

The Indianapolis Times

ROY W. HOWARD, President.

BOYD GURLEY, Editor.

WM. A. MAYBORN, Bus. Mgr.

Member of the Scripps-Horwitz Newspaper Alliance

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.

KNOW YOUR STATE

INDIANA is supplied with crude oil from the great producing centers of the Southwest, by pipe lines, which are of sufficient capacity to supply the largest refineries in the world, situated in the northern part of the State, were the ample railroad accommodations curtailed through strikes, accidents or other causes.

INSULL'S TRIUMPH

Why did the supporters of Pepper, Vare and Pinchot spend \$3,000,000 in Pennsylvania to nominate one candidate for United States Senator?

That's one question the Senate investigating committee didn't answer. The country doesn't know why the Mellon group spent nearly \$2,000,000 in a vain effort to renominate Senator Pepper. It doesn't know why nearly \$1,000,000 was spent to nominate Vare.

And, it won't make much difference how much money was spent in the Illinois primary, unless that question is answered—why are millions spent to nominate a candidate for United States Senator?

Of course, Senators may work up a vigorous indignation and refuse to seat Vare. They have the right to keep him out or throw him out. But it won't mean anything, for the Governor of Pennsylvania will appoint a Senator to take his place, and that means that the Mellon interests will get the Senator, even though they were defeated at the primary. For their candidate for Governor was nominated.

In this Illinois investigation, it is more important to find out why the big power combine, headed by Samuel Insull, used money and influence to nominate Frank L. Smith for Senator than to find out how much they spent.

Does any one think the Mellon group spent \$2,000,000 to nominate Pepper merely because they thought Pepper would faithfully represent all of the people of Pennsylvania in the United States Senate?

Does anybody think the financial group, headed by Samuel Insull, that owns the People's Gas Company, the Commonwealth Edison Company, the elevated railways and part of the surface lines in Chicago, to say nothing of other public utilities throughout the State, spent money to nominate Frank L. Smith merely because they thought he was a good fellow and would represent all of the people of Illinois?

If they don't invest vast sums in senatorial nominations and elections in the interest of good government, why do they do it?

What do they want? What do they expect?

They expect substantial dividends on their political investments—in Pennsylvania, Illinois and everywhere else, where they invest their money in government.

Right now Mayor Dever of Chicago is trying to get the traction owners to meet with the city administration to try to agree on a new street railway franchise. The traction owners are stalling. There is a letter sent out by the protective committee of the Chicago Railways Company, which says:

"Unfortunately the city has no authority at this time to grant a street railway franchise for more than twenty years. Legislation enabling the company to secure operating rights without definite time limitations, and with a reasonable return on the acknowledged value of the property, must be secured from the Legislature before an ordinance can be agreed on which will restore the company's credit so that money can be obtained for improved transportation service."

There's one reason why the vast power interests invest money in the government. They want legislation that will enable them to get them, particularly franchises.

And nationally they want to secure control of the white coal, the water power at Muscle Shoals and elsewhere all over the United States.

This is the information the Jim Reed committee should bring out. Not how much money, but why?

EUROPE QUIETS DOWN

Saner counsels are prevailing in Europe as Poincaré proceeds with the task of putting French finances in order. Thoughtful leaders in both France and Great Britain are pointing out that the attacks on America accomplish nothing, and are productive of bitterness which can only affect the future unfavorably.

The United States treasury wisely has decided to end its long range controversy with the British exchequer. The French are becoming worried at the prospect of forfeiting the profitable American tourist trade. The most violent of the anti-American British journals are being silenced by the criticisms of their contemporaries.

Apparently the near-hysteria of recent days with France on the edge of the abyss, is waning.

French and British alike are realizing the remedy for whatever conditions need remedying is not to be found in abuse. Meantime France is rising and the Poincaré ministry has evolved a program which it will take before the chamber of deputies Tuesday. There are evidences that the political groups in the chamber have been aroused by the people to a realization of France's danger, and are prepared to unite on the heroic measures to avert ruin.

Poincaré's problem in impressing additional taxes and curtailing expenditures is a gigantic one, but conditions are more favorable for success than at any time in recent days.

G. B. S. REFUSES THE GAG

George Bernard Shaw was seventy yesterday.

In describing his arrival at three score and ten, the newspaper correspondents stress the fact that he has been much mellowed by the years.

Where the flaming radical once scoffed and railed, they say he now smiles indulgently.

At 70, however, Shaw is not changed in one tremendously important particular. He still insists upon the privilege of free expression of his ideas, of which he has an abundant and sparkling supply.

At his birthday party it was proposed that his remarks be broadcast. The British Broadcasting Company, which controls that activity in England, liked the idea. Shaw's remarks are almost sure to be interesting. The company, however, set down

one condition. The Irish poet, dramatist, critic, and almost everything else, was to keep away from controversial subjects. He was to deal in pleasant platitudes.

Shaw, of course, refused to have anything to do with such business. For a chance to have an audience of most of England—and perhaps part of the United States, he wouldn't forfeit the privilege of expressing his honest opinions.

Perhaps the correspondents are right. In a world of error and confusion Shaw has probably gradually turned from the hope of setting the things right suddenly and come to accept as more or less inevitable much that is.

He hasn't, however, yielded anything to his youth in his basic ideas of what it is that constitutes a respectable human existence. One of these ideas is that of free speech.

Shaw's example at seventy can't fail to appeal to people everywhere who are fighting the age-old battle for freedom of expression. It is now subject to decisive attacks in the courts; it should have been a particular appeal.

WHY DON'T FISH HAVE WEB FEET?

It is customary to picture a scientist as a plodding individual who lives a quiet laboratory life, seeking that which makes for the comfort and welfare of the human race. This is generally true.

Lately, however, publicity seekers of various ilk have been posing as scientists chiefly to get their names in the newspapers.

A few weeks ago the startling bit of news was broadcast that if we drank too much milk we would assume the mentality and aspects of a cow.

Now a professor in London lends much enjoyment to the occasion by proclaiming in a loud voice (or at least in large type), "The increased popularity of swimming will make the human race web-footed."

Ho hum! These July days are so warm. If the two scientific gents will make notes on their cuffs to return next winter, we will take up their cases more fully.

Just at present a few questions must suffice. Here they are:

Italians are the world's champion spaghetti eaters. Have been for a long time. Why is it they don't like telephone poles, or shoe strings, or angle worms, or tangled yarn?

If we really do become what we eat, has the scientist making swimmers web-footed ever eaten a large piece of cheese?

If swimming makes us web-footed, why don't fish have web feet?

THEY STILL ARE BROTHERS

They tried the Scott brothers, Russell and Robert, in Chicago for the murder of a drug store clerk during a robbery. At first Robert Scott pleaded guilty, then he fought the case and, in open court, denied that he had fired the shot that killed the man.

Russell Scott was tried. He was sentenced to be hanged. Robert Scott, following his denial and trial, was sentenced to life imprisonment. With that sentence pronounced, Robert the other day issued a statement saying that it was he, after all, who had fired the fatal shot.

Russell, thus, under sentence to hang, is thrown upon executive clemency. Under such circumstances just what is a Governor supposed to do? The man who says he is guilty of the murder is under life sentence; his brother, whom his statement exonerates, is doomed to hang.

These Scott boys are not a bit like Cain and Abel.

IRON, A CIVILIZING INFLUENCE

For more than two years Kansas City judges have been sending drunken drivers to the municipal farm, where they serve their sentences in chains.

They serve once, and they don't come back, according to J. J. O'Rourke, superintendent of the farm. One lesson is enough. They all tell O'Rourke that they have made that mistake for the last time.

Iron, in the form of shackles, is a great civilizing influence.

Ten million feet of lumber destroyed by a Detroit fire would have made enough matches to smoke a pipe.

Let's take the cars away from reckless drivers. Then our streets will be safe, and quiet—and deserted.

HATED TRUTH

From Baltimore Evening Sun

Men do not desire the truth. They never have desired the truth. It is not possible that they ever will desire the truth.

Because men live and die in error the truth is ever an assault on the beliefs and faiths of the time and therefore an assault on vanity.

When the first of moderns began to study the heavens through a glass and to proclaim the truths he discovered he lighted a fire under his feet. The world did not desire truth. It desired only that its complacent ignorance be left undisturbed. Before a man can learn to be must by inference confess that he is ignorant. It is vanity that stands in the way of progress.

The Indiana Supreme Court, upholding a conviction for contempt, asserts that "the truth is no defense."

It is a tenet dear to English law. "The greater the truth, the greater the libel." To a man of reason the dogma will seem absurd, yet this same man will train his children to accept it and punish them if they do not.

Do the children point out his faults? Very well; that is impudence, and they shall be spanked. Perhaps the children express the truth and no more. No matter; the greater the truth, the greater the impudence.

There is the whole story. The powers that control the scheme of things do not desire and will not tolerate any truths that might detract from their assumed position.

The telling of unwelcome truths in time of war is called treason. Men are jailed and hanged for it. The telling of unwelcome truths in time of peace is called heresy, and men are ostracized and persecuted for it.

The telling of unwelcome truths at any time or place comes down upon the heads of the monarchs or majorities.

"What is truth?" asked the Roman. It is a red flag waved before a sullen bull; a wasp to sting and enrage the sullen; an enemy of the existing order; an assault on the scheme by which the fat now draw tribute from the lean and ignorant.

George Bernard Shaw was seventy yesterday.

In describing his arrival at three score and ten, the newspaper correspondents stress the fact that he has been much mellowed by the years.

Where the flaming radical once scoffed and railed, they say he now smiles indulgently.

At 70, however, Shaw is not changed in one

tremendously important particular. He still insists

upon the privilege of free expression of his ideas,

of which he has an abundant and sparkling supply.

At his birthday party it was proposed that his

remarks be broadcast. The British Broadcasting

Company, which controls that activity in England,

liked the idea. Shaw's remarks are almost sure to be interesting. The company, however, set down

Tracy

There Is Pathos in Being
the Son of a Great
Man.

By N. E. Tracy

Robert T. Lincoln, who died yesterday, had been secretary of war, minister to England and president of the Pullman company.

The average man would be regarded as having made a name for himself through the attainment of such honors, but not Abraham Lincoln's son.

His father's overshadowing greatness was more than enough to oblige them.

It followed him through life and it will cling to his memory as long as that memory lasts.

"I am not a great man," he used to say, when asked for a public expression of his opinion on any subject.

If your first thought is of how wonderful such a heritage must be, your second will reveal its pathos.

Some of great men are never permitted to grow up. That is one reason and the chief reason, perhaps, why so few of them ever become great on their own account.

And the question of whether Mellett's assassination has really waked Cantor still remains to be answered.

And that is my thought and my admiration for a fine intelligent piece of acting. That is the memory, the sort of entering a memory of other days—the days when Bernhardt did the very thing which Ann Davis did last night at Keith's.

If this is good news for the Rotary club and chambers of commerce in other towns it is bad for the reformers in other towns.

There is a professional complex on both sides of the picture.

Uplifters have to proclaim that each town is the worst in order to promote their business, while commercial organizations are inclined to see it the other way.

Fifteen thousand blind pigs, 500 hundred houses and a bucket of dope each day is Detroit's contribution to the evil side of life—I think we may look for speedy denials.

And that is my thought and my admiration for a fine intelligent piece of acting. That is the memory, the sort of entering a memory of other days—the days when Bernhardt did the very thing which Ann Davis did last night at Keith's.

Speaking of civic righteousness, the Rockefellers investigation finds that Detroit is the "vilest city in the United States."

If this is good news for the Rotary club and chambers of commerce in other towns it is bad for the reformers in other towns.

There is a professional complex on both sides of the picture.

Uplifters have to proclaim that each town is the worst in order to promote their business, while commercial organizations are inclined to see it the other way.

Supporting cast selected in that fine touch which Stuart Walker and George Sommes accomplish big things.

Cast as follows:

Frederick Ladd Alan Floud
Sir Montague Tollemache Paul Wright
Sir Edward Israel John Stover
Jasper Sturdee Aldrich Barker
Dame Sturdee Ann Davis
Anton Razafsky McKay Morris
Priscilla Elizabeth Harriet
Barbara Owen Belinda Carlisle

Believe me in this—see Ann Davis bring the name of this artist—it is cast Leslie. I hope that I am right in this because this woman is an artist of more than usual ability. She does not "look" but puts on blackface makeup in full view of the audience and then becomes a "male dandy" in spirit and artistry. A very fine example of thinking out a good routine. It will be a pleasure to see her again.

Supporting cast selected in that fine touch which Stuart Walker and George Sommes accomplish big things.

Cast as follows:

Frederick Ladd Alan Floud
Sir Montague Tollemache Paul Wright
Sir Edward Israel John Stover
Jasper Sturdee Aldrich Barker
Dame Sturdee Ann Davis
Anton Razafsky McKay Morris
Priscilla Elizabeth Harriet
Barbara Owen Belinda Carlisle

Believe me in this—see Ann Davis bring the name of this artist—it is cast Leslie. I hope that I am right in this because this woman is an artist of more than usual ability. She does not "look" but puts on blackface makeup in full view of the audience and then becomes a "male dandy" in spirit and artistry. A very fine example of thinking out a good routine. It will be a pleasure to see her again.

Supporting cast selected in that fine touch which Stuart Walker and George Sommes accomplish big things.

Cast as follows:

Frederick Ladd Alan Floud
Sir Montague Tollemache Paul Wright
Sir Edward Israel John Stover
Jasper Sturdee Aldrich Barker
Dame Sturdee Ann Davis
Anton Razafsky McKay Morris
Priscilla Elizabeth Harriet
Barbara Owen Belinda Carlisle

Believe me in this—see Ann Davis bring the name of