

# 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 a copy; elsewhere, 3 cents—delivered by carrier, 12 cents a week.

BOYD GURLEY, Editor ROY W. HOWARD, President FRANK G. MORRISON, Business Manager

PHONE—Riley 5551 WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 25, 1929.

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"

### No Turning Back Now

The city manager law is dead, killed by three judges of the supreme court.

But the civic conscience, high purpose and fine zeal which had inspired a crusade for decent government and better public conditions under its provisions is not dead. That is beyond assassination.

The immediate reaction to this decision, should be a determination on the part of those who have given their trust, their time, their money and their enthusiasm to this cause, to fight as never before against the evils they sought to banish through a changed form of government.

To these forces the decision comes as a surprising and astounding blow to their hopes. One of the unfortunate circumstances surrounding the decision and the present situation is that while the unimpeachable men and women were working and planning for the city manager election, confidently relying upon the assurances and opinions of many outstanding attorneys that the law was valid and beyond overthrow, in other quarters of the city, where a different type of citizens congregates and discusses public matters, a most accurate forecast of the outcome was common and confident.

It is unfortunate that leading lawyers and the better citizens were wrong, while those who frequent the poolrooms and resorts of questionable nature were correct in their predictions as to the final result.

The decision of the court finds the law impossible of operation in one particular. It says that the provision that the city clerk, within five days, must certify to the validity of the signers to a petition for a change of government cannot be carried out in a city of the size of Indianapolis.

This is a duty, which, says the decision, cannot be delegated to others. And it correctly estimates that the clerk, if personally called upon to find and interview every signer, would have to visit two and sixty-three hundredths of a voter each minute, day and night during the five days.

The court, and in this all will assent, says that this cannot be done, and takes judicial notice of that fact.

There will be many who will regret that the court could not find it within its province to take judicial notice of the fact that at the election held under the petition filed with the clerk, the citizens of Indianapolis cast their ballots at the ratio of nearly six to one in favor of such a change.

To minds less judicial this might have suggested that the one purpose of verification of a petition, which is to test the desire of a sufficient number of citizens to make the expense of an election a reasonable use of public funds, had been justified and that it might be properly assumed that out of the overwhelming number of citizens who favored the change a sufficient number of qualified voters had petitioned for the election in which they participated.

However, the court has ruled. The law is dead. And turning from its grave, the friends of good government, stunned though they may be by grief, must find a way to accomplish the results they hoped for by other means.

For the tragedy of the situation, if it has its tragical aspects, is not the death of the city manager law. It lies in the possibility that the finest group of citizens ever organized in this city, with the most fervent enthusiasm ever shown for civic righteousness, may lose their zeal and take on a color of hopelessness and helplessness.

The city manager movement was a legitimate child. It was begotten of resentment against the outrages which had been perpetrated in the name of a partisan city government and mothered by a lofty hope that a city, unshackled from bossism, from machine rule, from intrigue and manipulation, might reach a great height of spirit as well as prosperous comfort for its citizens.

That resentment still exists. That hope still lives.

Today those who have led the thousands who gave their trust and confidence to what, it appears, was an unconstitutional aspiration, have a deeper responsibility than ever before.

They must stand guard against trickery, against hopelessness, against a dispersion of the forces of civic righteousness. They must lead.

The decision is the opportunity, of course, for the forces of greed and selfishness. They may and probably will, try to find a respectable front for their sinister purposes. They will try to again capture the city hall.

### Hoover and the Tariff

The President has intervened in the senate tariff fight—not in protest against higher rates for rich and prosperous industries as hoped, but in defense of the flexible provision under which the President, on recommendation of the tariff commission, may change rates up to 50 per cent.

Arguments used by Mr. Hoover in favor of retaining the flexible provision are perfect—theoretically, seven years ago it was put into the law and pretty generally accepted on all sides as a reform.

It was to help take the tariff out of politics, to provide machinery for correcting inequalities in individual schedules without the prolonged congressional debate which always follows attempted tariff tinkering, and finally it was to increase the power of the bi-partisan and scientific tariff commission.

Unfortunately, it has not worked out that way. Whoever or whatever is responsible, the fact is that in seven years of operation the flexible provision has in effect made the tariff commission more political in character, and has concentrated more power in the hands of the President, while at the same time subjecting him to increased partisan pressure.

The flexible provision in the hands of Mr. Coolidge meant little more than an invitation to raise rates right and left. Practically every important change was a full 50 per cent increase. When the commission recommended a decrease on a major commodity, Coolidge ignored it.

Along with that process went an attempt by the White House to control the commission through indirect pressure, and finally through the astounding subterfuge of demanding standing resignations from commissioners to be used if and when the President desired.

This bit of unpleasant history explains why many of the most progressive senators of both parties now are so opposed to the "reform" machinery which they helped to build. They now propose to make the commission directly responsible to congress, which alone will have authority to change rates, as originally contemplated by the Constitution.

They believe this will preserve the best part of the present system and eliminate the evils of the last seven years.

Doubtless a great many voters find themselves in our own predicament. We agree with the President that the present system is best, theoretically. But we have pointed out repeatedly the abuse of the flexible provisions under Mr. Coolidge.

It all comes down—as most governmental problems do—to the spirit in which a law is enforced. And we do not think Mr. Hoover is the kind of President who will abuse the flexible provision power for partisan purposes. Therefore we are somewhat less excited about the need of quick revision than we were when Mr. Coolidge was in the White House.

We are saving our excitement in this tariff fight for the matter of high industrial rates which violate the Republican campaign pledge, which will increase the cost of living, which will start foreign retaliation and boycotts and which are pretty close to public robbery.

We still hope the President, in line with his message to congress, will take as positive a position in the matter of the high industrial tariff increases as he has on the flexible provision.

### Truly Rural

Clinton Bardo, president of the New York Ship Building Company, speaking out of the richness of his experience with William B. Shearer, declares on the witness stand that he now regards Shearer as an undesirable man to have around.

Asked why, he lapses into the rural and says: "Well, you might send him after the cows and he might take a gun and shoot the farmer's pigs."

That rather picturesque language describes accurately what big business frequently gets when it hires what have come to be called by the pompous title of "public relations engineers," previously known under the more plebeian heading of "press agent."

Especially will some of the public utilities appreciate Mr. Bardo's feelings, for those utilities have been on the anxious seat now for a couple of years as a result of high-pressure schemes devised by their "public relations engineers."

The text book scandals and other similar revelations brought forth by the federal trade investigation are demonstrations of the fact that the press agents who were sent out to bring in the cows actually did shoot up the pigs.

### REASON

By FREDERICK LANDIS

THEODORE ROOSEVELT, now Governor of Porto Rico, is the brightest of T. R.'s children and the one most like him is Alice Roosevelt Longworth.

Had the fates cast her for a male role the Roosevelt banner would not be hanging on the ancestral wall at Oyster Bay; it would be waving up close to the head of the procession.

Young gentlemen, suffering from that tired feeling, may be interested to learn that the oldest tiler in the American vineyard, Jacob B. Ullery, aged 91 years, still takes care of his 100-acre farm up in Michigan.

He cut his place out of the wilderness more than seventy years ago and has run it ever since, thus proving that the nearest approach in all this world to a fountain of eternal youth is to spend your days as your own boss in a business that you like.

William F. Kenny, the wealthy New York contractor, now in Europe, who had his barber cross the Atlantic to give him a hair cut, should also take a seafoam and a shave while the fellow is over there.

## M. E. Tracy

SAYS:

### Talk Has Become Almost a Religion In This Country, Not Only as a Substitute for Action, But as a Guarantee of Results.

SENATOR MCKELLAR is against the proposed Anglo-American naval accord; not that he loves peace less, but parity more.

Counting cruisers, he finds that England has about twice as many as the United States. And to his mind a cruiser is a cruiser, whether she weighs 3,000 tons and mounts six-inch guns, or 10,000 tons and mounts eight-inch guns.

The fact that four-fifths of England's cruisers would be comparatively small under the proposed agreement, while more than one-half of ours would be comparatively big, does not impress the senator as of any consequence.

What he wants is the number—nothing more.

Discouraging as Senator McKellar's opposition to the administration program may be, it is offset by the announcement that neither Mrs. Gann nor Mrs. Longworth will be in Washington during Premier MacDonald's visit.

According to a United Press dispatch, Secretary Stimson looks ten years younger.

Preparations for the premier's visit necessarily involved some hard bargaining with regard to tonnage, caliber, speed, and so on, but that caused little worry compared to the far greater problem of where to seat the Vice-President's sister and the Speaker's wife at social functions.

### Enright Says He Knows

RICHARD E. ENRIGHT, running for mayor of New York on the "Square Deal" ticket, says that if Governor Roosevelt authorizes an investigation of the Rothstein case, he will tell what he knows.

"I have some information concerning the Rothstein case which is authentic," he says, "and I will be glad to submit it to any investigation the Governor might appoint."

This information would be extremely embarrassing to several city officials, he declares, insinuating that the police have done what they could to cover it up for that reason.

More particularly, he charges that the police and District Attorney Egan have known pretty well where Herman Miller, an "impor" witness in the Rothstein case, was to be found, while he himself had information that Miller was in New York City for two weeks last August.

Borrowing an idea from President Hoover, District Attorney Egan says that if Mr. Enright knew of Miller's presence in the city, it was his duty to inform the authorities, not forgetting to mention time and place.

### Wink at Speakeasies

FOR many years the opposition to Tammany hall, whether represented by a Republican, Socialist or a fusion candidate, has hung on the hope of proving graft or collusion.

The Rothstein case is popular with the opposition because it represents one more possibility in that direction.

Exposure of the speakeasy graft probably would be easier, but not so effective.

The presence of 32,000 speakeasies, as Mr. Enright charges, would suggest nothing so emphatically as that New York is tolerant toward them. Even if such tolerance does include considerable hush money.

Proof of connivance to pigeon-hole a murder case would hurt Tammany more than would exposure of an indulgent attitude toward hooch.

As a matter of common sense, such attitude is taken for granted. Especially since Mr. Whalen declined the invitation to "co-operate" with federal authorities.

Like all Washington, New York oratory took regard to speakeasies takes academic lines.

A great deal is heard about "common knowledge," what the authorities could do if "they had the will," and so on.

Prohibition, when you come to think of it, has taken the place of the weather in furnishing a subject about which everyone feels free to talk. While no one feels obligated to do anything.

### Talk Is Our Religion

TALK has become almost a religion in this country.

We believe in it not only as a substitute for action, but as a guarantee of results.

Some of our shrewdest business men are willing to pay good money for talk. As the Shearer case reveals, and rather poor talk at that.

## All Is Not Gold That Glitters



DAILY HEALTH SERVICE

## Study Child's Mental Capacity Early

By DR. MORRIS FISHBEIN  
Editor of the American Medical Association and of Hygiene, the Health Magazine.

THE most rapid period of growth of the child is in its early years. In the very early period of growth days count greatly; after middle life, days mean little in the changes that go on in the human organism.

The psychologists who have studied the mental development of the child consider it of the greatest importance to determine as soon as possible whether the child is likely to be mentally defective. The quicker important force can be brought to bear, the better it is for the future life of the individual.

Thus, Dr. Arnold Gesell of the Psycho-Clinic of Yale University indicates a few of the definite activities that a child can carry out purposefully during its first year.

By the end of the first month, the normal infant apparently recognizes its mother's face; by the end of the second month, it will follow her moving figure with its eyes; at the end of the third month, it can begin to manipulate objects a little; at the end of the fourth or fifth month, pick up a toy in the crib; at six months, reach for a spoon that falls on the floor; at 10 months, pick up any small object; at 11 months, push a pencil through a hole, and at 12 months, speak one or two words.

A normal infant is likely to develop at about this speed.

It has been found that even difficulty with nutrition and underweight will not modify greatly the learning ability of the infant or its behavior with relationship to these simple tests.

The infant mentally defective at birth will begin to show its defects very promptly. If the infant does not show normal characteristics of growth early in life, it demands prompt consideration and attention.

Even though it is not certain that much can be done for such an infant, except to protect it against a world which has but little consideration for the inefficient, what scientific medicine can do in such cases is to determine as soon as possible the need for specialized study and care, the separation of the individual from the group and its life and those of its relatives the special attention that will make more enurable.

## IT SEEMS TO ME

By HEYWOOD BROWN

I JUST have read what seems to me the best novel any American now alive has written, but this is not to be issued in book form for another week or so and accordingly it is the honorable duty of a critic to keep quiet.

It is not a bad rule to read an old book whenever you just have finished a new one. Accordingly, I supplemented the magnificent native novel by tackling "The Outline of History" once again.

That isn't quite ancient yet, but it remains a good book to have around. It is a particularly appropriate book for the library of a lazy man. It is a good book for me.

You see, it will always be fresh as far as I'm concerned, because I have no expectation of ever getting all the way through. I suppose, man and boy, I've been reading "The Outline" night on to seven years. There have been intervals in this endeavor and mostly I start all over again to refresh my memory.

Otherwise, so the stanch Briton suggests, the English would have made short work of the Old Guard had they tried any monkey business on the far side of the channel.

Nelson, according to this historian, was a warrior of far greater imagination than Napoleon. But if so, it seems a pity that he did not rise to Wellesian heights of strategy and lose Trafalgar so that Napoleon might later land on England's shore and take a licking.

Very probably mankind is not better off because he lived. It is reasonable to assume that his career was not altogether pleasing to God.

But Bonaparte remains even yet the great bogey man of Europe, a figure great enough to reach out from the grave and frighten H. G. Wells and mark him.

Here was a man who took life and made it theatrical. It was an achievement in popular esthetics if nothing else. But Wells doesn't seem to care about esthetics.

Perhaps even a mortal might be extracted from the life of Napoleon. He proved the magic quality of personality and the inspiration of gesture. Some day the same methods may be used for some finer purpose.

## Book That Never Fails

THIS time I jumped into the middle and grew fascinated with what H. G. Wells has to say about Napoleon. Publishers have a saying that no biography of Napoleon ever can fail.

Hot or cold, he remains the most glamorous of all historical figures. Nor is the urge to write about Napoleon limited wholly to historians and biographers.

The editor of a literary magazine tells me that in the last three years he has read no less than 26 novels which deal in part with the retreat from Moscow. Even the Great Shaw grows a little sentimental and romantic when he writes about the Corsican.

Accordingly, it is strange to find that H. G. Wells is practically the only living writer who professes to have a contempt for Napoleon. Mr. Wells feels that his historical stature has been exaggerated vastly.

He would have the world accept him literally as a little corporal. It may be that this attitude is defensive. Wells does protest a shade too much.

The sight of the terrible Corsican peeping over the edge of the Thirty-eighth chapter sends Mr. Wells scurrying from his detached internationalism right into the center of a British square.

### Borey Scared Him

IT must be that when Wells was little and bad, his nurse told him that if he did not eat his mums or go to bed, or perform some other necessary chore in the life of a child, old Borey would get him. And Wells is still scared.

He takes it out by scaling down the emperor and remarks that it was pretty lucky for the Frenchman that Trafalgar went against him.

Governorship of the territories conquered by Balboa, and known as Darien, was obtained a short time later by Pedro Arias (Pedrarias) Davila, through intrigues at the Spanish court, and Balboa resigned the command into the hands of the Governor.

Balboa was beheaded in 1517 after a dispute with Pedrarias.

## SCIENCE

BY DAVID DIETZ

### Measuring Distance to Stars Is Simple, as Far as the Underlying Principle Is Concerned.

HOW do astronomers measure the distances of the stars? That is the question in the mind of a correspondent who writes, "I read with interest your reports of the recent meeting of the American Astronomical Society at Ottawa. It is stimulating to hear the way the astronomers toss around billions and trillions of miles. But how do they know?"

Measuring the distance to a star is a very simple matter as far as the underlying principle is concerned. In practice, however, it is an extremely difficult task, requiring the highest of astronomical skill.

An analogy will make the method clear. Let us suppose that a surveyor on one bank of a river wishes to know the exact distance to a tree on the other side. He will proceed as follows:

First, he will measure off a base line on his side of the river. Then, he will set up his surveying instrument at one end of the base line and sight at the tree, measuring the angle between it and the base line. Then he will do the same thing from the other end of the line.

He now has a triangle of which his line is the base and the tree the apex. He knows the length of the base line and the two angles which he has measured. It is then a simple matter to calculate, by trigonometry, the distance to the apex of the triangle, which is the tree.

### To the Sun

WE can apply this same method to finding the distance to the sun. At the same instant, an astronomer in New York and one in San Francisco point their telescopes at the sun, noting the angle at which their telescopes are inclined.

They now have a triangle like the surveyor had. The distance from New York to San Francisco is their base line. The telescope readings give the two angles. All they need do now is calculate the distance to the apex of their triangle, which is the distance to the sun.

It would seem at first that the distances of stars might be obtained in the same way. But the stars are so far away that the base line from New York to San Francisco is far too short.

However, once we know the distance to the sun, which, of course is the radius of the earth's orbit, we can make use of that.

Consequently, we can pursue the following method: We can point our telescope at the star in January and again in June. We then have a great triangle, whose base line is the diameter of the earth's orbit, a distance of 186,000,000 miles. Actually, a modification of this method is used. Two photographs of the star and its neighboring stars are taken, six months apart. Due to the change in angle at which the star is seen, it will appear to have shifted its position slightly with reference to the other stars in general.

This shift, or parallax, as it is known technically, then is determined from careful measurements of the two photographic plates and the angles and then the distance calculated from it.

### Dog Star


AT the present time, six American and one English observatories are co-operating in a program of measuring stellar distances by the parallax method.

Recently the results of their work to date were assembled into a catalog by Dr. Frank Schlesinger, director of the Yale university observatory. It gives the distances of 1,870 stars.

These, of course, are the nearer stars. The distances of more remote stars are estimated.

Let us suppose that we know the distance of a certain star from parallax measurements. Suppose now that a spectroscopic study reveals that another star of unknown distance is exactly like the star of known distance, exactly like it both in size and in true brightness.

It is possible then to estimate the unknown distance by comparing the apparent brightness of the two stars. Obviously, the further away the star of unknown distance is, the dimmer it will appear.



## An Unequalled Display of Topcoats

There's a of these new fall new fall topcoats . . . a brilliant, matchless display . . . each styled and tailored in manner that achieves quality. Customized of the finest wools in the smartest patterns. Like all Society Brand clothes, in Indianapolis they're sold exclusively at Doty's . . .

**\$35 Up**

Wilson Bros. Furnishings

# DOTY'S

16 North Meridian Street