

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, 45 cents a month.
BOYD GURLEY, Editor ROY W. HOWARD, President EARL D. BAKER, Business Manager
PHONE—Riley 5551 TUESDAY, JUNE 28, 1932
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 Two-Thirds Rule—or Ruin
Give Roosevelt time enough and he will wreck himself — and his party. His trickiness grows. Each convention move is more fantastic than the last.
If victory can be won by sharp practices, he has the nomination in the bag; that is, unless the convention revolts before the vote is taken. If not, the country will have time to discover the weakness of Roosevelt before the November election.
The only question seems to be whether he will wreck himself and lose the nomination, or wreck the party and lose the election.
As this is written, Roosevelt is attempting to slip in the back door with another version of the rule which the convention was ready to kick out the front door, until he lost his courage and fled. This latest maneuver is less defensible than the earlier one.

Here is the record. It is important.
At other conventions, Roosevelt has favored the rule requiring a two-thirds vote for nomination. Now that he is a candidate, he has sought to ditch this rule. That could be explained away as a legitimate change of opinion—except for the fact that he has tried to change the rule in the midst of the game.
This ruse was not advanced until the delegates began to arrive at Chicago, and until there was doubt of Roosevelt's ability to get a two-thirds vote—the test met by every Democratic presidential candidate in the last 100 years.

Roosevelt decided to abrogate the two-thirds rule, effective on the first ballot. But the trick exploded in his face. Not only his opponents, but some of his own leaders, such as Senator Pat Harrison, denounced the unfairness of the proposal. The convention reaction was bitter.

Roosevelt did a characteristic thing. Under fire, he turned and ran. Many of his supporters refused to believe the press reports of his Albany statement, until, several hours later, it was confirmed by his Chicago headquarters.

Then many of these same supporters were angry because he had deserted the fight into which he had dragged them. But they were not quick enough to see that this merely was another trick.

Perhaps if the reader will study this statement, he will understand how the Chicago convention was led for several hours into believing that Roosevelt actually had called off his fight on the two-thirds rule. The statement said:

"It is true that the issue was not raised until after the delegates to the convention had been selected, and I decline to permit either myself or my friends to be open to the accusation of poor sportsmanship, or to the use of methods which could be called, even falsely, those of a steamroller.

"I accordingly am asking my friends in Chicago to cease their activities to secure the adoption of the majority nominating rule at the opening of the permanent organization.

"I ask this of those delegates who are honoring me with their support, and who number many more than a majority. I trust, however, that the committee on rules may recommend some rule to insure against the catastrophe of a deadlock or prolonged baling.

"If, thereby, a greater emphasis on harmony and the more important objective of the party is attained, we will have served best our party and our nation."

If you read it a second time, you will find the catch. You will see that, after closing the door on the plan, he opens it again by requesting a rule to "insure against the catastrophe of a deadlock."

In other words, abrogation of the two-thirds rule if Roosevelt fails to get two-thirds of the votes.
Then, four hours later, Roosevelt appeared to reverse himself again—again closing the door, and again leaving another crack to slip through tomorrow, if necessary.

He announced through his Chicago headquarters that the rules committee had acted "spontaneously" and without consultation with him. He disavowed responsibility for the new rule.

But at the same time he reaffirmed his afternoon statement, which requested some such rule.

What Roosevelt will do tomorrow, what new ruse he will attempt in his desperate effort to grab the nomination, no one knows—least of all his followers.

But it doubtless will be in line with his record as Governor and as a candidate for the presidential nomination. That is a record of vacillation and trickery.

Science and Politics
In Chicago the prayers and attention of the entire medical staff of that city's great country hospital are being directed toward saving the life of a tiny baby girl, weighing 2 pounds and 15 ounces.
She lives in an incubator and gets her food through an eye dropper, as she gains ounce by ounce.
In Washington, President Green of the American

Federation of Labor joins with responsible congressmen in pleading for the lives and health of millions of Americans, while President Hoover blocks the relief bill with his opposition to its public works program.

The American Federation of Labor's monthly survey of business announces that 1,400,000 persons have lost their jobs since the first of this year, and that by next January there will be no fewer than 13,000,000 idle. All agree that relief must come from congress, and quickly.

"In the face of this crucial problem of life and health or starvation," says the survey, "delays of congress in passing relief legislation are sickening."

Is it not incredibly strange and cruel that while science labors day and night to conserve a feeble spark of human life, politics should permit the loss of health and life among millions of children and adults?

Until politics becomes as zealous to forestall sickness and death as science is now, we can not call ours a government worthy the name.

Another Medical Victory
Another disease has been conquered and another group of names has been added to that glorious list of medical heroes who have risked death by a dread infection to save their fellow-men from the same terror.

This time it is typhus fever that has been conquered. The victor is Dr. R. E. Dyer, one of the surgeons of the United States public health service.

He has perfected a serum, made from the blood of guinea pigs inoculated with the pulverized bodies of fleas that carry the plague. The serum, it is announced, is an absolute preventive against the disease.

For months Dr. Dyer and his associates worked with the germ-laden fleas. To prove the efficacy of their serum, they permitted the fleas to remain upon their arms and legs over night and even over weekends. They ran the risk of death to carry out their work and establish their results.

Their heroism recalls the role of other brave ones, some of whom were martyrs in the fight. It recalls Hideyo Noguchi, citizen of all the world, born in the mountains of northern Japan, who sleeps today in Woodlawn cemetery, New York. He died at Accra, on the Gold Coast of Africa, the victim of a mosquito whose bite was laden with yellow fever.

One is reminded also of Major Walter Reed and his associates, who showed that the stegomyia mosquito carries yellow fever and who made it possible to stamp out yellow fever in Cuba. A number of Reed's helpers died of yellow fever.

One thinks also of the late Sir David Bruce, braving the tropic heat of Africa to prove that the tsetse fly caused sleeping sickness.

For centuries typhus has been a dread plague. During the Middle Ages, it ravaged Europe. Until 1854, it was confused with typhoid fever because of the similarity in symptoms.

A sure preventive for typhoid has been in use since the first of the century, and was used by all the armies in the World war.

A Wise Move
The Medical Society of New Jersey has set up a committee to limit the designation of "specialist" to physicians scientifically qualified to assume it.

When the committee has completed its work, any doctor who wants to practice as a specialist must submit his scientific and personal credentials for a strict examination, and if he is turned down he simply must list himself as a general practitioner.

The ruling will appeal to the ordinary citizen as exceedingly sensible, worthy of emulation by other state medical societies. The layman who wants a specialist is, after all, more or less at the mercy of chance.

In many localities many inexperienced young sawbones, fresh from his internship, may list himself as a specialist, and his prospective patients have no way of judging his qualifications.

Such a scheme as this of New Jersey looks like a very good way of handling the situation.

A contract bridge player who spanked his wife for failing to return his lead is being sued for divorce. That ought to make spanking a common play for married bridge players.

A school superintendent says children are not as well trained at home as they were thirty years ago. Parents asleep at the switch, we suppose.

The New York reporters certainly overlooked one bet when Amelia Earhart came back. They forgot to ask her what she did with that \$20 bill.

Police Ordered to Wink at Vice, a Cleveland headline says. What they probably meant was: Police Ordered to Keep Winking at Vice.

Just Every Day Sense
BY MRS. WALTER FERGUSON

ALREADY window signs are being distributed for use before the November elections. They recite this proud boast: "We have voted as a patriotic duty to insure good government and to demonstrate our appreciation of the Revolutionary fathers who fought and died to give us a constitutional government."

Yet having won this pretty placard, one still might fall short of patriotism. Since merely voting, or so it always have seemed to me, demonstrates neither devotion to country or common sense. It is how one votes that counts.

It is said that almost 50 per cent of Americans do not vote at all. Which may not be such a calamity as it sounds. The trouble is that about 75 per cent of those who do never know what they are voting for.

And the individual who goes to the polls without making some conscientious effort to study issues and find out about the principles at stake, might as well remain at home. His country will be served as well in either case.

There is something ignoble in the sight of herds of people being shoehorned into booths to stamp a ballot at the dictation of another, be that other an individual or a party.

VOTING is a high privilege. Only he who considers it as such is worthy to exercise it. And the man who regards it as a duty probably never will give much attention to the matter, since we generally perform our duties half-heartedly.

The American people vote when they feel strongly about an issue. They remain at home when there seems to be little at stake. This, I think, is natural.

Nor do I credit the tale that it is always the better element that stays at home and the thug who votes. Millions of morons are too negligent to exercise their balloting rights, which is just as well in the long run.

The only really unpatriotic citizen to my notion is the fellow who votes for a party instead of a principle, who is a Democrat because he lives in Georgia, or a Republican because he was born in Vermont.

And most of the "patriots" I have known loved their country just like that.

M. E. Tracy

Says:
We Have Played Safe and Stood Pat Regarding the Problems at Hand Long Enough to Prove the Folly of This Course.

NEW YORK, June 28.—Senator Barkley made a good keynote speech. Even Republicans should have been impressed. At any rate, it showed them what kind of attack they face and what kind of arguments they must meet.

It was paragon, of course, but in a robust, straightforward way. If Democratic speakers take it as a model, we shall have an interesting and instructive campaign.

While Senator Barkley indulged in some vitriolic criticisms of the Hoover administration, he did not fail to back them up with a comprehensive review of the facts. Neither did he sidestep when it came to telling what might have been done to alleviate the country's present distress, or what the Democratic party ought to do if placed in power.

He handled the tariff, foreign trade, farm relief, unemployment, war debts and prohibition without gloves. While accorded frequent applause, it was his reference to the latter that brought down the house.

Delegates cheered and paraded for ten minutes when told that congress should pass a resolution calling for repeal of the eighteenth amendment. That showed what they considered the paramount issue.

G. O. P. Applied Muzzle

DELEGATES to the recent Republican convention felt the same way, but were muzzled by order of their master. In that particular respect, Democrats enjoy a distinct advantage. Whatever else may be said of their convention, it is not covered by the shadow of federal patronage, or bound by the necessity of insuring an administration for which it has no enthusiasm.

To some extent, the difference is explained by the fact that the Republicans are in, while the Democrats are out, but not wholly. Republicans are inclined to submit to discipline for the sake of efficiency. Democrats are inclined to tolerate inefficiency for the sake of free expression.

Such distinction always has separated the two parties, as is illustrated vividly by the convention just held and the one now in progress.

To think of the Republican record is to think of bosses like Hanna, Platt, and Quay. To think of the Democratic record is to think of storms and stampedes like those which characterized the conventions of 1896, 1912, and 1924.

Action Is Needed

WHENEVER a critical situation arises, the Republican party is prone to stand pat and play safe, even at the price of smothering public opinion, while the Democratic party leans toward more liberal and extreme measures.

Each philosophy has its strong points and its weak spots. Each should be appraised, not as a permanent guide, but by its adaptability to the problems at hand.

We have played safe and stood pat regarding the problems at hand long enough to prove the folly of it. The country needs to stir it out of its bewilderment and fear is action.

That is what the Democratic party is in good position to promote, not only because of the peculiar issues that have arisen, but because of its doctrinal background.

Sensor Barkley has struck the right chord—lower tariffs, friendly trade relations with other governments, human sympathy in dealing with causes of domestic distress, and, above all else, frankness with regard to the eighteenth amendment, which is not separable from our economic condition, but hopelessly bound up in it.

TODAY IS THE WORLD WAR ANNIVERSARY
U. S. TROOPS IN ITALY
June 28, 1918

ON June 28, 1918, the first American soldiers arrived in Italy to take part in the advance on Austro-Hungarian lines. One regiment of troops landed and proceeded to the front for future action.

West of Meriville, British troops advanced on a three-mile front for nearly a mile, overwhelming the Thirty-second Saxon and Forty-fourth German regiments.

The hamlets of L'Epinet, Verte Rue, and Le Becque were taken in the offensive.

Attacks were reported occurring in the Hungarian area at the garri-sons of Gyor and Pecs.

From Spain a report came informing that Austria had asked that country to attempt opening diplomatic relations with the entente, with a view to establishing general peace.

Questions and Answers

To whom should one apply for a copyright?

The register of copyrights, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

How many of the prisoners in the United States are men? Women?

In 1929 there were 4,390 female prisoners and 112,236 male prisoners.

Name the five boroughs of New York City?

Manhattan, Brooklyn, Bronx, Richmond and Queens.

On what date did the house of representatives pass the Philippine independence bill?

April 4, 1932.

Daily Thoughts

Heaven and earth shall pass away; but my words shall not pass away.—St. Luke 21:33.

Happy child! the cradle is still to thee a vast space; become a man, and the boundless world will be too small to thee.—Schiller.



Exercise for Adults Often Puzzles

BY DR. MORRIS FISHEIN
Editor Journal of the American Medical Association, and of Hygiene, the Health Magazine.

In a consideration of exercises most suitable for adults, Dr. Jesse F. Williams, in his book on "Personal Hygiene Applied," recognizes that most grownups nowadays are inclined to sedentary activities.

This is due to two causes which he mentions; namely, the formal calisthenic exercise of our younger days were not such as to stimulate repetition or any pleasure; as a result they promptly were given up when school days were over.

Second, the athletic games and sports for the grownups of today, learned in the schools of their youth, were so highly organized and required such elaborate accessories

that they also were not continued in adult life.

Probably the principal reason is the fact that the coming of the automobile during the last twenty-five years has made walking a lost art and interest in exercise purely vicarious and casual.

One investigator who studied the values of exercise adopted by 1,000 business men found that only about one-half of these business men followed a regular program of physical activity.

Least attention was given to physical activity by those between 25 and 35 years of age. With few exceptions the athletic activities followed in youth are the ones that persist into grownup life.

There is no reason why grownups should not indulge in physical activities, provided, however, that

they do not place too much strain on aging tissues.

The most favorable physical efforts for adults are swimming, hiking, camping, golfing, skating, and possibly horseback riding, hunting, fishing and gardening.

Persons after 30 years of age are not adapted to efforts requiring great speed. Golfing, hiking and skating are forms of sport which can be tried for long periods of time.

The gradual wearing out of the muscle power, the sagging of the walls of the body, particularly of the abdomen, make perils for the person of advanced age which should prevent him from partaking in sports better reserved for the later years of adolescence and youth.

Next—The benefits of exercise.

I do not think it is even necessary for a political commentator to be physically present to hear a Democratic doing be with us yet, lest we forget, lest we forget.

I am frank to admit that during all these portions of the speech I was at Joe's, eating a meat-ball sandwich. But I did get back in time for the demonstration. It was fine. Nobody could question its sincerity.

Two Texas delegates were punched in the eye and Weeping Willie Upshaw, who sat just in front of me, shook his fist at the marchers. It was worth a cycle of Snell. I always say, "I am not a Democrat, but I am pro-American to the core."

I am pro-American to the core. I should like for an American to hold the world's heavyweight championship title—by upright fairness, clean of graft and steal.

I believe that the two NBC sports announcers covering that fight gave us as unbiased, nonpartisan, truly accurate account of the fight as possible to have broadcast. How well, I wager, those announcers would have liked to have voiced their own personal opinions of the decision tendered by the referee and judges!

Round by round Schmeling ever was the aggressive fighter, "always pushing forward, never a step backward, following Sharkey step by step," ever on the offensive, tactful, artful, and confident.

I firmly believe that if Sharkey had had to face Schmeling even two more rounds he would have been knocked out. How that bad eye of Sharkey's was banged and bled, and the while Schmeling being "cool as a cucumber," unmarred and little hurt.

The recording of the crowd showed how it felt toward the decision. When Sharkey was introduced, he was applauded highly and cheered. But not so at the finish. They had witnessed before their very eyes a great steal.

I am wondering, was this match above board? Could it have been a prearranged affair? The way now lies open for a return bout and another half million in gate receipts. If this is true, God pity prize fighting promotion should the public find it has been duped again by this pair. If it was not a prearranged bout, wasn't Sharkey surprised, and Schmeling, too?

Indianapolis Times, give us the opinions of Dempsey, Tunney and others on this fight. Please be more liberal in your sporting material.

C. F. HENDRICKS.

Editor Times—Those foolish, peace-loving people who can't see further than the end of their own noses and deny that there exists any basic conflict in our society

they also were not continued in adult life.

Probably the principal reason is the fact that the coming of the automobile during the last twenty-five years has made walking a lost art and interest in exercise purely vicarious and casual.

One investigator who studied the values of exercise adopted by 1,000 business men found that only about one-half of these business men followed a regular program of physical activity.

Least attention was given to physical activity by those between 25 and 35 years of age. With few exceptions the athletic activities followed in youth are the ones that persist into grownup life.

There is no reason why grownups should not indulge in physical activities, provided, however, that

they do not place too much strain on aging tissues.

The most favorable physical efforts for adults are swimming, hiking, camping, golfing, skating, and possibly horseback riding, hunting, fishing and gardening.

Persons after 30 years of age are not adapted to efforts requiring great speed. Golfing, hiking and skating are forms of sport which can be tried for long periods of time.

The gradual wearing out of the muscle power, the sagging of the walls of the body, particularly of the abdomen, make perils for the person of advanced age which should prevent him from partaking in sports better reserved for the later years of adolescence and youth.

Next—The benefits of exercise.

I do not think it is even necessary for a political commentator to be physically present to hear a Democratic doing be with us yet, lest we forget, lest we forget.

I am frank to admit that during all these portions of the speech I was at Joe's, eating a meat-ball sandwich. But I did get back in time for the demonstration. It was fine. Nobody could question its sincerity.

Two Texas delegates were punched in the eye and Weeping Willie Upshaw, who sat just in front of me, shook his fist at the marchers. It was worth a cycle of Snell. I always say, "I am not a Democrat, but I am pro-American to the core."

I am pro-American to the core. I should like for an American to hold the world's heavyweight championship title—by upright fairness, clean of graft and steal.

I believe that the two NBC sports announcers covering that fight gave us as unbiased, nonpartisan, truly accurate account of the fight as possible to have broadcast. How well, I wager, those announcers would have liked to have voiced their own personal opinions of the decision tendered by the referee and judges!

Round by round Schmeling ever was the aggressive fighter, "always pushing forward, never a step backward, following Sharkey step by step," ever on the offensive, tactful, artful, and confident.

I firmly believe that if Sharkey had had to face Schmeling even two more rounds he would have been knocked out. How that bad eye of Sharkey's was banged and bled, and the while Schmeling being "cool as a cucumber," unmarred and little hurt.

The recording of the crowd showed how it felt toward the decision. When Sharkey was introduced, he was applauded highly and cheered. But not so at the finish. They had witnessed before their very eyes a great steal.

I am wondering, was this match above board? Could it have been a prearranged affair? The way now lies open for a return bout and another half million in gate receipts. If this is true, God pity prize fighting promotion should the public find it has been duped again by this pair. If it was not a prearranged bout, wasn't Sharkey surprised, and Schmeling, too?

Indianapolis Times, give us the opinions of Dempsey, Tunney and others on this fight. Please be more liberal in your sporting material.

C. F. HENDRICKS.

Editor Times—Those foolish, peace-loving people who can't see further than the end of their own noses and deny that there exists any basic conflict in our society

SCIENCE

BY DAVID DIETZ
Theories on Origin of Earth Start With Assumption That It Was Born From Accident to Sun.

MODERN theories of the origin of the earth all start with the assumption that the earth and other planets were born as a result of some sort of accident to the sun.

The first theory of this sort was proposed in 1740, when Buffon, the French naturalist, suggested that the planets might be fragments of the sun split off by the oblique impact of comets.

This daring theory, which we must admire for its speculative boldness, was, in considering the planets to be fragments of the sun, in line with modern theory. But the mechanism suggested was impossible.

We know today that the central portion of a comet, the so-called nucleus, is only a mass of dust and gas, containing some bits of matter the size of pebbles and perhaps a few larger rocks.

The sun might swallow many comets without any important effect.

At any rate, Buffon's theory seemed to attract no particular attention, while the theory proposed by Laplace in 1854, the nebular hypothesis, captured the imaginations of the entire scientific world.

Laplace's theory held that the sun, the planets and their satellites were evolved from condensation of a great parent nebula.

Encounter Theory Given

IN 1878 A. W. Bickerton, a chemist in New Zealand, suggested the "encounter theory" to account for the origin of the earth. Bickerton, however, published his theory in a journal devoted chiefly to biology, and as a result it seems that it escaped the attention of astronomers both in Europe and America, and was practically unknown until revived and expounded by A. C. Gifford in 1926.

It seems that Bickerton became interested in astronomy because of the excitement caused by the appearance of a nova, or "new star."

Occasionally, a star bursts into a brilliance which it previously did not possess. Such a star is known as a nova, from the Latin word for "new."

It is obvious that only some cataclysmic event in the life of the star could cause it to attain such new brilliance.

It has been suggested that a collision between two stars might account for the appearance of the nova.

This led Bickerton to formulate his theory that a collision between two stars, in which one struck the other at an oblique, glancing blow, might result in the formation of planets, the planets consisting of material which the one star chipped off the other.

But, as already stated, Bickerton's theory received little attention at the time of its publication, and Laplace's nebular hypothesis continued to reign throughout the closing years of the nineteenth century.

Laplace Idea Shattered

IN 1900, two professors at the University of Chicago, Dr. F. R. Moulton and Dr. E. C. Chamberlin, published a mathematical analysis of the Laplace theory, demonstrating that it could not be made to fit the observed facts of the solar system.

They also showed that a contracting nebula would not behave in the way Laplace postulated.

One of the important facts which must be taken into account in theories seeking to explain the origin of the solar system is the fact that most of the matter in the star system is concentrated in the sun.

If we consider the mass or amount of matter in the solar system as 100 per cent, then more than 99 per cent, almost 99.9 per cent of that mass is accounted for by the sun.

The following table, prepared by Professor Moulton, is of interest. It puts the total mass of the solar system at 1 and indicates the fraction of the whole to which each body in the solar system corresponds:

Sun 0.999999
Mercury 0.000001
Venus 0.000004
Earth 0.000003
Mars 0.000003
Jupiter 0.000933
Saturn 0.000285
Uranus 0.000044
Neptune 0.000016
Pluto 0.000003

Total 1.000000

should take a good long look at the hullabaloo now raging in congress.

If, after taking that long look, we are still able to maintain that the class struggle is non-existent, they will be very proper candidates for some institution that looks after nit-wits and keeps them from harm.

Now, as never before, the capitalist class is waging bitter and desperate battle against every proposal designed to make the rich bear their proper share of the nation's expense. The rich fight the corporation tax, the estate tax, the capital losses tax, and in their stead they propose taxes that still further would depress the mass of the people.

Not content with that, they sneak into the provisions of the bill a tariff on coal and oil. And Ogden Mills, who is secretary of treasury, presumably should be an advocate of the people's interest, openly espouses the capitalist interest in the name of "business recovery."

The class struggle, here as everywhere in the contemporary American scene, is so open and obvious that only a fool could deny it. The question, however, is this: Is militant action in the class struggle going to be left entirely to the capitalist, or is the worker going to shake himself out of the sloth produced by decades of class co-operation and organize for militant action in his own interest?

The capitalist is organized, and unless the worker becomes similarly organized and equally powerful through organization, he is destined to increasing misery.

WILLIAM AYERS.
Box 242C, R. 14.

What are the corresponding dates in the Jewish calendar to Aug. 18, 1912, and May 24, 1913?

Aug. 18, 1912, is Elul 5, 5672; and May 24, 1913, is 1 yar 17, 5673.