



The Indianapolis Times

(A SCRIPPS-HOWARD NEWSPAPER)
Owned and published daily except Sunday by The Indianapolis Times Publishing Co.
214-216 West Maryland Street, Indianapolis, Ind. Postage paid at Indianapolis and at additional points where copies are sold.
Subscription rates in Indiana, \$2 a year; outside of Indiana, 65 cents a month.
ROY W. HOWARD, President
EARL D. BAKER, Business Manager
BOYD GURLEY, Editor
PHONE R-ey 6551
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."

Have You Called?
Once again the public service commission has indicated that utility rates must be cut.

A sweeping reduction has been ordered for southern Indiana in the new Insull empire. Whether the reduction will satisfy the residents of that section of the state remains to be seen. The total amount of reduction will amount to but little when spread out among the thousands of customers, but it is a start in the right direction.

In the meantime, the people of this city are paying extortions rates for not only electricity, but for water. If there be any justification for reductions in Marion and in southern Indiana there are twice as many arguments for cuts in this city, and the reductions should be deeper.

The old rates in Marion were approximately 20 per cent lower than those in effect in this city or at least the average rate received by the company was around this figure.

If Indianapolis had the same rates as are given Marion, the people would be saved at least two millions of dollars a year.

Commissioner Cuthbertson, who voted for the reduction in Marion, has charge of the petition of Indianapolis.

He advised a friendly conference between city officials and officers of the light and water companies to effect a "compromise." It is now apparent that the utilities only "compromise" when forced to abandon their extortions and that the only effect of the suggestion has been a delay of a public hearing.

The telephone of the public service commission is Riley 6551. A telephone petition might help this body to make up its mind about Indianapolis.

Wrong Then—Or Now

Behind the collapse of the Lausanne reparations conference before it started is Hoover's refusal to co-operate. There are other factors, such as France's determination to get her pound of flesh and Germany's bitterness after long exploitation.

But there was some chance of a settlement until Washington sent its secret memorandum to Paris announcing that the United States would not play.

Of course this latest statement of American foreign policy is withheld from the American public, just as the American policy on armaments and on Colonial concessions is secret, and just as the American documents on the Manchurian crisis are secret.

But the American public has been given, through dispatches from Paris, a summary of the American secret debt memorandum. As there set forth the Hoover policy is as follows:

There is no connection between German reparations and allied debts to America; reparations must be handled alone by the European powers; there is no prospect of extension of the one-year debt moratorium, much less of any reduction or cancellation; any effort by European nations to formulate a joint policy on American debts will be fought by Washington.

Absurd as this summary sounds, its essential accuracy has been established.

This Hoover European policy, added to his Manchurian policy of running out on the peace treaties, represents a frightfully complete bankruptcy in statesmanship.

Hoover now has reversed his European policy of last summer. Then he admitted that reparations and debts must be handled together; now he denies it.

Then he took the initiative and forced a general moratorium as the only way to prevent international financial ruin; now he not only gives up his initiative and leadership, but refuses even to meet with the other nations.

The opposite Hoover policies of last summer and of today can not both be right. Either he was wrong then or he is wrong today. We thought then, and we still think, that the Hoover policy of last summer was right.

Unless Hoover has the wisdom and the courage to throw the full strength of American leadership into a solution of the interlocked debt-reparations-tariff-disarmament problem, which Europe can not possibly handle alone, the alternative is as black as Hoover described it last summer.

The Twelve-Mile Limit

Prohibition brought the bootlegger and the racketeer; the speakeasy and bathtub gin. Ginger-jake, grapefruit juice from prohibition, as does blinding whisky. Prohibition cut government revenues by millions, and prohibition has caused American trans-Atlantic ships to lose money.

Chairman I. V. O'Connor of the United States shipping board testified to that last fact before a house committee. At the same time he described another hypocritical phase of the experiment.

O'Connor, when questioned, the press dispatches reported, testified that all American lines except Duluth operate bars after passing the twelve-mile limit, but can not advertise the fact. This causes passengers to go to Europe on foreign boats where they are sure of obtaining a drink.

Add this to the other accepted deceptions national prohibition has created and fostered.

Finally enough will accumulate, until the people no longer can stand the law. Then—and the time is not far off—prohibition again will become a matter for the states to be concerned about.

Deportation Tyranny

Last May the Wickersham commission unanimously signed and issued a report on alien deportations under the labor department. This report charged "grave abuses" in enforcing the deportation law, "unnecessary hardships" inflicted upon aliens, labor department methods that are "unconstitutional, tyrannical and oppressive."

The commission expressed amazement that the secretary of labor now sits in judgment upon his own department's acts. It urged creation of a board of alien appeals to prevent needless suffering and to humanize the law.

Since then these findings have been backed by other investigators. The Los Angeles Bar Association found that the arrest of aliens without warrants is a fairly general practice, that they often are denied bail, counsel or access to friends, pending investigation.

Dr. Jane Clark of Bernard college in a recent book says: "It must be conceded that the present procedure affords opportunity for deprivation of rights considered fundamental to Anglo-Saxon law, where personal liberty is involved."

The Wickersham expert, Reuben Oppenheimer, writing in the New Republic, styles the current drive by Secretary Doak's men, "the deportation terror."

What has the administration done? Worse than nothing.

Mr. Hoover's answer to the charges of his own commission is a recommendation in his message to

congress that "the deportation laws should be protected by the issuance of a certificate of residence."

Doak, emboldened by his chief's complicity, parrots the strange suggestion that all aliens have their fingerprints placed upon naturalization papers. He also apes old world methods by urging that the government be given the right to cancel naturalization within five years after issuance of certificates, in case the alien "violates the law in such manner as to show lack of proper intention at the time of his admission to citizenship."

In short, the administration, accused by its own expert commission of abuse of power, asks for more power to abuse.

Who Murdered Marian McLean?

Charles Bischoff, a 45-year-old degenerate, recently confessed the murder of an innocent 6-year-old girl, Marian McLean, in Cincinnati. The murder, an act of multiple sex perversion, was one of the most horrible ones conceivable. If there ever was a situation to incite mob violence, this is one. Playing alive, followed by slow burning in oil, would on the face of it seem too good for Bischoff.

In his purely human reactions to such an atrocity as this, the professional criminologist instinctively feels much as the man in the streets. His first impulse is to reach for his can-opener and make for Bischoff. But as a criminologist he recognizes that such an attitude is folly and short-sightedness.

To a man of Bischoff's perverted personality, such an act was as natural as a contribution to the community chest by a law-abiding and benevolent citizen. He was impelled by this almost incredibly brutal act by a complex set of forces running all the way through his defective heredity and his twisted life experience to the special stimulation of his abnormal impulses the day of the murder.

The police records and the court processes will say officially that Charles Bischoff murdered Marian McLean. But a more fundamental view of this atrocity will find guilty, not this degenerate, but a delinquent tardy society—specifically, in this case, the state of Ohio.

We mention Ohio only because the crime was committed within its formal political boundaries. Ohio is not behind most other states in her criminological theories and practices. In this case, her police showed themselves better controlled and more restrained than those of most sister states.

What does it mean when we say that society murdered Marian McLean? Nothing more or less than the plain fact that psychiatrists, sociologists, and criminologists for years have been urging upon society the adoption of methods which would have made it nearly impossible for such a type as Bischoff to rove at freedom. The conservative and traditional opposition to such measures is responsible for tragic cases such as these.

Bischoff's actual arrest and identification as a degenerate criminal was the work of police detectives when Bischoff was nearing the half-century mark. He should have been picked out as a child by observant teachers or medical examiners and handed over to the special stimulation of his abnormal impulses of mankind.

Not Too Far!

We each can contribute something toward the prevention of war. We can educate our children to hate it, can use our influence against the maintenance of vast military establishments and can refuse to assist in any conflict which does not appeal to us as justifiable, or just.

On the positive side we can work for the establishment of judicial tribunals and, above all else, for the ideal of setting controversies by arbitration.

Further than that, however, is it dangerous to go under existing conditions.

Disloyalty Wrong Course

UNDER existing conditions, the 50 or 60 recognized governments represent the highest form of law and order we possess.

Until we have created something better, it would be unwise to threaten them by open disloyalty under certain circumstances for the sake of proving devotion to a wish.

Any government could be wrecked by the refusal of a sufficient number of its citizens to bear arms in case of attack.

It might be better, perhaps, if some governments were to be wrecked, but that depends on their character.

Indeed, the whole question of war still revolves around specific cases, specific commitments and specific ends.

M. E. Tracy

Says:

Ohio Ministers Refuse to Support War. What Would They Do if the United States Were to Be Invaded by a Foreign Foe?

NEW YORK, Jan. 23.—Ohio ministers go on record as opposed to war, as unwilling to give it their "financial or moral support," as solemnly refusing to "acknowledge the obligations" which the supreme court of the United States declared to be binding on citizens when it decided the Macintosh case.

Before making up your mind as to the merits of such a sweeping declaration, just ask yourself what would be the popular attitude had it been pronounced by 400 Communists, instead of 400 clergymen, and whether that has not some bearing on the principle involved?

Any One Can Start It

WAR is an activity over which no faction, no party and no nation exercises complete control, or anything like it.

Since anybody can start it, its prevention obviously hinges on a world-wide attitude.

Besides, there have been cases, and there probably will be cases in which war represents the only means of protection or relief.

People have been forced into war not only by attack, but by such tyranny and oppression as made war preferable.

Invasion; Then What?

WHAT would these clergymen do if the United States were to be invaded by a foreign foe, such as Japan, for instance?

Not that such a thing is likely, but that it is possible and that they have laid themselves open to every kind of possibility.

Would they regard it as wise to accept defeat without resistance and risk the end of American civilization?

Theory and Reality

HERE is a big difference between ideals and ideas, between what we hope for in theory and what is attainable in practice.

We must go on dreaming of better days to come, since that is essential to progress, but in doing so, we can not afford to ignore realities.

Among all the realities with which we are acquainted, human nature is the most intimate and exacting.

Strive as we may to make ourselves believe that war is contingent on this or that custom, philosophy, or doctrine, we generally are forced to fall back on the very regrettable fact that in nine cases out of ten, it is traceable to the common weaknesses, impulses and caprices of mankind.

Not Too Far!

WE each can contribute something toward the prevention of war. We can educate our children to hate it, can use our influence against the maintenance of vast military establishments and can refuse to assist in any conflict which does not appeal to us as justifiable, or just.

On the positive side we can work for the establishment of judicial tribunals and, above all else, for the ideal of setting controversies by arbitration.

Further than that, however, is it dangerous to go under existing conditions.

Disloyalty Wrong Course

UNDER existing conditions, the 50 or 60 recognized governments represent the highest form of law and order we possess.

Until we have created something better, it would be unwise to threaten them by open disloyalty under certain circumstances for the sake of proving devotion to a wish.

Any government could be wrecked by the refusal of a sufficient number of its citizens to bear arms in case of attack.

It might be better, perhaps, if some governments were to be wrecked, but that depends on their character.

Indeed, the whole question of war still revolves around specific cases, specific commitments and specific ends.

People's Voice

Editor Times—There is much talk of tax reduction in our state today. It is rather amusing to me that the leader in the special session movement is Senator Lee Hartzell of Ft. Wayne, who, during the 1931 session, was such a strong for old age pensions, which the Fraternal Order of Eagles has shown repeatedly is a cheaper method of caring for the worthy old men and women than the poorhouse system.

To add to the amusement, Governor Leslie takes great credit for vetoing the pension bill last year, when he saved the taxpayers money.

I don't know what kind of arithmetic the Governor and the senator studied, but Ramsey county, Minnesota, under a pension law, is paying \$201.12 a person annually, while the poorhouse system government statistics show, cost \$490.78 a person annually. Where does the Governor get the idea his veto saved the people's money?

J. PIERCE CUMMINGS.
3601 Kenwood avenue.

Editor Times—While reading the front page of The Times of Jan. 11, I noticed William Cardinal O'Connell's "roast" in regard to radio crooners. Three rousing cheers and a diamond studded gold medal for him and the big "roast."

At last the voice of a red-blooded man is heard above the boop-a-doo. I love you, brand of degeneracy. I have heard over the radio for the last five years. It's time for some one to make a protest and I am glad to see O'Connell has started the ball to rolling.

Before 1916 any man trying to "roon" would have received a red necktie from his audience for his efforts, and any one brave enough to suggest a salary of \$500 a week to a "crooner" might have died soon to send a farewell message to mother.

We seem to be among men with children's brains. OBSERVER.

What was the value of the California almond and English walnut crops in 1930?

The almond crop was valued at \$2,700,000; English walnuts \$11,160,000.

Poor Bait!



DAILY HEALTH SERVICE

Typhoid Germs Persist After Illness

BY DR. MORRIS FISHBEIN

Editor, *Journal of the American Medical Association*, the *Health Magazine*

IT is commonly understood that

typhoid is now under control. If Chicago had today the same typhoid rate that existed in 1890, it would have approximately 60,000 cases of typhoid each year instead of less than 200. With that amount of typhoid, there would be, of course, a serious mortality.

But the menace of typhoid continues to exist as long as there are persons who carry about the germs of the disease and who do not take measures to prevent dissemination of germs into food and water where they may multiply and bring about epidemics.

In a recent discussion of the subject, Dr. James G. Cumming, chief of the bureau of preventable diseases in the United States army

medical corps, pointed out that the last typhoid outbreak of importance in this country was due to just such an incident.

In 1922, 400 people attended a church supper. Forty-four of these people developed typhoid and four died.

An investigation revealed that potato salad had been eaten by all who were taken sick and was indeed the only food at the table that was eaten by all those who were taken sick. The dressing used from the salad was eliminated from suspicion because it had been boiled.

It was found that four women had prepared the salad, peeling and slicing the boiled potatoes while still warm. After the potatoes were peeled and diced, they were put away in pans covered with towels until the next day.

In this suitable atmosphere the