

# The Indianapolis Times

BOYD GURLEY, Editor.

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.

## A PHILIPPINE CRISIS

With Carmi Thompson in the Philippines as special envoy of President Coolidge, it is apparent that a crisis is approaching in the islands over which the United States so long had held dominion.

No statement has come from the White House to reveal exactly what is behind the scenes, but one guess is all the average man needs, for the situation is obvious.

Uncle Sam, accepted as a guest in the islands after the war with Spain, has become an over-long visitor. And the visitor is running the whole household.

You welcome your friend and protector to your home. You bow him into the spare room. You provide for him with food. But when he elects to remain year after year, and not only that, but also to tell you when to serve the meals, how to take care of the babies, and so on you begin to lose enthusiasm for his company. You get the feeling that he is to continue as a fixture in the household, there ought to be an understanding.

That, in a measure, represents the attitude of the Filipinos toward the United States Government today. There is nothing surprising about it. The only surprising thing is that they have been patient so long.

The Filipino legislature wants a plebiscite on independence of the islands. The legislature probably will pass a plebiscite bill, Governor General Wood will veto it, the legislature then will repass it over his veto, and so President Coolidge will get it for final decision.

How will he decide—and upon what foundation will his decision be based?

There is one outstanding reason why our Government may oppose complete separation from the Philippines at this time.

It has to do with world peace, American obligations in the west Pacific, and the safety of the Philippines themselves. That reason is the vital one.

Should the United States withdraw in a naval and military way from the Philippines, other nations might very logically interpret the act as signaling that we had lost interest in China and in our doctrine of "open door and equal opportunity" there. It would be an invitation to other nations interested in breaking down the open door policy, and in the partitioning of the spoils that lie so temptingly in that vast empire.

Right now the United States, largely because of its military position in the Philippines, is the policeman on the beat outside the by no means burglar-proof Chinese house.

As to the Filipinos themselves, with our flag hauled down at Manila and no American protectorate, they would be in a bad way in case of trouble. Their place in the Pacific is much like that of Belgium in Europe. Any power hoping to grab China would first have to grab the Philippines. And any power, out on such a mission, would quickly move toward the Philippines, if the United States had withdrawn.

Now:

We pledged the Filipinos long ago that we would give them their independence. We have not kept faith.

"Well," it is said, "we didn't keep our promise because we couldn't without endangering ourselves and surrendering our principles in the matter of China."

But that is only true in part.

We now maintain not only our military rights, but the civil government as well. We are running the entire household. If the Filipino legislature passes a law for the governing of our own domestic affairs, and if the American governor general does not like that law, he merely vetoes it. The time for that sort of thing has passed.

The guest has become overbearing. It is none of his business how the domestic affairs are run. That's the way the Filipinos have come to feel about it, and, doubtless, that's why Carmi Thompson was sent there.

Thompson will report to Mr. Coolidge and the President will be called upon to make some decision. It seems to us that there is but one sensible and honorable way out. This:

While this Government must maintain its military position and its protectorate relationship, it is not necessary for us to run the domestic affairs.

Since it is obviously to the mutual advantage of the Philippines and the United States to retain this country's military position on the islands, the graceful way out becomes merely a matter of method.

The desired end should easily be accomplished through treaty, under which this Government would cease to meddle in domestic affairs, while retaining an armed protectorate that would discourage would-be China grabbers; that would guard the Filipinos from "peaceful penetration"; that would permit our Nation to keep its place as watch dog in the west Pacific; and that would allow us to remain there, no longer as an unwelcome guest, but as one whose presence was welcomed, and mutually agreed.

The suggestion for such a treaty might most properly come from us following Thompson's return to the States, and his report to President Coolidge.

All that our Government requires in the Philippines are fenced of naval and military bases and reservations, with adequate fortifications at certain strategical points in the islands, with supervisory power over foreign treaties, whether military or financial, such as we exercise in the case of Cuba.

That would put us in a position where we could protect the Filipinos without domineering and bullying, as we now do. At the same time, we would continue to act as the policeman at our own back door—and—pardon if we seem to consider this important—we would be making good our word, thereby removing the stain that will remain upon our national honor until our solemn promise to the Filipinos is fulfilled.

## NATURE'S BEAUTY SHOPPE

Throw away that rouge pot, Gwendolynne—here's a carrot. And you can drop that beauty soap right now, because papa has bought you a new bathing suit.

That doesn't make sense the first two or three times you read it, but it has a meaning just the same. For the Chicago department of health has just come to bat with the announcement that na-

ture is a better beautifier than all the "cosmeticians" in the world.

Don't take appetizers to give you pep; eat plenty of vegetables.

Don't rouge your cheeks to make 'em rosy; drink milk, eat fruits and things like cabbage.

Don't use lotions to prevent wrinkles; get plenty of sleep instead.

Don't dope yourself with beauty clay; go in swimming and see how it helps you.

Don't worry if your eyes fail to sparkle; get some exercise.

And let sunshine instead of facial cream tone up your complexion.

Those are the points made by the Chicago doctors. If they are correctly informed we may yet live to see the truck gardeners replacing the beauty parlors.

## NOT SURPRISING

The announcement at Canton that members of the police force will be indicted, in all probability, for complicity in the murder of Don Mellett should not surprise his Indianapolis friends.

Today this newspaper prints an illuminating article by Negley Cochran, veteran editor and observer, upon the new alliance of crime and politics for the control of city governments.

It shows the good citizen, too busy to vote, exactly why it is sometimes necessary to murder a protesting Mellett.

The alliance reaches the top, not directly, of course, of political machinery.

An ambitious gentleman, desiring to be Governor or Senator, or something else, creates his State machine.

He probably speaks at church gatherings and would be listed by the professionals as a dry.

But he must have the votes of cities and so he gathers to him the man who can deliver the votes of cities.

He understands that among the good citizens there will be a fairly even division along partisan lines. He must get the votes of those to whom parties mean nothing, but to whom the fear of the law means much.

And the local boss, having made himself solid with the citizen who wants to be protected from interference with his business projects, to escape too heavy taxation, proceeds to get those who want protection from the police in their bootlegging, gambling and other illegal enterprises.

He understands that these men—and women—for the underworld women can be counted upon to vote where the housewife will think it undignified to proceed to deliver the votes of certain wards and precincts.

We are shocked, of course, when we learn that in Chicago the election boards contain the names of bootleggers and known criminals.

We are too busy when the same thing occurs in Indianapolis, and besides the boss is generally a pretty good fellow and can always get that little matter of taxes straightened out and that tag on the automobile removed.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do, but in what politicians may do with their excited followers.

Do you suppose there are not scores who harbor the same thought and entertain the same hope?

As I have pointed out in this column, the danger of revolt in Mexico does not lie in what church authorities may do,