



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. Mail subscription rates in Indiana, 49 a year; outside of Indiana, 65 cents a month.

BOYD GURLEY,
EditorROY W. HOWARD,
PresidentEARL D. BAKER,
Business Manager

PHONE—Riley 5551.

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."

On This Labor Day

For the first time since Labor day has been a legal holiday, industrial workers are not meeting to rejoice in new victories in the matter of wages or conditions. They have the more serious problem of working at any price and under any conditions.

The owners of industries are not faced with the problem of meeting demands for more wages but that of keeping their factories operating at any wage.

The gaudy floats, the blare of bands, the marching men are missing from the city streets. Instead there are gatherings of committees to discuss ways and means of feeding the hungry during the coming winter, not because the country lacks for food supplies but because those who need food are unable to buy it.

The legalization of this day as a holiday came in recognition, forced through the years by organized workers, of the fact that labor is not a commodity to be bought and sold in a competitive market.

That conception of labor, still harbored by a few anti-social industrialists, is basically the same as that of slave labor.

The black man of other years was sold outright. To hire labor in a competitive market is to buy a man by piecemeal, with the added advantage to the employer that when the worker grows old and decrepit he need not be fed or housed.

When the nation lost its last frontier and agriculture became secondary to industry in the number of workers, white men finally forced the tardy recognition of their own humanness.

It took years to establish any semblance of social and industrial justice. It took years to obtain a workman's compensation act to provide for the injured soldiers of industry. It took years to secure, in some states, an old age pension act. Indiana still has a Governor who took personal pride in reading his veto of that humane measure when passed by the last legislature.

The crusade of that great statesman of Indiana, Albert Beveridge, for the abolition of child labor from mines and factory is still incomplete and in many states children are still condemned to toil during the years they should be storing up health and education.

The eight-hour day was another victory established to protect the health of workers.

Today there is the more pressing problem of enforcing a much shorter day in order that all men and not a few, may have any work at all.

These victories of labor have been won under manufacturing conditions that permitted all men who wished to work to obtain work. Idleness was made a crime on the theory that every man could get a job.

Mass production and invention of labor-saving machinery, without a proper distribution of the products of the machine, have created a condition that this Labor day finds millions of men and women out of work with the prospect of more men being on bread lines before the snow flies.

Yet all that is being done on a national scale is the formation of a crew of evangelists who propose to beg dollars from the rich that we the workless may be fed. There is no real effort to find the one solution for unemployment, which is work for all, under a distribution of the products of labor that will satisfy not only needs but luxuries.

Two years ago, the Fraternal Order of Eagles raised what then seemed to be a most radical slogan that "it is the inalienable right of every American citizen to work at a saving wage." It does not sound radical today to the man who has been in enforced idleness for months with little hope for a job for months to come. It does not sound radical to his wife or his children.

There is work for every one in this country and will always be work until every slum is replaced by a cottage, every home is equipped with every modern convenience, every household is well stocked with food, every child has the very best of education.

This nation has the man power and the machinery to produce these material means of life. This nation has inexhaustible raw materials. It has the best of scientific knowledge.

A nation that has been able to put together the intricate parts of machines which replace human labor should have the genius to put together the men, the machine, the materials and then distribute them to those who create the finished products.

The solution may change some of our present day conceptions of social justice. But the solution does not lie in the direction of wage reductions for the employed, further reducing the total purchasing power of the nation as a whole, nor in the permanent maintenance of organized charities, whose case workers attempt to regulate the lives of those whose only misfortune is poverty.

Men have the right to work. The work awaits. Perhaps at some gathering of workers today there may appear a leader with a remedy and a solution. For the problem will and must be solved.

Our Diploma Mills

Ex-President Clarence C. Little told Columbia university summer school students that the great trinity of evils in the modern college are liquor, automobiles, and co-education. We demand higher standards of conduct for students than for ourselves in regard to the use of liquor and cars, while the students tend to abuse their privileges.

Dr. Little's criticism is in general sound, but it is blurred by a failure to differentiate between those students who go to college and those who go to learn. The great mass of students who merely go to college need to be trained in the philosophy of drinking, driving, and petting.

Those who are in college to learn will not, as Dr. Little himself admits, be disturbed greatly by such things.

Since a college education has come to be the mode with children of the middle class and above, we have had ever-greater hordes of young people approaching college with no basic eagerness to learn anything. There is no spirit of intellectual adventure in the bosom.

For these types the average college curriculum and machinery have singularly little to offer. The latter are based upon the apparent assumption that students are burning with zeal to learn—even to learn a vast amount of largely useless material.

Hence, we ought to be honest enough to transform the majority of our institutions of higher learning into frank civilizing factories, devoted to acquainting students with the major aspects of modern culture and the leading problems of living in the twentieth century, incidentally cultivating an urbane and tolerant intellectual attitude.

Probably two years of this would be quite adequate, leaving the other two years now wasted in college for travel or study in professional schools.

In institutions of this sort, wine, women, and motoring would have their natural part. No person can be expected to live sanely and effectively today unless he is familiar with the responsibilities of this trinity.

Inculcation of a civilized philosophy in regard to these matters would be a major responsibility of these civilizing institutions.

It is no credit to any institution to turn out mere "babes in the woods." If any man or woman is helpless before the problems of sex, alcohol, and automobiles upon graduation, this is nothing for any college to be proud of, no matter what the prowess of that individual with respect to the binomial theorem or the hortatory subjunctive.

For the few—but we may hope ever-growing number—who go to college to learn something, we have institutions well adapted for this specific purpose. Such students will not be seriously distracted by men, women, gin, or cars.

The way out is not through abolishing the perplexing problems which Dr. Little mentions, but through candid, honest, and rational differentiation of our institutions of higher learning.

But it will be hard for us to surrender our educational bluff and pretense to such degree as would be essential to accomplish this reform.

Tax Liquor

Otto H. Kahn, New York banker, has joined the long list of social workers, financiers, industrialists, merchants, labor leaders and newspapers urging repeal of prohibition in the fight against business depression.

Like the others, Kahn does not think that the economic counts against prohibition are the only, or necessarily, the worst, nor does he think prohibition repeat or modification by itself would bring permanent prosperity. But he does think it is one important factor. After listing other factors, he says:

"Set in motion the machinery for abolishing prohibition, and, pending that proceeding, modify the Volstead act and do whatever else may be permissible in the way of relief as long as the eighteenth amendment is unrepealed. The formidable moral and economic evils of the existing state of affairs seem to me proven beyond further question.

By repealing an experiment which, however rightly intentioned, has failed with lamentable consequences, we should raise vast revenues for the government, we should help agriculture greatly, we should decrease unemployment substantially, not to speak of the hideous brood of bootleggers, gangsters, etcetera, and of the other grievous items in the long register of prohibition and Volstead ills. And we should promote greatly the eminently desirable cause of true temperance."

Mr. Kahn's logic will commend itself to those anxious to relieve the unemployed and the depressed farmers, and to obtain from the present huge flood of liquor enough taxes to make up part of the billion-dollar annual federal deficit.

Clemency has been denied Albert B. Fall. About the only one he hasn't appealed to is Al Capone.

The impossible has been done again, the angle has been trisected. Next thing we know "One-Eye Connelly" will be paying his way.

Just Every Day Sense

BY MRS. WALTER FERGUSON

WHAT is a middle-aged woman, whose children are grown, to do when her husband has no consideration for her feelings, refuses to take her anywhere, and indulges only in stinginess and tamrums when he is at home?

In the letter which contains this question, one can detect the lurking animosity toward a man who has been unjust for years.

After a wife has passed 50, and has spent the best of a lifetime trying to get along with such a husband, I believe she is justified in staging a rebellion.

Men such as this one are married these days only to women past 50, for no young person would put up with that treatment. And no woman of any age whatsoever should be obliged to.

WHAT every wife in such a situation should do is to throw a tantrum of her own when her husband starts indulging in his. She should look at last squarely at the man who sits at the head of her table. Let her regard him, if possible, with eyes unblinded by a sense of marital duty.

Then she will know what he actually is and what he always has been. Stripped of the garments of affection in which she has dressed him, she will be confronted by a braggart and a bully.

And although she has been faithful for years, she will know that she does not love this person. She will know, too, that it is not necessary for her any longer to bear his tyrannies.

A woman who meets this crisis, however, should never lose courage. Stern truth will tell her that she never has been loved or appreciated. Therefore, before it is forever too late, she must start about making the fragment of a new life for herself, and find, if possible, some congenial work to do. Above all, she should not be hampered by any sense of duty toward a man to whom she already has more than fulfilled all obligations.

M. E. Tracy

SAYS:

We Claim to Be for Humanity, but Let People Go Hungry While Our Warehouses Groan With Grain.

ACK of idealism is the chief trouble with politics in this country. Incidentally, it's the chief trouble with law enforcement and some major activities.

One feels the absence not only of plan, but purpose, all along the line.

The two great parties have ceased to stand for distinct or divergent policies.

Campaigning has degenerated into technical demagoguery, with stage tricks substituted for documents.

There's the Tariff

TAKE the tariff, for instance, which used to be such a vital issue, and what's the source of argument, except minor changes to satisfy some local interest, or some particular business?

Take prohibition. Is either party in a position to express itself coherently?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Thirteen years ago the country was held bent for a League of Nations and couldn't imagine victory over kaiserism being worth while without it.

Eleven years ago the eighteenth amendment was adopted with great, though not abiding, faith in its curative qualities.

Six years ago our marines were sent down to run Nicaragua, though for just what purpose no one seems to know.

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take prohibition. Is either party in a position to express itself coherently?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?

Take the foreign policy. What are we driving at?