



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, 2 cents; postage extra. Carter, 12 cents a year; outside U. S., 25 cents a subscription rates in Indiana, \$3 a year; outside of Indiana, \$5 cents a month.

BOYD GURLEY, Editor

ROY W. HOWARD, President

EARL D. BAKER, Business Manager

PHONE-Riley 5551

Member of United Press, Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, Newspaper Information Service and Audit Bureau of Circulations.

"Give Light and the People Will Find Their Own Way."

New War "Profits"

Very soon, members of the cabinet and congress will report on what they find may be done to promote peace by removing profit from war, but their report will not mention the fact that Japan is buying great stocks of cotton in the United States and shipping them across the Pacific.

Something like four million bales of cotton have been purchased by Japan within the last few months, a decided increase over normal buying. Germany bought similar quantities of cotton in this country in the early part of 1914. Cotton is one of the basic ingredients of high explosives.

Already southern farmers are storing half the cotton ginned in expectation of higher prices. Other industries soon may find themselves busy on the strength of oriental orders, unless Japan is satisfied to stop the war, now that she has created puppet governments to rule Manchuria for her.

All of which means what? Better times for a little, perhaps, but at what price!

No war profiteering here—just legitimate business which will help our suffering unemployed? But every thinking man knows that, if Japan can smash the peace machinery today, Europe can do so next. That would mean another World war. Food for the unemployed, today—shrapnel tomorrow. A prosperous nation for a little while—and then possibilities we dare not face.

It is not enough to study and control the relation of private profit of war after war has begun. Unless we are hypocrites we must, when we say we want peace, begin to study the relation between profit and war when other nations offer to buy from us the sins of war.

Instead of calling its task complete, the war policies commission should start its work again, and this time, start at the beginning.

Admit the Mistake

A sure sign of bigness is willingness to admit a mistake. Yet such willingness is one of the rarest of human traits.

It is inconceivable that President Hoover now regards the Hawley-Smoot tariff as anything else than a mistake.

Evidence of that fact has mounted constantly since the bill was signed.

Reprisals from abroad, "flight" of American industry and American capital to foreign lands, decreased exports, increased depression—these have been the result.

One critic sums it up, "the Hawley-Smoot tariff has substituted the hostility of foreign countries for previous friendship; has resulted in retaliatory action and markets closed to our commerce in all parts of the land; has driven huge sums of capital into foreign fields where, within foreign tariff walls, American capitalists escape the retaliatory and other tariff barriers and employ foreign labor in place of previously-paid American labor."

No one in this nation is in a better position to see and to realize the blighting results than is President Hoover. His experience alone as secretary of commerce equipped him to sense in detail the fundamental weaknesses of the thing which he, in a time of great political pressure, signed, and which constitutes the great mistake of the Hoover administration.

That mistake can be remedied and remedied quickly. A repeal of the Hawley-Smoot bill would be inevitable if recommended by the President to congress. That would throw the tariff back to where it was before the bill was enacted. And the weight that America has been carrying since the bill was signed would be removed from the heavily burdened shoulders of the American people.

Will President Hoover have the bigness that is necessary to admit a mistake?

It Belongs to the People

From any angle it is considered, the report of the Hoover Muscle Shoals commission is only the opinion of nine men appointed by the President and the Governors of Tennessee and Alabama.

It contained no more than was expected. It was a blueprint of President Hoover's known ideas of what should be done with this great power plant. It favored lease of the shoals to some private corporation. Indeed, it hardly could have favored anything else since one member of the commission admitted they went to the White House "for orders."

But only congress can dispose of Muscle Shoals. Twice before it has insisted on the federal government operating the power plants there. Twice congress was thwarted, once by President Coolidge and once by President Hoover.

This will not deter congress from acting again, and in favor again, we believe, of government operation.

President Hoover was given an excellent opportunity to lease the fertilizer manufacturing plants at Muscle Shoals under the bill the last congress passed. But he vetoed it. Now, however, his commission makes a suggestion very similar. If congress' plan was wrong, why is his commission's plan in this regard right?

Under the bill Hoover vetoed, the people who paid for Muscle Shoals would have been able to purchase some of the surplus power manufactured there. Under the Hoover commission plan, the chances of the people getting any of this power are nil.

Congress, we believe, will accord the Hoover report but casual consideration, and will insist, once again, that Muscle Shoals, belonging to the people and the government, must be retained for them.

Free Speech in Colleges

The Committee of the American Association of University Professors has investigated and reported on the case of Professor Herbert A. Miller, distinguished sociologist of Ohio State University, summarily dismissed last spring. His discharge was announced as being on the ground of a speech sympathetic with Indian independence at Bombay.

There is no doubt that Dr. Miller made the speech. It may have had something to do with his dismissal. It has been charged that the British diplomatic agencies and secret service got the ear of the trustees and administration.

But it also was well established that the main reason for his discharge was his opposition to compulsory military training for male students of the university.

The investigating committee looked into the stand of the trustees as it related to freedom of speech for professors. The best they could obtain was a statement that: "Members of the faculty have enjoyed and now enjoy, wide latitude in expressing their opinions in the classroom."

The committee rightly comments that: "No faculty would consider this an adequate recognition of freedom of speech."

In the first place, the trustees and administration reserve the right to pass on just what constitutes

"wide latitude" of opinion. It would be far safer to be "wide" on matters of literary criticism or classical scholarship than on subjects pertaining to contemporary economic controversies.

Yet it is precisely in the latter field that we most need courageous and forthright statements by such experts as college professors are held to be. Quarrels over Shakespeare or Aeschylus are not likely to be of any considerable aid in "salvaging civilization."

Certainly, nothing less than "complete latitude"—within the limits of the laws governing obscenity, profanity, insanity and feeble-mindedness—must be guaranteed at all times to college professors in the classroom. Otherwise, they can not function as emanated intellects and decisive leaders of student opinion.

The question of expression of professional opinion outside the classroom brings out another defect in the attitude of the trustees. There is here no assurance whatever that a professor may not be snapped up and summarily dismissed for unconventional articles or lectures on public utilities, Russia, India, reparations, Manchuria, the British elections, Mr. Hoover and the like. Miller's speech on India was given during leave of absence.

The sensible procedure in regard to the extra-mural expressions of professors would seem to be about as follows: (1) When a professor speaks or writes for the non-college audience, he should be under no limitations beyond legal penalties and considerations of elementary good taste—and we should avoid identifying the latter with mere conventionality; (2) the professor never should speak in the name of the institution unless officially requested to do so.

The investigating committee closes with a ringing challenge to the university administration:

"Until the president and board definitely can assure the faculty that all university procedures and policies, including decisions of the board itself, are legitimate topics for orderly discussion and criticism by the faculty, it is idle to assert that freedom of speech prevails at Ohio State university."

When Youngsters Drive

One of the most disturbing traffic accidents of the season is that recently recorded in Kansas City, where an auto driven by a 14-year-old boy knocked down and killed a pedestrian at a street intersection.

No youngster of 14, of course, or of any age anywhere near 14, should ever be permitted to drive an automobile on any public street. In this case, to be sure, the lad is said to have been driving without his parents' consent; but that fact only adds to the weight of the object lesson.

Parents must not only keep their children out of the driver's seat. They must see to it, very rigidly, that the ruling is obeyed. When a child of that age does drive, and gets involved in an accident, the major part of the responsibility rests on his father and mother.

Keeping child-drivers off the streets is primarily their job, not the police department's.

Baker's Anti-War Plan

Newton D. Baker's speech at Boston urging passage by congress of the Capper resolution calls attention to one of the simplest and most promising anti-war measures yet proposed.

The Capper resolution would bind the United States not to be a market for finances, industrial goods, farm products or munitions for any nation which went to war in violation of a previous agreement to arbitrate international troubles.

Its advantages are obvious. Many nations would be reluctant to enter a war if they knew that American markets and banking houses would be closed to them. Furthermore, if a war did get started there would be much less chance for the United States to get involved through commercial and financial ties with one of the combatants.

Mr. Baker believes that adoption of such a policy by the United States would prevent large-scale wars.

People in Somerset, England, use a rose to pay tenure. If the p. c. in America use anything to pay tenure lucky.

An English woman is heading a movement for "perfection of man." Sounds like a Swiss movement.

It's all right to take time off from business to keep in the pink if you don't get into the red.

In these days of "abysmal ignorance" about the only one who can air his views with impunity is the aviator.

Drinkers, says a headline, pay one-fifth of Britain's taxes. Well, over there it's "Ale, ale, the gang's all here."

Bald men are stampeding a Chicago doctor who has discovered how to grow hair. Evidently all hair-minded.

Just Every Day Sense
BY MRS. WALTER FERGUSON

DAY after day the pioneers pass. One of the last to go was Colonel Zach Mullhall, long a spectacular figure in the Middle West.

Lived to a ripe age and had seen many dynasties come and go. He had witnessed the ardor kindled by multitudes of reforms die again, consumed by their own violence.

Up and down the world he traveled through eighty-three years, cattle puncher, circus rider, Wild West showman, country gentleman, military leader, in his fine high boots and his tall hat. He loved reading, the tramping of herds, and the smell of sawdust in the circus ring.

But with all the clatter that filled many of his days, with the fanfare of trumpets that attended his comings and his goings, and with all the notice he attained from presidents and kings, Zach Mullhall lived with one wife all of his life.

He was a great showman. He also was a good husband. And, by all odds, the most beautiful side of his many-sided character was his affection for the woman whom he married in 1876, so long ago that to most of us it seems unbelievably remote.

After she died some months past, he suddenly became an old man, bowed down by a profound despair. Since that day life had for him no more a reason for enduring.

And so he, too, died, one of the grand old men of the West, whose name is surrounded by many legends, who helped to build an empire and to fashion the civilization that is today most typically American.

Nobody save those who lived in her immediate vicinity knew very much about Mrs. Mullhall. But it seems to me that her husband, by losing all interest in and relinquishing life after she went out of it, has written for her a fine obituary.

True husband and wife they were, and rarely lonely in an age when marriage has ceased to be sacred or enduring.

And the trustees and administration reserve the right to pass on just what constitutes

"wide latitude" of opinion. It would be far safer to be "wide" on matters of literary criticism or classical scholarship than on subjects pertaining to contemporary economic controversies.

Yet it is precisely in the latter field that we most need courageous and forthright statements by such experts as college professors are held to be. Quarrels over Shakespeare or Aeschylus are not likely to be of any considerable aid in "salvaging civilization."

Certainly, nothing less than "complete latitude"—within the limits of the laws governing obscenity, profanity, insanity and feeble-mindedness—must be guaranteed at all times to college professors in the classroom. Otherwise, they can not function as emanated intellects and decisive leaders of student opinion.

The sensible procedure in regard to the extra-mural expressions of professors would seem to be about as follows: (1) When a professor speaks or writes for the non-college audience, he should be under no limitations beyond legal penalties and considerations of elementary good taste—and we should avoid identifying the latter with mere conventionality; (2) the professor never should speak in the name of the institution unless officially requested to do so.

The investigating committee closes with a ringing challenge to the university administration:

"Until the president and board definitely can assure the faculty that all university procedures and policies, including decisions of the board itself, are legitimate topics for orderly discussion and criticism by the faculty, it is idle to assert that freedom of speech prevails at Ohio State university."

It is not enough to study and control the relation of private profit of war after war has begun. Unless we are hypocrites we must, when we say we want peace, begin to study the relation between profit and war when other nations offer to buy from us the sins of war.

Instead of calling its task complete, the war policies commission should start its work again, and this time, start at the beginning.

It is not enough to study and control the relation of private profit of war after war has begun. Unless we are hypocrites we must, when we say we want peace, begin to study the relation between profit and war when other nations offer to buy from us the sins of war.

Instead of calling its task complete, the war policies commission should start its work again, and this time, start at the beginning.

It is not enough to study and control the relation of private profit of war after war has begun. Unless we are hypocrites we must, when we say we want peace, begin to study the relation between profit and war when other nations offer to buy from us the sins of war.

Instead of calling its task complete, the war policies commission should start its work again, and this time, start at the beginning.

It is not enough to study and control the relation of private profit of war after war has begun. Unless we are hypocrites we must, when we say we want peace, begin to study the relation between profit and war when other nations offer to buy from us the sins of war.

Instead of calling its task complete, the war policies commission should start its work again, and this time, start at the beginning.

It is not enough to study and control the relation of private profit of war after war has begun. Unless we are hypocrites we must, when we say we want peace, begin to study the relation between profit and war when other nations offer to buy from us the sins of war.

Instead of calling its task complete, the war policies commission should start its work again, and this time, start at the beginning.

It is not enough to study and control the relation of private profit of war after war has begun. Unless we are hypocrites we must, when we say we want peace, begin to study the relation between profit and war when other nations offer to buy from us the sins of war.

Instead of calling its task complete, the war policies commission should start its work again, and this time, start at the beginning.

It is not enough to study and control the relation of private profit of war after war has begun. Unless we are hypocrites we must, when we say we want peace, begin to study the relation between profit and war when other nations offer to buy from us the sins of war.

Instead of calling its task complete, the war policies commission should start its work again, and this time, start at the beginning.

It is not enough to study and control the relation of private profit of war after war has begun. Unless we are hypocrites we must, when we say we want peace, begin to study the relation between profit and war when other nations offer to buy from us the sins of war.

Instead of calling its task complete, the war policies commission should start its work again, and this time, start at the beginning.

It is not enough to study and control the relation of private profit of war after war has begun. Unless we are hypocrites we must, when we say we want peace, begin to study the relation between profit and war when other nations offer to buy from us the sins of war.

Instead of calling its task complete, the war policies commission should start its work again, and this time, start at the beginning.

It is not enough to study and control the relation of private profit of war after war has begun. Unless we are hypocrites we must, when we say we want peace, begin to study the relation between profit and war when other nations offer to buy from us the sins of war.

Instead of calling its task complete, the war policies commission should start its work again, and this time, start at the beginning.

It is not enough to study and control the relation of private profit of war after war has begun. Unless we are hypocrites we must, when we say we want peace, begin to study the relation between profit and war when other nations offer to buy from us the sins of war.

Instead of calling its task complete, the war policies commission should start its work again, and this time, start at the beginning.

It is not enough to study and control the relation of private profit of war after war has begun. Unless we are hypocrites we must, when we say we want peace, begin to study the relation between profit and war when other nations offer to buy from us the sins of war.

Instead of calling its task complete, the war policies commission should start its work again, and this time, start at the beginning.

It is not enough to study and control the relation of private profit of war after war has begun. Unless we are hypocrites we must, when we say we want peace, begin to study the relation between profit and war when other nations offer to buy from us the sins of war.

Instead of calling its task complete, the war policies commission should start its work again, and this time, start at the beginning.