



The Indianapolis Times

Owned and published daily (except Sunday) by The Indianapolis Times Publishing Co., 214-220 West Maryland Street, Indianapolis, Ind. Price in Marion County, 2 cents a copy; elsewhere, 3 cents—delivered by carrier, 12 cents a week.

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

PHONE—Riley 3551 MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1931.

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."

Cards on the Table

After much handshaking and backslapping among the European statesmen and the formal blessings bestowed by President Hoover and Secretary of State Stimson, the Franco-Italian-British naval agreement is recalled. Following three postponements of signature and publication, there is further unexpected delay.

Apparently the European powers want the new agreement limiting French and Italian auxiliary craft to be made a formal part of the London treaty of 1930, while the United States it seems, objects to any procedure which would raise the question of further ratification by the senate.

On its face, this appears to be a matter of minor importance. But just such minor matters have a way of becoming crucial issues in international affairs, especially in American foreign policy.

Our adherence to the world court, for instance, originally was blocked by a technicality. If the situation had been handled with a maximum of frankness and skill, instead of drifting into a partisan political impasse, doubtless we would have been in the world court long ago.

It is to be hoped that the administration will handle this matter more intelligently. If it is not careful, however, the original public approval and enthusiasm which greeted announcement of the new naval agreement will be turned into suspicion and distrust. Once that is allowed to develop, years may be required to undo the mischief.

Therefore, it is essential that the state department, at the earliest possible moment, put all its cards on the table. The sooner the public is given the full facts regarding these too secret negotiations, the sooner the public will accept any reasonable policy the state department matures on the basis of those facts.

For the state department to fix its policy, before giving public opinion a chance to form, would be another one of those needless mistakes which mars American diplomacy.

Justice Holmes

To him whose ninetieth birthday gives us the welcome opportunity, we express again our reverent admiration and affection.

Every birthday of Oliver Wendell Holmes must be for the people of this nation an occasion of pride and gratitude.

He is one of us, and few people can say that of such a man.

Holmes—with his great, wise spirit, his alert and learned mind, his unquenchable fire of youth, his tireless energy, his wit, his simplicity, his broad vision, his sense of reality, his instinct for leadership—are there many to compare with him?

He once said, "We live by symbols." To us Justice Holmes, whose own life has covered so great a part of the life of the United States, is a symbol of our ideal nation.

For the highest patriotism we command to the youth of the land a study of the volume of his decisions, recently published by the Vanguard Press, and the commemorative volume of tributes issued to-day by Coward-McCann.

No one has expressed more beautifully than he the thing at which we are aiming in this government.

"When men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths," he said, "they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundations of their own conduct that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas . . . that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the open market, and that truth is the only ground upon which their wishes safely can be carried out. That, at any rate, is the theory of our Constitution. It is an experiment, as all life is an experiment."

Few men have played as real and brilliant a part in American life as this man, who, for forty-eight years, has been on the judicial bench in Massachusetts and Washington. "A leader of opinion," to quote Chief Justice Hughes, "with an influence transcending the limits usually assigned to judicial utterances."

He is part of almost all our past. It is hard to think of any future which he will not share.

Hoover Refuses

Of Hoover's many mistakes, none is more difficult to understand than his veto of the Wagner unemployment exchange bill.

The bill embodied recommendations made by Hoover himself and Hoover commissions repeatedly during the last ten years. It had the vigorous support of economists, social service and labor organizations. It had the approval of the experts of the present Hoover emergency employment commission. It had the overwhelming support of the press of the country. It had been passed by congress.

The general explanation of the President's veto in Washington is that he and the Republican managers are unwilling to let credit for such constructive law go to the Democrats, Senator Wagner of New York being author of the bill.

That partisan motives could prevent the President from granting this small measure of relief to upward of seven million unemployed seems impossible.

But certainly Hoover's veto statement contains no reasonable explanation. The present federal employment system which he says he is so eager to preserve has proved its utter, almost criminal, futility. That can be overcome only by a co-ordinated national system, embracing state and federal exchanges, with federal aid and supervision—after all recommended by Hoover in the past and as provided in the Wagner bill.

That the President should raise the cry of dangerous subsidies to the states in this connection is ludicrous. It is exactly the same principle as the road grants to states, approved by every one. And the amount of money involved, less than \$1,500,000 next year, is insignificant compared with other subsidies—for instance, the \$50,000,000 annual subsidy to the shipping and air mail companies.

No, one looks in vain for any justification of this Hoover veto blunder, this latest refusal to lend a hand to the unemployed.

Stool Pigeon Civics

It is of course well known that most of our state prisons are governed through the use of stool pigeons. These contemptibles gain the confidence of their fellow prisoners and report any insubordination or plotting to the prison authorities. They are rewarded therefor by special privileges and the like. This is stool pigeon government at its best.

At its worst, it results in a reign of terror in which these low-lived beings have their fellow convicts at their mercy and can invent fictitious charges which will send those whom they do not like to the dungeon and worse. The whole system should be revolting to any honorable man.

It is shocking to find Henry E. Field of the department of correction of Boston telling the Ameri-

ican Orthopsychiatric Association that stool pigeons are indispensable to prevent prison outbreaks. Field went further and held that these stool pigeons must be taught that their work is of an honorable character, should be rewarded, and otherwise kept from losing their self respect.

He did not specify what must be done to preserve the morale of the vast majority of the convicts who are spied upon.

The fact is that nothing could be more opposed to sound prison policy than a system of stool pigeons. Any prison administration which can not preserve order without them should be dismissed forthwith. The chief purpose of any rational prison administration is the social re-education of the convicts—in other words, their reformation.

They must be taught the essentials of sound citizenship. They are not good citizens when admitted. They will not be when released unless taught citizenship while incarcerated. This was the core of Thomas Mott Osborne's notion of prison democracy. Some day this will be regarded as more essential to good prisons than walls.

No convict can be taught self respect and social responsibility through a stool pigeon system. This revolts the soul of even the most hardened crook.

Few criminals ever imprisoned have been as foul and low as a stool pigeon. They preserve some semblance of honor among their fellows. The stool pigeon is the supreme negation of all decency. Stool pigeons may prevent a few breaks in our present intolerable system of prison administration, but they will reform nobody.

On the other hand, they obstruct reform among the thousands of convicts who are in psychic rebellion against this contemptible system.

To attempt to create an atmosphere of reformation in a prison which uses stool pigeons is comparable to making fine citizens out of school children by appointing framers and informers as official lecturers on civics in our high schools.

Administrative massacre of stool pigeons and all they stand for must precede any serious effort to create a sound system of prison discipline.

In Coolidge Land

The Sage of Northampton, while resident in the White House, assured us with frequent gravity and solemnity that we are living in the best of all possible worlds—a society in which prosperity and content are easily accessible to all.

But the cloud of hunger and misery now is moving up the Connecticut valley in full sight of the resident of "The Maples." Professors Colston Warne and Willard Thorp, economists of Amherst college, have investigated the extent of unemployment at Holyoke. They selected as the unit of investigation the 588 members of Grace church in that city.

Holyoke is an industrial city, specializing in textiles and paper. Warne and Thorp found that 33.2 per cent of the congregation were employed full time; 46.6 per cent part time, and 20.2 per cent not at all. One-fifth of the unemployed had been out of work for more than a year.

Now the members of Grace church rank far above the level of the average working population in Holyoke. They are of old American stock—Scotch, German and English—of better than average economic status.

If the above is the condition of this class of workers, what can be the condition of unskilled and semi-skilled labor?

We hope Coolidge will unlimber and tell us what he thinks of "Holyoke prosperity" and of the remedies for it.

A member of parliament has suggested that a knighthood be conferred on Charlie Chaplin. In that event will they call him Earl of Derby?

When Edgar Lee Masters said that this is "the age of brass and gas," was he trying, by any chance, to explain the reason for his biography of Lincoln?

Speaking of tough breaks, consider that St. Paul boy who recently suffered his twenty-second fracture.

Sophomores at the University of California are engaged in a whisker-growing contest, which promises to be quite a hair-raising event.

A man in Pennsylvania was caught singing hymns as he robbed a store. Maybe he thought this the proper procedure while making a collection.

THE government can borrow money cheaper than this, and surely it does not want to make money of its soldiers; surely it does not care to embarras the Shylockers with the boys who earned its bacon back in 1817-18.

In the war all of the equities are outraged, those who take the chances getting the worst of it and those for whom they take the chances getting the best of it.

If war were on the square, the soldiers should make the fortunes.

When it comes to fixing the compensation of the compensation of the army, those who are shot at should go down as the ranks goes up, for the higher the rank the more remote its possessor is from the danger zone.

If a major-general were paid in proportion to his proximity to peril, he would get about 50 cents a week, but in addition to this, we would give him his bed and rations.

The private who charges just one machine gun earns more than a general who reads a map for six months.

When it comes to pensions, the amount received depends on one's rank, those who gave the war absent treatment getting the most.

To say the least, there should be equality between officers and men.

There will be some prospect of ending war whenever the common people, the goats, learn just what is handed to them. If universal conscription could be made the rule of all nations, this also would throw a large monkey wrench into the machine of Mars.

It is shocking to find Henry E. Field of the department of correction of Boston telling the Ameri-

M. E. Tracy SAYS:

The Drys Are Afraid of a Showdown, Their Entire Strategy Based on Not Giving the People a Chance to Vote.

MEMPHIS, Tenn., March 10.—Whatever else may be said of it, Mr. Raskob's proposition appears to have stirred up the animals.

"Not a party question," declares Senator Glass, dry Democrat of Virginia, just as though a national question could be sidestepped that easily.

Senator Robinson, dry Democrat of Arkansas, trying to pour oil on the troubled water, exactly as he did for Hoover and with no happier results in prospect, advised that "economic rehabilitation" is the best bet.

Afflicted with the corn belt complex and unable to forget what the south did two years ago, Senator Capper, dry Republican of Kansas, feels certain that the up roar means nothing but Hoover's renomination and re-election.

Thousands on the Volstead side of the argument talk in a similar vein.

Roll it all into a ball and what have you but the tumult of fear among standup politicians?

The wets may be too optimistic, but the drys are afraid of a showdown. Their entire strategy is based on the idea of not giving the people a chance to vote.

Bolt Is Certain

NOT a party question, though it has been the chief topic of discussion whenever and wherever politics has been brought up in this country during the last five years, and though more polls have been taken on it by newspapers and magazines, not to mention unofficial state referenda, than on any other question in American history.

What do we have parties for, anyway, if not to afford public opinion an opportunity to express itself in just such cases?

Everyone knows that there is disagreement over prohibition in both parties, but must we remain in agreement as a nation because of that?

Has it become so all-fired important to prevent two ineffectual political outlaws?

Of course, there will be a bolt in the Democratic party if the Raskob plan is adopted, but there will be just as big a one in the Republican party.

If Raskob has a dry south to reckon with, Hoover has a wet east, and as between the two the dry south is the more likely to string along with its party this trip.

Two years ago, the wet east held its nose and voted the grand old ticket, while several southern states gave their noses a real rein and jumped the fence.

In neither case was there much to brag about, but the southern states have done rather more to prove their repentance.

Where are those bright lights who led the southern defection, such as Senators Simmons, "Tomtom" Heflin and Tom Love? They are all back home nursing their wounds and grievances.

** * *

Use Poor Judgment

DEMOCRATIC leaders are unnecessarily scared of prohibition as an issue and, making due allowance for their personal convictions, that is what alls many of them.

Their efforts to play safe by puffed-up represent even poorer judgments.

This issue can not be avoided. If the people are forced to it, they not only split parties, but make new ones to express themselves.

The people already have gone to extremes and unusual lengths in that direction.

On what other question have so many states authorized referenda not for the purpose of making any change, since that was impossible, but merely to get a line on public sentiment?

The politician must be deaf, dumb and blind who can not sense what is in the wind.

** * *

Course Is Clear

THE question right now is not whether this nation shall remain hypocritically dry, or endeavor to find a more constructive plan of procedure, but whether it shall be denied the right to register its views, whether it shall remain a republic, or become a moral tyranny in which reformers and racketeers divide the spoils.

Admittedly, there is no precedent for the existing situation, but why should that bother any one, when ordinary common sense makes the case clear?

With perfectly good intentions, we wrote something into law which the public, or a large section of it, refuses to obey, and which the government can not enforce.

The people ask opportunity to go out with such an anomalous situation, or try to correct it.

Because of certain technicalities, the people can be denied that opportunity for a little while, but it seems as though the stupidest politician ought to know the result of such tactics.

** * *

In the war all of the equities are outraged, those who take the chances getting the worst of it and those for whom they take the chances getting the best of it.

If war were on the square, the soldiers should make the fortunes.

When it comes to fixing the compensation of the compensation of the army, those who are shot at should go down as the ranks goes up, for the higher the rank the more remote its possessor is from the danger zone.

If a major-general were paid in proportion to his proximity to peril, he would get about 50 cents a week, but in addition to this, we would give him his bed and rations.

The private who charges just one machine gun earns more than a general who reads a map for six months.

When it comes to pensions, the amount received depends on one's rank, those who gave the war absent treatment getting the most.

To say the least, there should be equality between officers and men.

There will be some prospect of ending war whenever the common people, the goats, learn just what is handed to them. If universal conscription could be made the rule of all nations, this also would throw a large monkey wrench into the machine of Mars.

It is shocking to find Henry E. Field of the department of correction of Boston telling the Ameri-

THE INDIANAPOLIS TIMES

Still Sitting Pretty!



DAILY HEALTH SERVICE

Worth of Pasteur Treatment Proved

<p