



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."

Mr. Hearst's Sad Pliht
Opponents of a heavy income tax on great fortunes, led by Mr. William Randolph Hearst, multi-millionaire newspaper publisher, are becoming over-extravagant and overhysterical in their arguments. Instead of impressing the people with their claims they are in danger of making themselves ridiculous.

This is particularly true when Mr. Hearst tries to scare the millions of persons with small incomes into believing that the tax rates recently imposed by house insurgents are aimed at the little taxpayer.

We quote from one of Mr. Hearst's editorials:

"We have got to cut down on the butcher, the baker and the candlestick maker."

"We will have to use the old automobile and wear the old suits."

"We will have to relinquish those pretty things in the shops that we would like to have for ourselves and the family."

"We will have to get along with the old house and postpone the painting job for another year or two."

"We will have to patch up the old furniture and dispense with all luxuries and even comforts."

And why are all these dire things about to happen to the millionaires of the United States? Well, we quote the answer in Mr. Hearst's own words:

"Our star-spangled representatives at Washington are not interested in diminishing unemployment."

"They are only interested in increasing it."

All of these iniquities and privations, so touchingly pictured by Mr. Hearst, grow out of the fact congress failed to pass the sales tax.

The original tax program in congress, you will recall, called for a sales tax falling on all consumers in the United States—rich and poor alike—and for certain tightening up on exemptions to small taxpayers and certain modest increases in the rates paid by great taxpayers.

Instead of adopting this plan, the house insurgents killed the sales tax and placed wartime rates on great incomes, running up to 65 per cent on incomes exceeding \$5,000,000 a year.

In brief, the big increases are on great incomes.

So, presumably, it is Mr. Hearst and other wealthy men who face the prospect of wearing their old pants, driving their old car, letting the front porch go un-painted, and the like. Some of them even may have to go with an old yacht and shut up one of their country estates.

All of which is a very, very sad picture for the dear public, already grieving because it was not permitted to relieve this distressing condition by being permitted to pay a sales tax.

Seriously, of course, nobody really thinks that our representatives in Washington are "only interested in increasing" unemployment. That would mean that they wanted to increase suffering and starvation. It would amount to treason against their own country.

The charge is so extravagant that it is almost funny.

Whether or not we agree with congress, at least its members are patriotic American citizens, most of whom are doing their level best according to their own lights to serve the government which they love.

In killing the sales tax, the house did so on the ground that it imposed a disproportionate burden on the poor. For a man, be he rich or poor, can wear only a certain amount of clothing, use a certain amount of articles, eat a certain amount of food and enjoy a certain amount of entertainment.

And this law forced the poor man to pay exactly the same tax for those things as it did the rich—violating the fundamental principle that taxes be imposed in proportion to the taxpayers' ability to pay them.

Therefore, the house restored the tax rates on large incomes that prevailed during another great crisis, the World war. That's what all the shouting is about.

Prohibition and the Deficit

High moral ideals were not primarily responsible for putting over prohibition. The purposes were not so noble as they were practical.

Great industrialists believed that prohibition might accomplish two things which they desired: (1) It would bring the workers to the factories in the morning—especially Monday morning—sober, rested and capable of putting in a good day's work; (2) it would insure sober workers, less likely to congregate with their fellows and discuss their wrongs in saloons, thus keeping the laboring class more docile and less likely to revolt.

It was the vast financial support of the dry idealists and fanatics by such men which enabled the Anti-Saloon League and other dry groups to organize their unparalleled political propaganda and intimidation which made prohibition a fact in the constitutional and statute law of the United States.

But these policies hardly could have been put over so rapidly and thoroughly had there not been a special psychological condition in our country. The World war supplied this. Prohibition was sneaked over under cover of the prevalent hysterical tendency of the people of the United States to save and sacrifice to defeat the Kaiser.

Prohibition was part and parcel of war idealism, as much as the freeing of repressed peoples, the sanctity of treaties, the battle for democracy, and the like.

Prohibition has failed in its aims. It has not produced a dry country. It has debauched our liquor habits. It has led to an appalling increase of drinking among the young of the nation. It has provided fertile soil in which the racketeer has spawned. It has encouraged disrespect for law and order. It has led to most serious infractions of our hard-won liberties.

Yet all these things did not suffice to produce any marked governmental revision against prohibition. They will not produce militant determination upon revision or repeal by our political leaders. If we get revision, it will be due to hard, practical economic realities which, in a different field, helped to put over prohibition.

This time it is public rather than private business and finance which will play the decisive role. It is our federal deficit rather than the desire for private prosperity which furnishes the motive power. We face a \$2,000,000,000 deficit in the federal budget.

We know that we well might collect from \$1,000,000,000 to \$2,000,000,000 in additional taxes if we legalized the sale of liquor and collected a stiff excise tax from the sale of lawfully obtained beverages.

The situation will do more to promote practical action than the most disheartening exposure of the "Noble Experiment," or the most irrefutable logic devoted to the issues of liquor consumption.

The current depression will supply the same sort of mass pressure which the World war exerted in leading to the enactment of prohibition. Our fear

is that surely one of the relics of barbarism now in our midst is our present system of military training in the schools. And a large share of the pap that feeds this system is the propaganda about American supremacy in the qualities of the mailed fist.

It is nothing at all to our credit as an educated and a self-exalted people loving people, that whereas one school had military training a century ago, 200 schools now use it. This, at least, is the proud boast of the militarists.

It's high time we were awake to such a menace.

Every country has its junks who scream for "national supremacy." When enough voices join the chorus, that nation is doomed.

Opponents of a heavy income tax on great fortunes, led by Mr. William Randolph Hearst, multi-millionaire newspaper publisher, are becoming over-extravagant and overhysterical in their arguments. Instead of impressing the people with their claims they are in danger of making themselves ridiculous.

This is particularly true when Mr. Hearst tries to scare the millions of persons with small incomes into believing that the tax rates recently imposed by house insurgents are aimed at the little taxpayer.

We quote from one of Mr. Hearst's editorials:

"We have got to cut down on the butcher, the baker and the candlestick maker."

"We will have to use the old automobile and wear the old suits."

"We will have to relinquish those pretty things in the shops that we would like to have for ourselves and the family."

"We will have to get along with the old house and postpone the painting job for another year or two."

"We will have to patch up the old furniture and dispense with all luxuries and even comforts."

And why are all these dire things about to happen to the millionaires of the United States? Well, we quote the answer in Mr. Hearst's own words:

"Our star-spangled representatives at Washington are not interested in diminishing unemployment."

"They are only interested in increasing it."

All of these iniquities and privations, so touchingly pictured by Mr. Hearst, grow out of the fact congress failed to pass the sales tax.

The original tax program in congress, you will recall, called for a sales tax falling on all consumers in the United States—rich and poor alike—and for certain tightening up on exemptions to small taxpayers and certain modest increases in the rates paid by great taxpayers.

Instead of adopting this plan, the house insurgents killed the sales tax and placed wartime rates on great incomes, running up to 65 per cent on incomes exceeding \$5,000,000 a year.

In brief, the big increases are on great incomes.

So, presumably, it is Mr. Hearst and other wealthy men who face the prospect of wearing their old pants, driving their old car, letting the front porch go un-painted, and the like. Some of them even may have to go with an old yacht and shut up one of their country estates.

All of which is a very, very sad picture for the dear public, already grieving because it was not permitted to relieve this distressing condition by being permitted to pay a sales tax.

Seriously, of course, nobody really thinks that our representatives in Washington are "only interested in increasing" unemployment. That would mean that they wanted to increase suffering and starvation. It would amount to treason against their own country.

The charge is so extravagant that it is almost funny.

Whether or not we agree with congress, at least its members are patriotic American citizens, most of whom are doing their level best according to their own lights to serve the government which they love.

In killing the sales tax, the house did so on the ground that it imposed a disproportionate burden on the poor. For a man, be he rich or poor, can wear only a certain amount of clothing, use a certain amount of articles, eat a certain amount of food and enjoy a certain amount of entertainment.

And this law forced the poor man to pay exactly the same tax for those things as it did the rich—violating the fundamental principle that taxes be imposed in proportion to the taxpayers' ability to pay them.

Therefore, the house restored the tax rates on large incomes that prevailed during another great crisis, the World war. That's what all the shouting is about.

It is nothing at all to our credit as an educated and a self-exalted people loving people, that whereas one school had military training a century ago, 200 schools now use it. This, at least, is the proud boast of the militarists.

It's high time we were awake to such a menace.

Every country has its junks who scream for "national supremacy." When enough voices join the chorus, that nation is doomed.

Opponents of a heavy income tax on great fortunes, led by Mr. William Randolph Hearst, multi-millionaire newspaper publisher, are becoming over-extravagant and overhysterical in their arguments. Instead of impressing the people with their claims they are in danger of making themselves ridiculous.

This is particularly true when Mr. Hearst tries to scare the millions of persons with small incomes into believing that the tax rates recently imposed by house insurgents are aimed at the little taxpayer.

We quote from one of Mr. Hearst's editorials:

"We have got to cut down on the butcher, the baker and the candlestick maker."

"We will have to use the old automobile and wear the old suits."

"We will have to relinquish those pretty things in the shops that we would like to have for ourselves and the family."

"We will have to get along with the old house and postpone the painting job for another year or two."

"We will have to patch up the old furniture and dispense with all luxuries and even comforts."

And why are all these dire things about to happen to the millionaires of the United States? Well, we quote the answer in Mr. Hearst's own words:

"Our star-spangled representatives at Washington are not interested in diminishing unemployment."

"They are only interested in increasing it."

All of these iniquities and privations, so touchingly pictured by Mr. Hearst, grow out of the fact congress failed to pass the sales tax.

The original tax program in congress, you will recall, called for a sales tax falling on all consumers in the United States—rich and poor alike—and for certain tightening up on exemptions to small taxpayers and certain modest increases in the rates paid by great taxpayers.

Instead of adopting this plan, the house insurgents killed the sales tax and placed wartime rates on great incomes, running up to 65 per cent on incomes exceeding \$5,000,000 a year.

In brief, the big increases are on great incomes.

So, presumably, it is Mr. Hearst and other wealthy men who face the prospect of wearing their old pants, driving their old car, letting the front porch go un-painted, and the like. Some of them even may have to go with an old yacht and shut up one of their country estates.

All of which is a very, very sad picture for the dear public, already grieving because it was not permitted to relieve this distressing condition by being permitted to pay a sales tax.

Seriously, of course, nobody really thinks that our representatives in Washington are "only interested in increasing" unemployment. That would mean that they wanted to increase suffering and starvation. It would amount to treason against their own country.

The charge is so extravagant that it is almost funny.

Whether or not we agree with congress, at least its members are patriotic American citizens, most of whom are doing their level best according to their own lights to serve the government which they love.

In killing the sales tax, the house did so on the ground that it imposed a disproportionate burden on the poor. For a man, be he rich or poor, can wear only a certain amount of clothing, use a certain amount of articles, eat a certain amount of food and enjoy a certain amount of entertainment.

And this law forced the poor man to pay exactly the same tax for those things as it did the rich—violating the fundamental principle that taxes be imposed in proportion to the taxpayers' ability to pay them.

Therefore, the house restored the tax rates on large incomes that prevailed during another great crisis, the World war. That's what all the shouting is about.

It is nothing at all to our credit as an educated and a self-exalted people loving people, that whereas one school had military training a century ago, 200 schools now use it. This, at least, is the proud boast of the militarists.

It's high time we were awake to such a menace.

Every country has its junks who scream for "national supremacy." When enough voices join the chorus, that nation is doomed.

Opponents of a heavy income tax on great fortunes, led by Mr. William Randolph Hearst, multi-millionaire newspaper publisher, are becoming over-extravagant and overhysterical in their arguments. Instead of impressing the people with their claims they are in danger of making themselves ridiculous.

This is particularly true when Mr. Hearst tries to scare the millions of persons with small incomes into believing that the tax rates recently imposed by house insurgents are aimed at the little taxpayer.

We quote from one of Mr. Hearst's editorials:

"We have got to cut down on the butcher, the baker and the candlestick maker."

"We will have to use the old automobile and wear the old suits."

"We will have to relinquish those pretty things in the shops that we would like to have for ourselves and the family."

"We will have to get along with the old house and postpone the painting job for another year or two."

"We will have to patch up the old furniture and dispense with all luxuries and even comforts."

And why are all these dire things about to happen to the millionaires of the United States? Well, we quote the answer in Mr. Hearst's own words:

"Our star-spangled representatives at Washington are not interested in diminishing unemployment."

"They are only interested in increasing it."

All of these iniquities and privations, so touchingly pictured by Mr. Hearst, grow out of the fact congress failed to pass the sales tax.

The original tax program in congress, you will recall, called for a sales tax falling on all consumers in the United States—rich and poor alike—and for certain tightening up on exemptions to small taxpayers and certain modest increases in the rates paid by great taxpayers.

Instead of adopting this plan, the house insurgents killed the sales tax and placed wartime rates on great incomes, running up to 65 per cent on incomes exceeding \$5,000,000 a year.

In brief, the big increases are on great incomes.

So, presumably, it is Mr. Hearst and other wealthy men who face the prospect of wearing their old pants, driving their old car, letting the front porch go un-painted, and the like. Some of them even may have to go with an old yacht and shut up one of their country estates.

All of which is a very, very sad picture for the dear public, already grieving because it was not permitted to relieve this distressing condition by being permitted to pay a sales tax.