

The Indianapolis Times

(A SCRIPPS-HOWARD NEWSPAPER)
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, Editor ROY W. HOWARD, Business Manager FRANK G. MORRISON, Editor
PHONE—Riley 6551 TUESDAY, APRIL 7, 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."

A Real Solution

To aspiring Indiana politicians, who may be worried about the prohibition question, why not advance a new program, label it the Indiana idea, and go through to victory and fame and national sanity?

Instead of repeal of the Volstead act or turning back the power to states, why not resort to the simple expedient of taking the profit out of the sale of liquor and end the corruption that has always attended that business?

What would happen if the government manufactured and sold, without profit, all the alcoholic beverages demanded by the people?

The bootlegger would disappear. He is in business for profit. He could not compete with a government that demanded nothing more than cost.

Corrupt public officials and gangs would go. Their sources of revenues would be over. The lure for profit is the source of all corruption, bootleg, utility or loan shark.

There would no longer be any paid propaganda by manufacturers. They are in the business for profit. There would be no incentive for them to resort to old methods of advertising for trade. There would be no incentive to open saloons or speakeasies. There would be no incentive to take a hand in corrupting government, as occurred in the days that preceded the prohibition debacle.

There would be an incentive for the temperance societies dedicated to the diminished use of alcohol to carry on their work of education. They would find the job easier with the new condition, for liquor would no longer be fashionable with the socially elect. Being cheap, it would be scorned by the rich and those who copy the manners and morals of the rich.

The professional dry crusader says his league is in politics to stay. Here is his chance to become a real leader for his cause.

Or, perhaps, some so-called liberal will take the idea. It is offered to both alike. There is no patent attached and, being simple and sane, is not likely to be accepted or tried.

The Raskob Program

Chairman Raskob of the Democratic national committee demands that his party in the next campaign take a definite stand on prohibition and other national issues. Following the meeting of the committee last month, at which he made a similar appeal, he now requests committee members to consider and submit by next fall their recommendations for a party platform.

That is all to the good. The committee has no power to dictate to the national convention. But it has the specific authority and the duty to make recommendations. That this practice has not been followed in the past makes it no less essential now.

Far from trying to tie the party's hands in advance, Raskob is taking the only course which can prevent dictatorial control by politicians at the convention.

While submitting his own platform suggestions, Raskob does not insist that they be accepted. He invites counter-suggestions and wholesome discussion. Only through such wide discussion can rank and file opinion be matured and effectively influence the convention.

Raskob's keenest fear is that his party will straddle the prohibition issue again. He objects to such evasion and hypocrisy on theoretical and practical grounds. He says it is unworthy of the Jeffersonian tradition. And he says that the party must take sides if it is to win and hold power.

With that reasoning, we are in hearty agreement. Evasion of the prohibition issue by both parties is doing more than anything else to defeat representative government and to destroy the only valid excuse for the party system. No man, wet or dry, can deny that American voters talk more and think more about the prohibition issue than any other. Fortunately or unfortunately, that is an undeniable fact.

And, so long as the two political parties continue to use their machine power to prevent public political decision on this question, they are guilty of conspiracy against the American form of government.

It happens that we are on the Raskob side of the wet-dry controversy. We believe national prohibition has failed, has multiplied crime. We believe in home rule for the states, that dry states shall have the right to be dry and wet states to be wet. We believe that is the road to temperate use of liquor and to effective social control.

But that consideration, in our mind, is secondary. The major consideration is the right of the American people to pass judgment for themselves on this prohibition experiment. The Republican and Democratic conspiracy to prevent such orderly mandate by the voters for continuance or discontinuance of national prohibition has produced vast and dangerous civil disobedience. In many states most of the population flout the law, which they consider unjust.

To deny these otherwise law-abiding citizens the right to try to change the law through their party platforms and candidates is to imperil our entire structure of government by law.

No convinced American—much less a follower of Jefferson—should want to prevent a popular mandate. If today the dries are allowed to substitute for representative government the methods of dictatorship, then some other dictatorship may reign tomorrow.

For the same reason, therefore, we welcome Raskob's effort to force the Democratic party to take a definite stand on economic issues. We welcome his effort no less because on most of the economic issues we happen to disagree with his suggested platform.

Most of Raskob's specific economic program in our opinion is either meaningless or baneful. His planks on tariff and farm relief are as evasive as ever written by the political straddlers whom he scorns.

His support of the five-day week, and old age and unemployment insurance, is somewhat vague and is overshadowed by his reactionary attitude toward government regulation of big business.

Here is his first platform plank: "Take the government out of business and relieve

trade from unnecessary and unreasonable governmental restriction, interference, and manipulation, at the same time safeguarding the public in every proper way by regulation against monopoly and unfair trade practices."

Does not Raskob know that this is what the representatives of special privilege have been saying ever since monopoly became an issue?

Does he not know that he speaks for the power interests and against the public when he condemns "federal curbs on these giants (public utilities), which is another of the regrettable tendencies to extend the powers of central government."

When he says, "my idea is that the states themselves should exercise this police control," does he not know that long experience has proved that state regulation is ineffective—and therefore is supported by the worst power interests?

But, regardless of whether we agree with Raskob on prohibition or disagree on most economic issues, we are convinced that he is rendering a great public service in forcing the Democratic party to face those and other issues.

Under the American party system, there can be no representative government if the parties prevent a popular vote on issues.

To the Republican party managers, no less than to the Democrats, we recommend the practical wisdom of Raskob's conclusion:

"We must so conduct ourselves that the people will be willing to trust us with the great responsibility of government, and we hardly can hope for this demonstration of confidence unless we lay our program before them frankly, definitely, clearly, and without equivocation or evasion."

No Hyde Park in Boston

It is a firm conviction of English authorities that the soapbox is the best guaranty against mob violence and threats of revolution. In Hyde Park, London, speakers are free to say anything they please which is not forbidden by the laws against flagrant obscenity.

They can demand the abolition of the monarchy, the institution of anarchy, confiscation of private property, or dismemberment of the empire. No night sticks are broken on the heads of the malcontents.

Mayor Frank Murphy of Detroit has created a similar asylum for firebrands in Detroit. The Massachusetts Civil Liberties Union has been attempting to establish a social escape valve on Boston Common. The pre-revolutionary precedent, when Boston Common was the seat of defiant harangues against George III, would seem to make the common the ideal American Hyde Park.

A bill to open the common to speakers without police permits was introduced in the state legislature. It passed the house by a large majority. But the Bourbons in the senate killed the bill.

It was defeated by a vote of 23-14, and twenty-two of the twenty-three opposed were hide-bound Republican conservatives. They apparently regarded Web Thayer a better safeguard against insurrection than an American Hyde Park.

An Appropriate Appointment

It is announced that Professor Bernadotte Everly Schmitt of the University of Chicago has been appointed lecturer at the Institute Universitaire de Hautes Etudes Internationales in Geneva during the academic year 1931-32.

Many will learn of this appointment with amazement. Geneva is supposed to be the seat of internationalism and world justice. What good could come from the appointment of this chief of American German-baiters to an international academic institution in Geneva?

The appointment is highly appropriate. Geneva is international and impartial in name only. It is the heir and successor of Versailles. The spirit of 1918 has not evaporated. Germany may be on a parity with the other members of the league in a legal sense, but she is not psychologically.

Such appointments as those of Schmitt may help. They may jar us into a consciousness of the true state of affairs and lead to a demand that fact conform to theory at the ostensible international capital of the world.

Many a boy poor at geography, says the office sage, later put his town on the map.

REASON BY FREDERICK LANDIS

NEXT to the money they get out of it, our criminals find their greatest thrill in their publicity.

When Schroeder, sent up from Indianapolis, entered the prison gates he said he had a scrap book of his notices and prized it highly.

And we see in the paper a picture of Brothers, tried for the murder of Lingle in Chicago, which represents him as reading with immense gusto the columns printed about his trial, the same being elaborately illustrated.

It has been a long time since we practiced law, but unless human nature has changed, we should say these criminal lawyers make a mistake to have their defendants appear as fashion plates before the jury. They should follow Shakespeare's suggestion—"neat, not gaudy."

WE are not surprised to read that Governor Roosevelt of New York leads all other candidates for the Democratic presidential nomination more than three to one in the straw vote of thirty-nine states, but there is an element of weakness in leading the field so far ahead of the convention.

This may cause the rest of the candidates to make common cause against him, for the trailers always hate the leader.

It is interesting to note that Tammany now favors Al Smith's renomination, for it knifed him in the last campaign, causing him to lose the Empire state, while Roosevelt carried it for Governor.

This was because Smith had Tammany investigated, the result being that two Tammany leaders went to the penitentiary.

Tammany doesn't love Smith now, for he is an honest man. It hates him less than Roosevelt, because Roosevelt has had them investigated since Smith, and it's the last hate that counts in politics.

WE see that Mayor Jimmie Walker carried twenty-three trunks when he left California for New York, which puts him in a class with Peggie Joyce.

This will not hurt Walker politically, for he tells the world he is a flashy dresser.

The people want a man to "be himself."

If he tries to "dress down" to the public habit, he is lost. J. Sloat Fassett, Republican candidate for Governor of New York, and an aristocrat, tried this year ago and it was fatal.

He took off his coat at a political meeting and the people thought it was a grand-stand play and they finished him.

M. E. Tracy SAYS:

The Ballot Box Is About the Only Place Where "One Man Is as Good as Another."

NEW YORK, April 7.—This being April, lots of people have colds. But King George is about the only one who makes the front page of big American dailies.

That's in keeping with the time-honored rule that news deals with the exceptional. Colds are common, but kings are not.

No doubt many fenders were scratched and crumpled during the week-end, but King George's aunt was one of the few for whom such an accident meant publicity on the other side of the world.

Though royalty may not cut such a figure as it once did in the serious business of politics, it still enjoys social prestige. Even minor titles have a rating in the matrimonial market.

In spite of all democracy has accomplished, the ballot box is about the only place where "one man is as good as another."

It's People's Fault

SPEAKING of ballot boxes, Chicago is voting on "Big Bill" Thompson for the fourth time.

He will be defeated.

Optimists will interpret his defeat as an encouraging sign, but that is not enough.

As long as such demagogues can run our greatest cities for twelve or fifteen years without a vast majority of people realizing that something is wrong, we have little hope of clean, efficient government.

Railing at them does no good. The basic fault is not and never was theirs.

It is ridiculous to assume that "Big Bill" landed where he did because of any peculiar talent on his part. He was, and is, the creature of the crowd, absolutely unable to get anywhere or do anything without the crowd's sanction and consent.

The only reason that people refuse to look upon him and his kind in that light is that they don't like to admit their own mistakes.

That is the price of democracy, however. If people are going to govern themselves, they must not only recognize, but profit by, their blunders, and not try to wiggle out of their responsibilities by making a goat of some poor devil whom they elected with their eyes open.

Must Play Square

THE habit of nominating popular candidates and of making agreements, without any serious thought as to the consequences, is measurably to blame for the political chaos in which we find ourselves.

Right now, the Democratic party is toying with the proposition of putting up a man for presidency next year and then straddling prohibition in its platform. Chairman Raskob takes the only sensible position, when he advises Democrats to avoid such shoddy tactics. They might win an election, but only to bring on a more crushing defeat.

Putting aside the question on public service, such tactics do not represent practical politics. The only way a party or a leader can succeed is by developing confidence and the only way that can be done is by playing square.

On Wrong Path

CONTRARY to prevailing opinion, most of our problems are neither very complicated nor very mysterious. For every one that originates in actual bewilderment, a dozen have originated in lack of courage or common sense.

During the last twenty-five years, we have preferred to be clever rather than wise, have studied the art of triumph through trickery, rather than enduring achievement through straightforward work.

The idea of winning at any price has come to overshadow the idea of whether winning represented anything of permanent and worth while value.

Not only in politics, but in business, education, and most other major activities, we are too much inclined to put faith in anything that seems to work well for a day or a week.

A theory that romance ends with the engagement, or at least the wedding ceremony, that success is guaranteed if one has connected with a good job at the age of 25, that a policy is sound if it gets by for a season, has come to play a stupendous part in our philosophy of life.

The time has come to pay more attention to ultimate and inescapable results, to square our program with the enormous expansion of horizons.

Questions and Answers

When and where was the first telephone switchboard for commercial service installed, and the first telephone exchange established?

The first telephone switchboard for commercial service was put in operation at New Haven, Conn., in 1878, with twenty-one subscribers. The first telephone exchange was opened in London, England, in 1879.

How much income must a single man have before he is required to file an income tax statement?

Single men must file income tax returns for any net income of more than \$1,500 per annum.

Who wrote the "Charlie Chan" stories, and what is the title of the last one?

Earl Derr Biggers is the author. The last one is entitled "Charlie Chan Carries On."

Is it necessary to use a ring at a wedding ceremony to make it legal?

No.

Is the Gulf stream gradually getting nearer to the coast of North America? Is it nearer than it was twenty-five years ago?

The course of the Gulf stream has shifted from time to time, but there is no evidence that its average course is any nearer North America than it was twenty-five years ago.

Was the Bank of the United States in New York, which recently failed, a member of the federal reserve system?

Yes.

An Engineering Problem



DAILY HEALTH SERVICE

X-Ray Finds Diaphragm Rupture

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

UNTIL the x-ray began to be used commonly, the diagnosis of rupture through the diaphragm rarely was made. The occurrence of this condition is not frequent, certainly not more than one in ten per cent of thousands of cases.

The symptoms may be sufficiently severe to cause trouble and to make necessary an operation, which has been possible only with the development of new methods of diagnosis and recent improvements in surgical technique.

Thus far, according to Dr. P. E. Truesdale, twenty-two children under 10 years of age have been operated on for this condition and about 41 per cent of them have died.

Since the operation may be considered a life-saving measure and of the greatest importance for having something resembling health during life, and since the operative technic is improving constantly, it is important that even more attention be given to these cases than now is being given to them.

The diaphragm is a large muscle which separates the chest cavity from the abdominal cavity. Its action is concerned with breathing.

Should there be spreading of the fibers so as to permit the stomach or the intestines to pass from the abdominal cavity into the chest cavity, collapsing the lung and encroaching on the space occupied by the lungs and the heart, there is bound to be a good deal of disturbance, both of breathing and of circulation of the blood.

Actually one case was reported in which the extended stomach, pushed into the chest cavity, occupied enough space to have asphyxiated the person affected.

The symptoms of the condition are all associated with difficulty in breathing, so that the affected person has pain over the heart, shortness of breath, turns blue and coughs, and is in other ways quite ill.

When the X-ray picture is taken, the tissues are found to be out of place; the stomach, instead of lying beneath the diaphragm, is pushed above it, and whatever other organs are concerned protrude into the chest cavity.

In the operation, the procedure followed includes opening of the cavity, replacement of the organs within the abdomen where they belong, and closing of the opening in the diaphragm through which the tissue protruded from the abdomen into the chest cavity.

The control of this condition by modern surgery represents another of the great triumphs of technic in this division of medical science.

IT SEEMS TO ME BY HEYWOOD BROWN

AN interesting situation has arisen in the city of Chicago. I gleaned the news from Variety.

Through the campaign climaxed by the election today, the Chicago Tribune has fought hard against the election of Mayor Thompson. But in one respect he has scored heavily. Last fall Mr. Thompson was seriously ill. And after the manner of newspapers, the Tribune prepared an obituary article to be ready the moment the flash came the mayor was no more. Thompson fooled both the public and his doctors by getting well.

In this article it was said, "He lived in a quiet seclusion, and he had the color of the Western plains and frontiers, the indomitable onward rush of democracy. His genius for the spectacular made him an international figure—his vitality, love of mixing, quantities of leadership, led him into politics."

Only for Obituary Purposes

NOW, there is nothing in that to indicate that William Hale Thompson should be mayor of Chicago. But it is a warm tribute for a man who currently is being held up as an impossible demagogue.

And the Chicago Tribune never would have tempered the wind of its wrath save for its assumption that the lines were not to see the light until Thompson was dead and gone.

To my mind the incident raises the whole question of what differentiation should be made between criticism of the quick and of the dead.

It is familiar journalistic practice to take back a great deal about any opponent as soon as he safely has departed from life. I think this constitutes a faulty method.

After all, no complete change takes place in a man's record merely because he dies. I remember admiring an editorial written by Frank Cobb of the World.

He had been hammering constantly at Mayor Gaynor for many months. And then, quite suddenly, Gaynor died. It was necessary for the paper to take editorial cognizance of this fact, and Mr. Cobb wrote with some expression of regret.

But he did not fail to mention the fact that everything he had said about Mr. Gaynor he still believed. He had said it because it seemed to him fair and just.

And he had no intention of taking it all back at the edge of a newly dug grave. This seems to me the better way.

Like all newspaper commentators, I have known that nightmarish fear of having some public personage die at the precise moment that an unkind column concerning him had been prepared.

Once, in fact, I let loose at a man, forgetting that while I wrote he lay gravely ill in a hospital. Late at night I awoke with the sudden remembrance of this fact. And I

was tempted to call up the paper and say, "Kill that article and let me write another."

But I Still Believe It

NOT only I am fearful lest the man in question might die about the time the article appeared. But I also was assailed with doubts as to the spuriousness of attacking a man who was ill.

On thinking it over, however, I decided to let the piece stand. It did represent something which I felt with sincerity and fervor.

And to make no great secret about it, the subject of the column was John R. Straton. It seemed to me that I could justify myself by saying that, after all, I was not dealing with an individual, but with a man whose views and type of mind comprised a symbol powerful in American life.

Indeed, in a very literal sense, this was true. Straton was a most practical, personal survival. The things he preached would go on. He was not the last of a clan.

And so it was with William Jennings Bryan. In the case of Bryan, magazine writers fared even worse than columnists. Several humorous weeklies were laden with punishing caricatures and comments about the Commoner which, as fate would have it, appeared a few days after his sudden death.

In some editors went to terrific effort in order to tear their makeup apart at the last minute rather than risk the criticism of speaking ill of the dead.

Again I say that I can see no coherence in such attitude. If a

writer is to recant because his adversary is gone, then I think that writer seems to confess, "I didn't really mean it. I didn't feel it utterly. It was all part of a game."

True opposition should be strong enough to endure here and hereafter. No Waterloo in this world or the next can suffice the change in the record of things which have occurred.

Let the Fight Go On

NATURALLY, I am not arguing against forgiveness. Not only is there divine rule, but the spirit of starting all over again from scratch comprises excellent common sense.

Revenge is among the most futile of human emotions. But toward the person who lives and dies still of the same mind there is no occasion for letup.

After all, in most cases, the fight is not against him as a piece of finite mortality, but against the ideas which he represents. And ideas are touched with immortality. This goes even for warped and evil notions.

And so it seems to me that the good fighter will not step aside whenever a funeral comes his way, but with more vigor and imagination say, "The struggle still goes on. I haven't changed my mind!"

If William Hale Thompson, for instance, is a vulgar, a corrupt and an evil figure in local politics, he can't wipe that out by any such simple device as lying down to die.

(Copyright, 1931, by The Times)

Daily Thought

I said in mine heart, God shall judge the righteous and the wicked; for there is a time there for every purpose and for every work.—Ecclesiastes 3:17.

We neither know nor judge ourselves; others may judge, but can not know us. God alone judges and knows us.—Wilkie Collins.

SCIENCE

BY DAVID DIETZ

Shale Oil May Be "Salvation" When Petroleum Supply Gives Out.

ONE of the biggest problems facing the chemist today is the question of what the world will do when its supply of petroleum oil gives out. There are various estimates as to how long the world's supply will last and it is extremely difficult to evaluate all the factors involved.

But all authorities agree that it is going to give out some day and some think that it may do so in less than "any years."

It seems fairly reasonable that the supply will give out within the lifetime of many people now living. And when that happens, the world will be faced with an extremely difficult problem.

Modern life is geared up to the automobile. The auto made the modern city and its residential suburbs a possibility. Industry requires the auto truck. All machinery is in constant need of petroleum oil.

It seems most likely that the world will turn first to the development of the shale oil deposits. These have not yet been worked, because at the present time it is not profitable to do so. But when oil becomes scarce, the economic problem will be totally different.

Oil Shale

IN various parts of the world there are great deposits of rock known as oil shales. Colorado and Utah possess mountains of it. It is estimated that there are 450 billion tons of it in Indiana.

Oil shale is a shale-like rock soaked with a wax-like material called kerogen, which when heated changes into oil.

The oil shale is a highly inflammable rock. There are various stories about its discovery by pioneers who used it to build chimneys and then saw their chimneys go up in flames the first time they built a fire.

A ton of oil shale will produce about fifty gallons of oil.

It is estimated that the oil shales now known are capable of producing more oil than the world now possesses in the form of petroleum oil.

The production of oil from the shale involves many processes which are too expensive at the present time. The rock must be mined, crushed, and heated, the oil drawn out, and the useless rock thrown away.

But as already noted, the expense will be no stumbling block once the present supply of oil gives out.

It is of course reasonable to suppose that many research chemists and engineers will turn their attention to the problem when the time draws near, and it is not unlikely that the process may be simplified and cheapened.

Use of Alcohol

ANOTHER possibility is that when oil begins to give out automobiles will be built to run on alcohol. Alcohol could be used as a motor fuel although it would furnish only two-thirds as much power to the gallon as does gasoline.