



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, 2 cents—10 cents a week; elsewhere, 3 cents—12 cents a week.

BOYD GURLEY, Editor.

ROY W. HOWARD, President.

FRANK G. MORRISON, Business Manager.

PHONE—MAIN 3500.

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.

The Road to British-American Peace

When from his throne King George scooped the world on the news that a new arbitration treaty is under way between his country and ours, his revelation was of more than ordinary importance, and for a reason.

One needs to be blind indeed not to see that measured by the standards in vogue up to the present time, no greater strain ever has been placed upon the peace-time relations between two great powers than that to which those between Britain and America now are subjected.

Without either having sought it, the two great English-speaking nations today face a situation loaded with dynamite. Never on more friendly terms than at present, fate, or destiny or what you will, has thrust them into an arena where only fighting has been known before. And if they are to escape without war it must be through the door of common sense, which no previous occupants of the ring ever have seemed able to find.

Time and again, Britain has been where she finds herself today. And every time she has fought her way out, across her conquered rival. Now, without our willing it, and whether we like it or not, comes our turn to face her in the same, blood-soaked arena, and only a new diplomacy, and a new statesmanship can rescue her and us without a repetition of the same old gory story.

This is not the outcry of an alarmist. Rather it is a sincere attempt to face a disagreeable truth which the people of Britain and the people of the United States must recognize, if history is not to go on repeating itself.

For more than 200 years Britain has fought and beaten every nation that rose to challenge her supremacy, either as a sea power or as a trading power. Now, thanks to circumstances rather than to any predetermined plan of our own, we find ourselves doing both. We are rivaling her in both directions at once.

Like Britain, our prosperity in a large measure depends upon our ability to sell our surplus products abroad. Like Britain, our position is such that our national security demands that upon the high seas there shall be no fleet superior to ours.

We are willing, even eager, to limit our fleet to the very minimum agreeable to the next power, but we can not afford to accept inferiority, because of the risks involved.

Thus at this moment we are appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars for new war ships to bring our Navy up to parity with Britain. In Washington this week, we are told, President Coolidge endorsed a new plan to strengthen our merchant marine, not only as a trade measure, but as a national defense measure.

Ships are now in preparation which will cross the Atlantic in four days, beating the fastest time of the fastest British flag ships by a whole day. Not only that, but built with flat decks from which airplanes can take off and on which they may land. In time of war they would be, to all intents and purposes, first-class aircraft carriers.

These things are not aimed at Britain. They are only the logical developments, the indispensable needs, of this stupendous, fast-growing country of ours. They are aimed at no one. We look upon all nations as friends.

But the fact remains that throughout all history this identical situation has ended only in the same identical way. The question before Britons and Americans alike now is, is history going to repeat?

Which is why the news King George published from the throne this week has more than the usual importance. This newspaper believes the announcement gives an inkling of the answer to the vital question confronting the people of his country and ours.

Fortunately, the world has learned a lot in the last twenty years. We have learned that nobody wins a war. Both sides lose. Also, fortunately, Britain and America are both democracies. In both the word of the people is the law of the land, provided they make good use of the prerogative which is in their hands and vote real statesmen into office.

Properly guided, the two nations never will go to war.

"Uncle Sham"

Senator Gillett's new move to clarify the position of the United States on the world court issue must not be allowed to die locked in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee room, where it is now.

Either we want to join the world court or we do not. If we don't, let's say so. If we do, let's say so. We can afford to be frank. At present, however, so equivocal is our position, nobody can say with certainty whether we are on the threshold of that institution, bound in, or a million miles away, traveling in the opposite direction.

The situation requires clarification and we can think of no better way to bring it about than the one suggested in the resolution of the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

On Jan. 27, 1928, as the resolution points out, the Senate, by a vote of 76 to 17, consented to our adherence to the court, subject to certain reservations. As the other world court powers would be members also of the League of Nations, and we not, they would seem to enjoy certain advantages in the court which we would not possess. The Senate reservations, quite properly, therefore, apparently were framed to put us on a basis of absolute equality with the other members.

If that is what the reservations really were intended to do—make us all equals in the court—the other powers expressed themselves as quite ready to accept them. But as there seemed to be some doubt as to the exact meaning of some of the reservations, it was suggested that perhaps a "further exchange of views" might not come amiss.

And then the matter rests. There has been no "further exchange of views." We simply let the whole thing drop. It is the aim of the Gillett resolution to authorize the President to sound out the other powers to see whether the difference, between them and the United States can be adjusted.

In short, its object is to get us off the world court doorstep, where we have been doing for the last two years.

Really, the question is of considerably more importance than the casual observer might think. The security of our Government is at stake.

Once when a number of arbitration treaties with other countries were up before the Senate, and were

on the point of being reservationed to death, President Roosevelt strenuously objected to the procedure.

"This amendment makes the treaties shams," he protested to Senator Lodge. "And it is my present impression that we would better abandon the whole business than give the impression of trickiness and insincerity which would be produced by solemnly promulgating a sham."

When the Senate, by a vote of 76 to 17, led the United States up to the door of the world court and knocked for admission, reservations in the hand, was genuinely desirous of getting in. Otherwise it was "solemnly promulgating a sham," which will give to foreigners "the impression of trickiness and insincerity."

We can not, therefore, remain standing where we are now. We must do something to clear the atmosphere of any lurking suspicion that our gesture was not made in good faith. The Gillett resolution affords the Senate a needed opportunity to prove our sincerity.

Let late the world has seemed rather prone to put unfaltering interpretations upon our acts. It would be difficult to estimate the damage the appellation "Uncle Shylock" has done us throughout the world. Don't let us needlessly give it a chance now to call us "Uncle Sham."

The Anti-Hoover Campaign

American political history reveals few instances in which a man has had as much popular support for a presidential nomination as Herbert Hoover has now, five months before the convention. Newspaper polls and commitments by nonpolitical Republicans show he is regarded as the one man eminently qualified. If this were in fact a government by the people instead of by political bosses, Hoover's nomination would be inevitable.

But the bosses do not want him. They do not like Hoover, because he is not a small-bore politician, because he does not place partisanship before the Nation's good, because he does not consider patronage the most important thing in public life.

Certain financial forces, which supply the sinews of war for professional politicians, do not want Hoover, because his attitude on many foreign and domestic questions has conflicted with their selfish interests. These two groups make a powerful combination, and this is not the first time they have combined to try to thwart the popular will.

Alarmed at the progress of the Hoover candidacy, they have started two definite movements to defeat him. One is the time-honored method of encouraging favorite son candidacies, and the crop is becoming a choice each day.

Nobody concedes these candidates a real chance for the nomination—least of all their political sponsors. Their only purpose is to build up a bloc of delegates than can be kept from Hoover until the politicians are able to unite behind a dark horse candidate who will do their bidding, if elected.

Warren G. Harding was an example of the kind of President we get from such strategy.

The second method consists of picking delegations sympathetic to the renomination of President Coolidge, but which can be swung against Hoover at the proper time. This course is being followed in New York and several New England States, even in the face of definite evidence that the people of that section favor the Secretary of Commerce.

Prominent members of the Republican national committee are understood to have suggested this kind of anti-Hoover campaign.

These men, in the face of the Coolidge do-not-choose-to-run statements, seek, nevertheless, to use the prestige of his name and office to defeat one of the men who has been a mainstay of the Coolidge Administration.

It is obvious that the Hoover supporters can not move to meet such attack, and the result may be the selection of hand-picked delegates ready to do what the bosses tell them.

These delegations, with those from favorite son States, will be used to create a deadlock, if possible, and force the nomination of a Lowden or a Dawes—anybody but Hoover.

These things are not being accomplished crudely or openly. The average individual has not the time to follow the maneuverings of professional politicians. If he did, forces now trying to block a free expression of sentiment at Kansas City would have no chance of success.

They will surely fail if, between now and June, the people make clear to the politicians, in the primaries, in the newspapers and in the political club houses, that the Republicans' best chances to win with a worthwhile candidate is to nominate Herbert Hoover.

One Reason for Willis

The estimable president of the W. C. T. U. puts Senator Willis of Ohio among the Republicans available and satisfactory as a presidential candidate.

The reason for his availability, of course, is that he is bone dry in his political convictions and is a pet protege of the one-time politically powerful Anti-Saloon League.

So long as Senator Willis thinks he is a candidate for the Republican presidential nomination, it is well to have one reason for his availability, because we can't think of any other.

Judge Shows Judgment

When Municipal Judge Clifton R. Cameron refused to convict a negro of taking a purse, because there was no evidence offered except a statement signed in the presence of two detectives who arrested the man, he announced that such procedure would be precedent in his court.

Detectives oftentimes make prisoners say what they do not wish to say, the judge declared, in explaining his stand. Such unsworn statements will have no bearing in his court unless accompanied by further cooperative evidence, he added.

While such pronouncements from the courts often make the officers irate, their justice is obvious.

The "get your man" idea is not confined to the Canadian Mounted. It pervades all police departments and, by God large, is the proper spirit. It has been a long time since excessive methods of duress have been resorted to generally in the Indianapolis force, but here as elsewhere the danger is ever present, of placing the desire for conviction above the desire for justice.

It is entirely proper for the judge to caution against such methods.

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. In no-trump, how can you detect that the lead may not be the fourth from top? 2. When is a bridge game a bridge? 3. What is an encouraging discard?

The Answers

- If it be an honor or the partner's suit that is led.
- When the partners refuse to cooperate.
- Seven or higher of another suit than led.

1. In no-trump, how can you detect that the lead may not be the fourth from top?

2. When is a bridge game a bridge?

3. What is an encouraging discard?

The Answers

- If it be an honor or the partner's suit that is led.
- When the partners refuse to cooperate.
- Seven or higher of another suit than led.

1. In no-trump, how can you detect that the lead may not be the fourth from top?

2. When is a bridge game a bridge?

3. What is an encouraging discard?

The Answers

- If it be an honor or the partner's suit that is led.
- When the partners refuse to cooperate.
- Seven or higher of another suit than led.

1. In no-trump, how can you detect that the lead may not be the fourth from top?

2. When is a bridge game a bridge?

3. What is an encouraging discard?

The Answers

- If it be an honor or the partner's suit that is led.
- When the partners refuse to cooperate.
- Seven or higher of another suit than led.

1. In no-trump, how can you detect that the lead may not be the fourth from top?

2. When is a bridge game a bridge?

3. What is an encouraging discard?

The Answers

- If it be an honor or the partner's suit that is led.
- When the partners refuse to cooperate.
- Seven or higher of another suit than led.

1. In no-trump, how can you detect that the lead may not be the fourth from top?

2. When is a bridge game a bridge?

3. What is an encouraging discard?

The Answers

- If it be an honor or the partner's suit that is led.
- When the partners refuse to cooperate.
- Seven or higher of another suit than led.

1. In no-trump, how can you detect that the lead may not be the fourth from top?

2. When is a bridge game a bridge?

3. What is an encouraging discard?

The Answers

- If it be an honor or the partner's suit that is led.
- When the partners refuse to cooperate.
- Seven or higher of another suit than led.

1. In no-trump, how can you detect that the lead may not be the fourth from top?

2. When is a bridge game a bridge?

3. What is an encouraging discard?

The Answers

- If it be an honor or the partner's suit that is led.
- When the partners refuse to cooperate.
- Seven or higher of another suit than led.

1. In no-trump, how can you detect that the lead may not be the fourth from top?

2. When is a bridge game a bridge?

3. What is an encouraging discard?

The Answers

- If it be an honor or the partner's suit that is led.
- When the partners refuse to cooperate.
- Seven or higher of another suit than led.

1. In no-trump, how can you detect that the lead may not be the fourth from top?

2. When is a bridge game a bridge?

3. What is an encouraging discard?

The Answers

- If it be an honor or the partner's suit that is led.
- When the partners refuse to cooperate.
- Seven or higher of another suit than led.

1. In no-trump, how can you detect that the lead may not be the fourth from top?

2. When is a bridge game a bridge?

3. What is an encouraging discard?

The Answers

- If it be an honor or the partner's suit that is led.
- When the partners refuse to cooperate.
- Seven or higher of another suit than led.

1. In no-trump, how can you detect that the lead may not be the fourth from top?</