.

"My conduct was the direct result of having this gun and bad company," was his plea. "If I had a chance I can prove that I can be a man and not a bandit."

Perhap's that's the cue for doleful music, sob stuff and sympathy.

All he asks for is a chance and a hard-hearted judge denies him that.

Possibly the young man's reformation is now complete and he is in earnest about proving that he can be a decent, respectable citizen instead of a bandit. But it is significant that he showed no disposition to go straight while he was free and banditry lucrative.

The bad company, the gun, and the criminal career weren't forced upon him. He chose them himself.

Yet his attitude is that of so many of our enterprising modern young criminals. They seem to feel that they aren't really to blame for their misdeeds, that they have been forced into crime, that they are the victims of circumstances beyond their control. "He grinned at me, what else could I do but shoot him?" That's the attitude.

Maybe they aren't to blame. Maybe it's all a matter of improper functioning of their glands, as some criminologists assert. If so, it is remarkable how his ductless glands get up and hum themselves when a youthful bandit lands before a judge and prison yawns.

TOO MUCH STRAIN ON THE PRISONER

Search for Dr. N. B. Ross of Muncie, convicted lifer, who failed to return to State prison at the expiration of his temporary parole, is being pushed vigorously. Photographs and descriptions of the fugitive have been broadcast.

The Times has received a letter purporting to be from the missing New Orleanian. If authentic, it may indicate that the fugitive is southward bound to some haven in South America beyond the reach of extradition.

The decalog is couched in ironic vein. What the worthy lady wants to say with a loud, firm voice is really, "For the love o' Mike and Pete, if you want to keep your man, don't do any of this fool stuff!"

Said "fool stuff" includes the use of soap and hot water on the face instead of cleansing creams which make the skin too soft to touch, no face powder, bleaches and poor hair dyes, exposure to wind and air and sun.

"This rules, if followed carefully, will cause any woman to look a 'fright and end up in the divorce court," the lady summarizes her decalog.

There's a nice social question tied up here. One of women's most ancient grievances is a deep-rooted belief that a husband demands in a wife those very qualities which make her lose him and seek interest elsewhere, but which, if defied by her, make her lose him anyway.

In other words, wives, many of them, have always believed that a husband turned thumbs down on a wife who beautified herself and stooped to the follies of cream and powder rouge, but solaced himself by looking upon somebody else's wife's cheek when it was red.

May the young man's reformation is now complete and he is in earnest about proving that he can be a decent, respectable citizen instead of a bandit. But it is significant that he showed no disposition to go straight while he was free and banditry lucrative.

The bad company, the gun, and the criminal career weren't forced upon him. He chose them himself.

Yet his attitude is that of so many of our enterprising modern young criminals. They seem to feel that they aren't really to blame for their misdeeds, that they have been forced into crime, that they are the victims of circumstances beyond their control. "He grinned at me, what else could I do but shoot him?" That's the attitude.

Maybe they aren't to blame. Maybe it's all a matter of improper functioning of their glands, as some criminologists assert. If so, it is remarkable how his ductless glands get up and hum themselves when a youthful bandit lands before a judge and prison yawns.

A SERMON FOR TODAY

By Rev. John R. Gunn

serves the future life. I would not cast a shadow upon the possibilities and glory of our life here. I love this life. It is grand to live in this world. This is a man world only to the man who makes it so. And yet, while this life and this world are not to be depreciated, somehow we look beyond unto visions and ideals which cannot be realized here. Surely God is too wise and too good to have created us in these capacities and aspirations just to tantalize us. They must surely be a prophecy of their own fulfillment in the future life.

What is meant by an "inferiority complex?"

I never read these words but that I think of a paragraph from the pen of