



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, 22 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

THURSDAY, JUNE 23, 1932.

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."

Unemployed Relief

One of the important actions by the special session of the legislature will be a law under which Indiana can obtain \$8,000,000 available for this state for relief of the unemployed.

While the special session was called for tax relief, it is probable that it would not have been summoned had it not been for the changed attitude of President Hoover in regard to this relief.

The law which appropriated \$300,000,000 for this purpose proposes to loan the money to the states, and through the states to the cities and counties.

Indiana is barred by the Constitution from incurring debts. A law to evade that provision and permit the borrowing of this money will be suggested.

It is most important that the money is not left in the control of those who will use it for political purposes. It is important that it be distributed by those who have a real sympathy with the jobless man.

As a state affair, relief for the unemployed in Indiana has left much to be desired.

For months the claim was boldly made that Indiana would take care of its own problem. When the claim was made, hungry children in mining camps were asking for food and in every part of the state there was distress.

The claim was repeated when charity organizations had exhausted their resources and counties in some industrial centers were unable to sell tax warrants to continue relief.

Perhaps federal aid will not be necessary at all if the legislature should seriously turn its attention to the huge gasoline tax fund and decide that other things are more necessary than highways in these times of stress.

Dr. Butler Sums Up

That was an interesting interview Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler gave Scripps-Howard papers on his return from the Republican national convention.

Dr. Butler believes President Hoover may skin through if state conventions don't repudiate the Hoover prohibition plank, "sired by Muddlehead out of Cowardice." Therefore, Dr. Butler intends to go forth and do his level best to get a lot of states to make just that repudiation.

Here is a Republican who thinks so much straighter than his party that the wonder is he hasn't long since thought himself clean out of it and quit going to its conventions.

His scoring of the federal patronage brigade is scorching. His refusal to be beaten in his great fight for repeal and restoration of state rights is as fine a piece of consistent, undaunted battling as American politics has seen. Thomas Jefferson would be as proud of him as Herbert Hoover is not.

Dr. Butler frankly admits the fine available timber in the Democratic party and the dearth of it in his own, but he also says—and it is true:

"The great trouble is that the Democrats have an almost incredible habit of running their train off the track just as it gets near the station."

Paste that in the hat of the Democratic national convention that meets next week in Chicago.

Here is the greatest opportunity in the party's history to offer the country a brief, clean-cut, concise, specific, constructive platform that will make the Republican affair look more than ever like a water-logged dictionary.

It doesn't need 500 words to say "Repeal the eighteenth amendment."

If the Democrats muffle this chance, they deserve the worst that will be said about them.

As for the candidate—well, turn back to the Butler interview:

"Alfred E. Smith is the best public servant this country has produced since Theodore Roosevelt—bold-gainged, honest, and highly capable."

And there is other good material.

The Republican convention, under Hoover orders, shut its ears to Dr. Butler.

The Democratic convention, under nobody's orders, can profit hugely by that major Republican mistake.

A Sensible Proposal

There is sense in the Hoover arms reduction plan. In two points it is unmistakably clear. These two points are essential. The rest is trimming.

Hoover specifies the amount of reduction (about one-third of existing military and naval strength) and proposes to accomplish reduction according to the scale set for the German army after the war—roughly, 100,000 troops for 65,000,000 population, the troops to be used for internal duty.

The absolute necessity for some such definite and comprehensive program is as obvious as daylight. The world lies under a burden of war casualties, mental, physical and economic, that disgraces its leaders.

The Hoover plan provides a starting point that even statesmen in international conclaves should need no "experts" to interpret.

Accomplishment is, admittedly, not as simple as exposition, but the American proposal provides a basis for this—the German scale.

The Hoover plan is a minimum and in no way radical when measured by the little sacrifice involved in its material realization. The United States army would not be affected, as the proposed cut is a reduction over and above the normal requirements for "policing" the country.

As for the navy, the plan would require actual cuts in the battleship and submarine program, where as some cruiser building might be necessary.

Even so, a sensible step toward disarmament is offered.

There are two ways of approaching disarmament. One is the evasive and diplomatic budgetary method, by which investment in arms is reduced.

This is unsatisfactory and impractical, because reductions usually are so small as to influence the potentiality of war not at all.

The second is the direct scrapping method.

Disarmament is not, as statesmen incline to believe, a process of mental contortion wholly divorced from reality. It is as realistic as the application of an acetylene torch to the steel of a dismantled ship.

This was the method used to disarm Germany. True, Germany had enemies sufficiently determined in their attitude to disarm her by force. But the situation is not without analogy here.

Civilization has an enemy more potent and impressive than vengeful allies confronting defeated Germany. That enemy is war and it is not only capable of creating unimaginable havoc if permitted to rise again, but we have learned that it is capable of destroying the world at a stroke.

The Hoover plan seems to recognize the reality of this situation and seeks to promote a realistic conception of it among the statesmen upon whom we

M. E. Tracy

Says:

European Politicians Are Stringing Hoover on Disarmament, Just as They Strung Woodrow Wilson 13 Years Ago.

NEW YORK, June 23.—"Absolutely unacceptable," says Joseph Paul Boncour, speaking for France, with regard to President Hoover's latest disarmament proposal, and the conferees at Lausanne appear to be in for another series of headaches.

The formula of reduction by one-third is too simple. What the diplomats and experts want is an opportunity to horse trade. How else can they prove that their profession means anything? How else can they justify all the gabble about tonnage and caliber?

Besides, President Hoover has shown his hand too freely, has let everybody know how intensely interested he is in disarmament, has created an impression that he is willing to go to almost any length to get it.

European politicians are not overlooking such an obvious bet. Rightly, or wrongly, they assume that the President of the United States is ready to concede much for disarmament, and that it is their business to find out just how much before closing any deal.

To put it brutally, European politicians are stringing Hoover, just as they strung the then Woodrow Wilson thirteen years ago; feeding him flattery, persuading him to lay his cards on the table, weighing the value of every trump that he holds, and then stalling while they think up ways to beat him in the final play.

Stage Not Ready

TO begin with, the stage is not set for genuine disarmament. The world has no substitute for its armies and navies, no agency for keeping the peace or administering justice among governments.

Paradoxically enough, our own government, which is making the most noise about disarmament, has refused to help the world create such agency, has declined to join the League of Nations on any basis, or the world court without reservations.

Of course, Europe regards President Hoover's proposal as just one more play to the galleries, noble from the standpoint of idealism, perhaps, but hopelessly premature.

It is mathematically true that the world could save ten or fifteen billion dollars during the next decade by reducing its military expenditures one-third.

It is equally true that the American people could pay their taxes without great discomfort if they gave up hooch.

It is also true that the American people could pay their taxes without great discomfort if they gave up hooch.

"I fought it when it was unpopular, I reread that Republican plank. That would be asking too much. But we believe you will enjoy reading a second time this direct Smith statement:

"The eighteenth amendment never should have been put into the Constitution. It is unworkable. I attacked it from the time it was first proposed, and prophesied its failure and stated that it would prove to be the greatest curse ever put over an unsuspecting people.

"I fought it when it was unpopular, I reread that Republican plank. That would be asking too much. But we believe you will enjoy reading a second time this direct Smith statement:

"The eighteenth amendment never should have been put into the Constitution. It is unworkable. I attacked it from the time it was first proposed, and prophesied its failure and stated that it would prove to be the greatest curse ever put over an unsuspecting people.

"I fought it when it was unpopular, I reread that Republican plank. That would be asking too much. But we believe you will enjoy reading a second time this direct Smith statement:

"The eighteenth amendment never should have been put into the Constitution. It is unworkable. I attacked it from the time it was first proposed, and prophesied its failure and stated that it would prove to be the greatest curse ever put over an unsuspecting people.

"I fought it when it was unpopular, I reread that Republican plank. That would be asking too much. But we believe you will enjoy reading a second time this direct Smith statement:

"The eighteenth amendment never should have been put into the Constitution. It is unworkable. I attacked it from the time it was first proposed, and prophesied its failure and stated that it would prove to be the greatest curse ever put over an unsuspecting people.

"I fought it when it was unpopular, I reread that Republican plank. That would be asking too much. But we believe you will enjoy reading a second time this direct Smith statement:

"The eighteenth amendment never should have been put into the Constitution. It is unworkable. I attacked it from the time it was first proposed, and prophesied its failure and stated that it would prove to be the greatest curse ever put over an unsuspecting people.

"I fought it when it was unpopular, I reread that Republican plank. That would be asking too much. But we believe you will enjoy reading a second time this direct Smith statement:

"The eighteenth amendment never should have been put into the Constitution. It is unworkable. I attacked it from the time it was first proposed, and prophesied its failure and stated that it would prove to be the greatest curse ever put over an unsuspecting people.

"I fought it when it was unpopular, I reread that Republican plank. That would be asking too much. But we believe you will enjoy reading a second time this direct Smith statement:

"The eighteenth amendment never should have been put into the Constitution. It is unworkable. I attacked it from the time it was first proposed, and prophesied its failure and stated that it would prove to be the greatest curse ever put over an unsuspecting people.

"I fought it when it was unpopular, I reread that Republican plank. That would be asking too much. But we believe you will enjoy reading a second time this direct Smith statement:

"The eighteenth amendment never should have been put into the Constitution. It is unworkable. I attacked it from the time it was first proposed, and prophesied its failure and stated that it would prove to be the greatest curse ever put over an unsuspecting people.

"I fought it when it was unpopular, I reread that Republican plank. That would be asking too much. But we believe you will enjoy reading a second time this direct Smith statement:

"The eighteenth amendment never should have been put into the Constitution. It is unworkable. I attacked it from the time it was first proposed, and prophesied its failure and stated that it would prove to be the greatest curse ever put over an unsuspecting people.

"I fought it when it was unpopular, I reread that Republican plank. That would be asking too much. But we believe you will enjoy reading a second time this direct Smith statement:

"The eighteenth amendment never should have been put into the Constitution. It is unworkable. I attacked it from the time it was first proposed, and prophesied its failure and stated that it would prove to be the greatest curse ever put over an unsuspecting people.

"I fought it when it was unpopular, I reread that Republican plank. That would be asking too much. But we believe you will enjoy reading a second time this direct Smith statement:

"The eighteenth amendment never should have been put into the Constitution. It is unworkable. I attacked it from the time it was first proposed, and prophesied its failure and stated that it would prove to be the greatest curse ever put over an unsuspecting people.

"I fought it when it was unpopular, I reread that Republican plank. That would be asking too much. But we believe you will enjoy reading a second time this direct Smith statement:

"The eighteenth amendment never should have been put into the Constitution. It is unworkable. I attacked it from the time it was first proposed, and prophesied its failure and stated that it would prove to be the greatest curse ever put over an unsuspecting people.

"I fought it when it was unpopular, I reread that Republican plank. That would be asking too much. But we believe you will enjoy reading a second time this direct Smith statement:

"The eighteenth amendment never should have been put into the Constitution. It is unworkable. I attacked it from the time it was first proposed, and prophesied its failure and stated that it would prove to be the greatest curse ever put over an unsuspecting people.

"I fought it when it was unpopular, I reread that Republican plank. That would be asking too much. But we believe you will enjoy reading a second time this direct Smith statement:

"The eighteenth amendment never should have been put into the Constitution. It is unworkable. I attacked it from the time it was first proposed, and prophesied its failure and stated that it would prove to be the greatest curse ever put over an unsuspecting people.

"I fought it when it was unpopular, I reread that Republican plank. That would be asking too much. But we believe you will enjoy reading a second time this direct Smith statement:

"The eighteenth amendment never should have been put into the Constitution. It is unworkable. I attacked it from the time it was first proposed, and prophesied its failure and stated that it would prove to be the greatest curse ever put over an unsuspecting people.

"I fought it when it was unpopular, I reread that Republican plank. That would be asking too much. But we believe you will enjoy reading a second time this direct Smith statement:

"The eighteenth amendment never should have been put into the Constitution. It is unworkable. I attacked it from the time it was first proposed, and prophesied its failure and stated that it would prove to be the greatest curse ever put over an unsuspecting people.

"I fought it when it was unpopular, I reread that Republican plank. That would be asking too much. But we believe you will enjoy reading a second time this direct Smith statement:

"The eighteenth amendment never should have been put into the Constitution. It is unworkable. I attacked it from the time it was first proposed, and prophesied its failure and stated that it would prove to be the greatest curse ever put over an unsuspecting people.

"I fought it when it was unpopular, I reread that Republican plank. That would be asking too much. But we believe you will enjoy reading a second time this direct Smith statement:

"The eighteenth amendment never should have been put into the Constitution. It is unworkable. I attacked it from the time it was first proposed, and prophesied its failure and stated that it would prove to be the greatest curse ever put over an unsuspecting people.

"I fought it when it was unpopular, I reread that Republican plank. That would be asking too much. But we believe you will enjoy reading a second time this direct Smith statement:

"The eighteenth amendment never should have been put into the Constitution. It is unworkable. I attacked it from the time it was first proposed, and prophesied its failure and stated that it would prove to be the greatest curse ever put over an unsuspecting people.

"I fought it when it was unpopular, I reread that Republican plank. That would be asking too much. But we believe you will enjoy reading a second time this direct Smith statement:

"The eighteenth amendment never should have been put into the Constitution. It is unworkable. I attacked it from the time it was first proposed, and prophesied its failure and stated that it would prove to be the greatest curse ever put over an unsuspecting people.

"I fought it when it was unpopular, I reread that Republican plank. That would be asking too much. But we believe you will enjoy reading a second time this direct Smith statement:

"The eighteenth amendment never should have been put into the Constitution. It is unworkable. I attacked it from the time it was first proposed, and prophesied its failure and stated that it would prove to be the greatest curse ever put over an unsuspecting people.

"I fought it when it was unpopular, I reread that Republican plank. That would be asking too much. But we believe you will enjoy reading a second time this direct Smith statement:

"The eighteenth amendment never should have been put into the Constitution. It is unworkable. I attacked it from the time it was first proposed, and prophesied its failure and stated that it would prove to be the greatest curse ever put over an unsuspecting people.

"