



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, \$3 a year; outside of Indiana, 65 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 Enterprise Association, Newspaper Information Service and Audit Bureau of Circulations.

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

The Case of Vehling

The coroner of this county stands convicted by a jury of attempting to use his office to extort money from relatives of accident victims.

There is no gratification, only sorrow, when a man who has achieved some measure of public approval and esteem, is sent to a prison to repent his betrayal of the people who trusted him.

But no matter how much sympathy may be extended to the weak official who falls, there must be an ever determined drive to force public officials to merit esteem and confidence.

In the case of Vehling, The Times played a somewhat important part in disclosing his violation of his oath.

When complaint after complaint came to this newspaper of outrageous actions in connection with the bodies of victims of accident or murder, The Times investigated. It printed the results of its inquiries. The grand jury, prosecuting attorney and now a trial jury have taken the necessary and proper action.

Vehling was one of those who do not learn. He had failed to take the warning of what happened to the Duvalls, to the officials who ran rampant in their defiance of decency until The Times exposed them.

He had failed to interpret his own election as a protest against a spoils system of government. Unfortunately he must pay a rather severe lesson for that lack of intelligence.

Public officials who betray their trust must be exposed and punished if the people are not robbed of their rights. That is the only way that public office can be lifted to a place of confidence and esteem. It is very necessary that those who go into office do so with the idea of serving, not robbing, those who elect them.

His fate should be a new signboard to the tempted.

Cardozo

This is a great day. Chief Judge Benjamin Nathan Cardozo of New York has been nominated for the United States supreme court, and his confirmation is assured. He is the one man in the country whose ability to carry on the eminent tradition of Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes can not be questioned.

National issues, Presidents and political parties come and go—but the supreme court goes on forever. The supreme court can and does make decisions of Presidents and laws of congress.

It writes in effect a new Constitution year by year. Its decrees are the highest law in the land, from which there is no earthly appeal. No other judicial body in all the world has its far-reaching power.

Therefore, the nomination of Justices for the high court is the gravest power exercised by a President of the United States. By the choice of these judges, who can serve for life, a President casts his shadow upon the vital decisions of government many years after he is dead—casts his shadow for good or evil.

For two years the Scripps-Howard newspapers have fought for the appointment of Cardozo. But he has not been the candidate of any one group or faction. It has been our experience in consulting leaders of the bench and bar from coast to coast to find them all, regardless of party, ready to admit that Cardozo stood almost alone in legal eminence.

Even the politicians who had their own judicial candidates, mostly second and third-rate men, never doubted question Cardozo's unique qualifications.

Politicians, however, did question the partisan expediency of his appointment. They said he was a Jew, and one Jew on the supreme court already was one too many. They said he was from New York, and New York had too many representatives on the court.

They said he was a liberal, and the departure of Holmes gave a good opportunity to stack the court more heavily with reactionaries.

Probably no one but the President, who is subjected to it, can appreciate fully the strength of such partisan political pressure.

The more glory, then, to the President in rising above petty politics. It was easy enough for newspapers and deans of law schools and independent lawyers to support Cardozo. But the President had to override bosses of both parties, avid for the spoils of office.

To his honor, he it said, the President took the course of true statesmanship. The great Holmes will have a worthy successor on the supreme bench.

How We Got Our Blue Sunday

The Sunday church shows and the anniversary of the Lord's day Alliance have brought to the fore once more the question of Blue Sundays. The alliance boasts that it closed 1,000 stores in New York alone in 1930, as well as standing guard over the threatened revival of the pagan Sunday.

No less a person than Herbert Hoover has written Broth'r Bowby of the alliance, congratulating him on his work.

"I am interested to learn that the Lord's Day Alliance of the United States will celebrate its forty-third anniversary. Its valiant work in promoting reverent respect for the Sabbath day is a potent factor in preserving the sacredness of that day, against secularism."

The apostles of Blue Sunday talk much about the pagan Sunday, from which they are trying to save us. They might be startled to find that the Sunday taboo, which they are trying to perpetuate, is of pagan origin and was originated by Mithraism, the most bitter opponent of early Christianity.

Primitive people, everywhere, under the yoke of an all-pervading supernaturalism, enforced many "rest days." The Jews, with only a little more than fifty of these days, were rather more restrained than many others. This whole subject has been admirably summarized by Professor Hutton Webster in his "Rest Days." The Jews, of course, forbade work on Saturday, the real "Sabbath day," but not on Sunday.

The Christians chose Sunday rather than Saturday as their day of worship and thanksgiving, largely because this was the day on which Christ was believed to have arisen. But the early Christians did not adopt for the Sunday the sabbatarian taboos of the Jews. After they had met for confession, communion and inspiration, they scattered to their homes and might work or play as they saw fit, subject to few and slight restrictions.

To the Mithraites, however, Sunday was a very holy day. They worshipped the sun as the source of light, and hence of all goodness which they identified with the light. Sunday to them was "the great day of the sun." Shortly before Constantine became converted to Christianity, the Mithraites prevailed.

M. E. Tracy

Says:

Most People Took It for Granted That Organized Killing by the Military Forces of a Government Meant War, but It Appears They Were Wrong.

NEW YORK, Feb. 16.—According to some authorities, it is not war as long as the nations engaged avoid calling it war.

Says Quincy Wright, professor of international law at Chicago university:

"Japan and China are not at war because neither has expressed an intention to make war."

"However," he adds, "if hostilities reach sufficient magnitude, it doubtless would be in the competence of third states to regard war as existing."

A very interesting viewpoint not only because of its particular bearing on the far-eastern situation, but because of its general bearing on the Kellogg pact.

It would seem that in outlawing war, we merely outlawed official declarations.

Lacked Definition

IT is only fair, of course, that we should be precise in the use of words, but why not beforehand, instead of afterward.

What was the use of outlawing war until we had agreed on an exact definition.

Most people took it for granted that organized killing by the military forces of a government meant war, but it appears that they were wrong.

The act must be preceded by a definite expression of intent, or reach a certain magnitude, before it can be regarded as the real thing.

In other words, a nation could create quite a disturbance, without making war in the technical sense, provided it did not say too much about its plans, or mobilize too extensively.

This Is War!

SUCH quibbling may be scientifically correct, but it confuses common folks and common folks still have to pay the bill.

Men in the street know what they mean by war, whether international lawyers do, or not.

It required no League of Nations commissioners to convince them that a state of war existed in the neighborhood of Shanghai.

With thousands dead and hundreds of thousands homeless; with transports unloading men by the regiment; with airplanes dropping bombs and the roar of heavy guns making night and day hideous, and with a great city being reduced to ashes, common folks will call it war.

Principles Count

IN the same way, common folks will call it stealing when a public official gets away with money that does not belong to him, even though the law demands a more technical name, and they will call it lying when a witness does not tell the truth.

Common folks still prefer to think in principles, rather than in strained and narrow definition. It enables them to keep some of the simpler virtues in mind.

Common folks will not admit that a thief is guiltless because somebody charged him with burglary when the requirements of law demanded that he be charged with larceny.

Ambiguity on Top

THE civilized world is quibbling itself into a vicious state of ambiguity and hypocrisy.

It has grown so bloated with definitions and technicalities that it can't tell what much of anything means.

The law, whether as administered by a justice of the peace, or a world court, has become as obscure and incomprehensible to common folks as a witch doctor's chant, although it was intended to protect their peace and protection.

Restlessness and crying occurred in 82 per cent during the day, and in 51 per cent during the night.

In handling these infants, it was found to be possible through

Questions and Answers

WHO was Orion, for whom the constellation was named?

He was a mighty hunter, in Greek legend, who was blinded because of his treatment of Merope, daughter of Oenopion of Chios, and upon the suggestion of an oracle recovered his sight by exposing his eyeballs to the rays of the rising sun.

After his sight was restored, he lived as a hunter with Artemis. Upon his death he was placed in the heavens as a constellation.

HOW many women are there in the United States congress?

Mrs. Thaddeus Caraway of Arkansas in the senate and Florence Kahn of California, Mary T. Norton of New Jersey, Ruth Bryan Owen of Florida, Ruth Pratt of New York, Edith Norse Rogers of Massachusetts and Effiegene Wingo of Arkansas in the house of representatives.

WHAT is specific gravity?

The ratio between the weight of a body and the weight of an equal volume of water.

WHAT is a certified check?

A bank check which was written or stamped on its face the word "accepted," "certified," "good" or an equivalent, with the signature of the cashier or the paying teller. This certifies that the signature is genuine, that the drawer has sufficient funds in the bank to meet the check and that the bank is bound to pay it.

WHAT is an angle less than a right angle called; also, an angle greater than a right angle?

Less than a right angle is called an acute angle, but less than a straight angle, is called an obtuse angle.

DOES the Island of Elba, on which Napoleon was exiled, belong to Italy or France?

It is the province of Leghorn, Italy, but when Napoleon was sent there it was under French jurisdiction.

WHO can not claim immunity from the taint of materialism?

We have built our homes on sham and show, and forgotten how satisfying simple living can be. So let's cultivate cabbage, contentment and character and see what that can do for us.

WHO so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.—Gen. 9:6.

EVERY unpunished murderer takes something away from the security of every man's life.—Daniel Webster.

WHO so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.—Gen. 9:6.

EVERY unpunished murderer takes something away from the security of every man's life.—Daniel Webster.

WHO so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.—Gen. 9:6.

EVERY unpunished murderer takes something away from the security of every man's life.—Daniel Webster.

WHO so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.—Gen. 9:6.

EVERY unpunished murderer takes something away from the security of every man's life.—Daniel Webster.

WHO so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.—Gen. 9:6.

EVERY unpunished murderer takes something away from the security of every man's life.—Daniel Webster.

WHO so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.—Gen. 9:6.

EVERY unpunished murderer takes something away from the security of every man's life.—Daniel Webster.

WHO so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.—Gen. 9:6.

EVERY unpunished murderer takes something away from the security of every man's life.—Daniel Webster.

WHO so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.—Gen. 9:6.

EVERY unpunished murderer takes something away from the security of every man's life.—Daniel Webster.

WHO so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.—Gen. 9:6.

EVERY unpunished murderer takes something away from the security of every man's life.—Daniel Webster.

WHO so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.—Gen. 9:6.

EVERY unpunished murderer takes something away from the security of every man's life.—Daniel Webster.

WHO so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.—Gen. 9:6.

EVERY unpunished murderer takes something away from the security of every man's life.—Daniel Webster.

WHO so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.—Gen. 9:6.

EVERY unpunished murderer takes something away from the security of every man's life.—Daniel Webster.

WHO so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.—Gen. 9:6.

EVERY unpunished murderer takes something away from the security of every man's life.—Daniel Webster.

WHO so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.—Gen. 9:6.

EVERY unpunished murderer takes something away from the security of every man's life.—Daniel Webster.

WHO so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.—Gen. 9:6.

EVERY unpunished murderer takes something away from the security of every man's life.—Daniel Webster.

WHO so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.—Gen. 9:6.

EVERY unpunished murderer takes something away from the security of every man's life.—Daniel Webster.

WHO so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.—Gen. 9:6.

EVERY unpunished murderer takes something away from the security of every man's life.—Daniel Webster.

WHO so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.—Gen. 9:6.

EVERY unpunished murderer takes something away from the security of every man's life.—Daniel Webster.

WHO so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.—Gen. 9:6.

EVERY unpunished murderer takes something away from the security of every man's life.—Daniel Webster.

WHO so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.—Gen. 9:6.

EVERY unpunished murderer takes something away from the security of every man's life.—Daniel Webster.

WHO so sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.—Gen. 9:6.