



The Indianapolis Times

(A SCRIPPS-HOWARD NEWSPAPER)

Owned and published daily (except Sunday) by The Indianapolis Times Publishing Co., 214-220 W. Maryland Street, Indianapolis, Ind. Price in Marion County, 10 cents—10 cents a week; elsewhere, 3 cents—12 cents a week.

BOYD SQUIRLEY, Editor.

ROY W. HOWARD, President.

FRANK G. MORRISON, Business Manager.

PHONE—MAIN 3500.

WEDNESDAY, FEB. 8, 1928.

Member of United Press, Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, Newspaper Enterprise Association, Newspaper Information Service and Audit Bureau of Circulations.

"Give Light and the People Will Find Their Own Way."—Dante.

Something Wrong, Some Place

Substitute clerks in the Indianapolis post-office appear to be the boys that Uncle Sam forgot when he took steps to improve the economic conditions of postal workers a year or so ago.

Between seventy-five and eighty Indianapolis substitutes are waiting, more or less hopelessly, for steady jobs. Meanwhile, they barely keep their families from actual want with the \$700 to \$1,000 a year they are able to eke out by part time employment at 65 cents an hour.

Postmaster Robert H. Bryson says that the substitutes were warned before they took examinations that they might have to wait two or three years before they were given regular jobs. Some of the substitutes say they have waited four years.

Postal clerks are trained workmen. The Government sees to that by requiring that they work the equivalent of six months at eight hours a day before they are eligible for regular appointments.

Either through the red tape of postal regulation, which changes a little more swiftly than the Constitution or through lack of administrative foresight, the substitute list has been allowed to grow until it has tied up a large group of productive, intelligent workmen who might be supporting themselves and their families and adding to the general economic welfare in other lines had they not believed that they would benefit by faithfully waiting for the opportunity for which they had trained themselves.

If the postmaster carefully has informed all applicants for substitutes' jobs that they might have to wait a long time for jobs—and he says emphatically that he has—no one can deny that they walked into the situation with open eyes.

On the other hand, someone ought to prevent certain correspondence schools from advertising the glorious opportunities for steady employment and advancement in the postal service.

Germany's Budding Time

An American publisher recently announced that he was going to introduce to American readers a long list of German authors whose work was worth knowing.

The books will be worth watching for. German literature today is better worth knowing than it has been at any time since the great days of Goethe, Schiller, Lessing and Heine. The smash of the monarchy, the freedom from the grip of the junkers and the militarists seems to have given German thought a new budding time.

Men breathe in a freer and cleaner air. In a re-public they dare to say and to write what they never dared under a monarchy. They are depicting Germany as it is, not as the bosses wanted it painted. They are telling the truth about their former rulers. They are showing the rottenness of the old bureaucracy.

They are revealing how deep seated was the hatred of the common German soldier, not only for the long continued war, but also for the officers who fared so well while to the men fell all the hardships and all the poor food and clothing. Germany today is producing a literature that can not be neglected by any educated man.

Inching Along

Half an inch, half an inch.

Half an inch onward. Into the idea of world cooperation against war, the Government at Washington slowly is feeling its way.

Two moves, neither in any way startling, but each with a certain importance all its own, were made in that direction Monday.

One was the signing of a new arbitration treaty with France. The other was the introduction in the Senate of a resolution suggesting to President Coolidge the advisability of further moves toward joining the world court. The significance of the latter lay in the fact that the resolution was offered by Senator Gillett, Republican, Massachusetts, a close friend of the President.

The text of the new treaty with France has not been made public, but its general lines have been known for some time. And while it is understood to be a little broader in scope than the Root-Jusserand treaty which it supplants, it owes its importance principally to two things, both moral, or psychological, rather than material.

First, there is a preamble denouncing war as an instrument for settling disputes of any kind which might arise between France and the United States, and expressing the hope that, in time, all Nations will see the light and outlaw war as a means of disposing of their quarrels.

This preamble, as Secretary Kellogg already has taken pains to point out, is not binding, but even at that the inclusion of such sentiment in such document represents an advance, however slight, from the position we have assumed in international affairs.

Second, France has seemed to attach much sentimental importance to the negotiation of this treaty. Exactly 150 years ago Monday, France and the United States signed the first treaty this country ever entered into, calling for "inviolable and universal peace" between the two countries.

And, as the present arbitration treaty with France automatically expires Feb. 27, France, at least, felt it would be particularly fitting if a new and stronger bond could be entered into on the anniversary of the original.

Purely as a gesture of friendship and good will, therefore, the new treaty is distinctly worth while.

Incidentally, it is a curious fact that while the United States generally is regarded as the daddy of modern arbitration and world cooperation for peace, it seems harder than pulling teeth to get us to accept the idea for ourselves.

We began it in the very middle of our fight for independence, when we signed our perpetual peace

treaty with France. As early as 1794 we signed an arbitration agreement with Britain. It is true that only three cases were arbitrated under that agreement, and we balked at two results, while the third met with British objections, but the idea was there, nevertheless.

And so things have gone ever since. We entered into a similar treaty with Mexico, at Guadalupe Hidalgo, in 1848, but though we have been on the verge of war with that neighbor a number of times since, the idea of arbitrating our differences never seems to have occurred to us.

We took the load in helping establish The Hague court of arbitration, the League of Nations and the World Court, but while others have rallied to the support of these institutions, in the main, we have held strangely aloof.

Which is why even such slight advances as those of Monday will be welcomed by those who have the best interests of the Nation at heart.

Abuse of the Mails

The efforts of Representative Henry W. Watson, Pennsylvania, to outlaw the sending of unsolicited merchandise through the mails will be applauded by hundreds of Indianapolis residents who have been annoyed by receiving some package of cheap and uninvited goods with a request that money be remitted for them or they be returned.

If the recipient exercises his perfectly legal right and throws the stuff in the wastebasket, he usually is bombarded with a series of follow-up letters, practically accusing him of dishonesty and eventually threatening to "place the matter in the hands of our attorney."

Not knowing that he is not obligated legally to pay for or return any goods he did not order, unless he appropriates them to his own use, he usually pays.

Beginning on a small scale of sending out neckties and handkerchiefs, this unsolicited merchandising business has grown to a point where the country is being flooded with traveling bags, jewelry, raincoats and numerous other articles by this method.

It is estimated that the business runs into millions of dollars a year, forcing people under tricky appeals to conscience or threat of prosecution to pay for goods they did not order or go through the annoyance of sending them back.

Congress and the Postoffice Department have established all sorts of postal regulations to protect the sender of mail. There should be some sort of protection afforded the recipient in this matter of unsolicited merchandising.

Pershing Is Out of It

There have been rumors, from time to time, that General Pershing was a more or less receptive candidate for the presidency.

We don't believe it, and we'll tell you why.

The other day the good general visited friends in a city that had not seen him for some time. Newspapers sent reporters and cameramen to greet him. And Pershing refused to be interviewed, and could be coaxed to pose for pictures only after long discussion.

A politician reporter and camera-shy? Surely not; not in America. Unless this man is different from all others, he is not planning on being elected to anything.

Presently, however, a crash of broken glass, from a boulder carelessly tossed, warns us that the warfare of some kind has begun. We quickly proceed to the door, where a chorus of befuddled kiddish voices yell tauntingly the old familiar strains, "What's wrong with Indianapolis?" Who's your mayor now?" "What's the matter with the public spirited citizens?" Hooray for the town of a thousand mayors!" etc.

"Dang the luck! Now look what those blamed council kids have started. Between them and that bicoon' gang of mud-slingers and jokers there's little rest in sight now."

Whereupon we duck back into our shells amid the thunderous uproar of political play boys and cuss and whine to ourselves and wonder why there isn't some legitimate and drastic steps we could take to curb these rough fellows before they tear up the community or incite a revolution or something.

BRIDGE ME ANOTHER

(Copyright, 1928, by The Ready Reference Publishing Company)

BY W. W. WENTWORTH

(Abbreviations: A—ace; K—king; Q—queen; J—jack; X—any card lower than 10.)

1. Partner not having bid, what do you lead against a no-trump bid when you hold K Q J 10?
2. When you hold K X X X, how many outside quick tricks are required to bid it initially?
3. In determining whether to bid a five-card suit when you hold A X X X or K Q X X X, should you bid it if outside quick trick is divided in two suits?

The Answers

1. K.
2. Three.
3. Yes.

Times Readers Voice Views

The name and address of the author must accompany every contribution, but no request for payment or return of letters not exceeding 200 words will receive preference.

To the Editor:

Just about the time some 375,000 Indianapolis citizens get comfortably settled at the fireside of political contentment after a strenuous season of disgracefully embarrassing and intolerable episodes in factional politics, a very familiar noise emanates from the vicinity of our already notorious councilmanic shanty just across the lot.

"They're at it again," "confound those kids!" and "now, what're they up to?" is perhaps all we can say as those rough, carefree boys bang away on their wash boilers and clamor wildly for a new gang chieftain.

Upon our ears echoes and re-echoes the old anvil chorus, "We don't want him; he won't play our way!" "We want a new mayor, Ert won't do!" "He can't play ball!"

and numerous other yells that are so common in a neighborhood of such noisy, mischievous kids.

"Well, boys will be boys," we muse, as we try to remain peaceful, and add some cotton into our ears, for whatever relief we can get.

Presently, however, a crash of broken glass, from a boulder carelessly tossed, warns us that the warfare of some kind has begun. We quickly proceed to the door, where a chorus of befuddled kiddish voices yell tauntingly the old familiar strains, "What's wrong with Indianapolis?" Who's your mayor now?" "What's the matter with the public spirited citizens?" Hooray for the town of a thousand mayors!" etc.

"Dang the luck! Now look what those blamed council kids have started. Between them and that bicoon' gang of mud-slingers and jokers there's little rest in sight now."

Whereupon we duck back into our shells amid the thunderous uproar of political play boys and cuss and whine to ourselves and wonder why there isn't some legitimate and drastic steps we could take to curb these rough fellows before they tear up the community or incite a revolution or something.

THOMAS E. HALSEY.

947 N. Illinois.

P. S.—Mister Slack doesn't need a vote of confidence from the citizens of Indianapolis. We're for him, and he knows it.

To the Editor: Wilbur Glen Volla, overseer of Zion, teaches the "flat world" theory.

Perhaps he has failed to hear that "prosperity" is just around the corner. JOHN L. KING.

Fine Arts Publishing Company.

Where can the army intelligence tests be obtained in book form?

They are published under the title, "Army Mental Tests," by Yoakum & Yorke, published by Henry Holt & Co. 19 W. Forty-Fourth St., New York.

Smith and Vare were denied seats in the Senate. Well, they won't have to listen to Heflin, anyway.

Liberty is a grand thing, but you never quite realize what a mighty and awful power it is until some young woman moves next door and begins to tune up for high C.

A life insurance company says \$404 is too much for a funeral. Well, maybe for some funerals.

Spring is here! They're showing the new fall hats.

Ten Greatest Men

BY BRUCE CATTON

John Haynes Holmes, pastor of New York's famous community Church undertook the other night to draw up a list of the ten greatest Americans.

The surest way to start an argument is to make a list of "the ten greatest"—whether it be a list of men, books, plays or race horses. Mr. Holmes, limiting himself to men who were born after the adoption of the Constitution in 1789, and refusing to consider any who now are living, selected the following names:

Abraham Lincoln, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry David Thoreau, William Lloyd Garrison, Theodore Parker, Robert E. Lee, Walt Whitman, Mark Twain, Charles W. Eliot and Eugene V. Debs.

This list is worth studying, even though all of us probably would like to amend it here and there. The variety of activities represented on it is rather surprising. There are two philosophers, one president, one soldier, one poet, one satirist, one theologian, one educator, two—well, perhaps we can lump Debs and Garrison together as "two agitators."

On what basis do you suppose this list was selected? What quality, if any, did these ten men have in common?

To begin with, each of them lacked the great American instinct of conformity. Not one of them ever was swayed in his actions by any fear of what people might think or by any consideration of the effect on his own fortunes. From Garrison, who was often in danger of lynching, to Lee, who spurned the highest office Lincoln could offer him, these men were independent; they thought for themselves and could be moved from their set course by no power on earth.

Perhaps we can express the matter best by saying that these ten men were, above all, brave men. And bravery is a virtue worth prizes highly—especially in this age, when men who seek high office walk on eggs for fear of offending some of us.

Undoubtedly you could amend this list. A great many names are left off that could be put in with perfect justice; Roosevelt and Bryan will have many supporters, and so will Daniel Webster and Jefferson Davis and John Hay. America has had many great men.

First, there is a preamble denouncing war as an instrument for settling disputes of any kind which might arise between France and the United States, and expressing the hope that, in time, all Nations will see the light and outlaw war as a means of disposing of their quarrels.

This preamble, as Secretary Kellogg already has taken pains to point out, is not binding, but even at that the inclusion of such sentiment in such document represents an advance, however slight, from the position we have assumed in international affairs.

The idea of world cooperation against war, the Government at Washington slowly is feeling its way.

Two moves, neither in any way startling, but each with a certain importance all its own, were made in that direction Monday.

One was the signing of a new arbitration treaty with France. The other was the introduction in the Senate of a resolution suggesting to President Coolidge the advisability of further moves toward joining the world court. The significance of the latter lay in the fact that the resolution was offered by Senator Gillett, Republican, Massachusetts, a close friend of the President.

The text of the new treaty with France has not been made public, but its general lines have been known for some time. And while it is understood to be a little broader in scope than the Root-Jusserand treaty which it supplants, it owes its importance principally to two things, both moral, or psychological, rather than material.

First, there is a preamble denouncing war as an instrument for settling disputes of any kind which might arise between France and the United States, and expressing the hope that, in time, all Nations will see the light and outlaw war as a means of disposing of their quarrels.

Second, France has seemed to attach much sentimental importance to the negotiation of this treaty.

Exactly 150 years ago Monday, France and the United States signed the first treaty this country ever entered into, calling for "inviolable and universal peace" between the two countries.

And, as the present arbitration treaty with France automatically expires Feb. 27, France, at least, felt it would be particularly fitting if a new and stronger bond could be entered into on the anniversary of the original.

Purely as a gesture of friendship and good will, therefore, the new treaty is distinctly worth while.

Incidentally, it is a curious fact that while the United States generally is regarded as the daddy of modern arbitration and world cooperation for peace, it seems harder than pulling teeth to get us to accept the idea for ourselves.

We began it in the very middle of our fight for independence, when we signed our perpetual peace

