

The Indianapolis Times

(A SCRIPPS-HOWARD NEWSPAPER)

ROY W. HOWARD, President
TALCOTT POWELL, Editor
EARL D. BAKER, Business Manager
Phone-Riley 5551



ROY W. HOWARD
Give Light and the
People Will Find
Their Own Way

MONDAY, MAY 22, 1933.

INDUSTRIAL RECOVERY

THE best news today is the increase in business activity. The big question heard everywhere is: Will the upturn last, will industrial production, stocks and commodity prices continue to rise?

The answer depends in large part on the industrial recovery bill. With the passage of that all-important measure, the country will have better than an equal chance to move forward.

Fortunately, most business and political groups, in addition to the labor unions, are supporting this Roosevelt bill enthusiastically. Nevertheless, dangers are developing which may kill it. The public, which has so much at stake, should understand these dangers as they become clearer this week.

The chief danger is in the fight over taxes. About \$220,000,000 of additional revenue is needed to pay interest on and retire the \$300,000,000 public works bond issue. This secondary issue concerning taxes is obscuring the larger issue of the bill itself.

There are good reasons why the public should not be burdened with an insidious and invisible general sales tax, especially because the farm relief law involves a virtual sales tax on necessities.

We believe—as the administration apparently believes—in listing three other methods of taxation ahead of the sales tax—that increased income, surtaxes, corporation and luxury taxes are fairer and more effective methods than the sales tax.

But much more serious than the threat of the sales tax as such is the danger that long and bitter debate on this subject may delay and eventually destroy the large industrial recovery plan.

The administration, with its absolute control of both house and senate, has sufficient power to prevent such debacle, provided it senses the danger in time.

It is less probable that the minority business interests opposing the bill can kill it in an open fight, though it would be unwise to ignore this obstruction altogether. The administration should have no difficulty in showing that the few industrial and financial groups fighting against this bill are in general the same discredited groups opposing bank reform, securities reform, and tariff reform.

A third danger arises in the administration itself. The President, in his proper recognition of the plight of the oil industry, has suggested that the petroleum stabilization bill in the interest of quick action be attached to other pending legislation—presumably to the industrial recovery bill.

This is a gamble. Whether it is wise parliamentary strategy remains to be seen. The industrial recovery bill—originally intended to eliminate unfair competition and facilitate minimum hours and maximum wages—already has been loaded down with the companion public works measure.

To make it carry the additional load of the contested oil bill is very risky. The oil bill could stand alone. Merging might sink both measures, and the oil industry, along with all other industries, would lose.

Having taken this risk, the administration should be alert to cut loose the oil bill on its own merits, if the added load should appear to be sinking the industrial recovery bill.

THE UNFAIREST PRACTICE

THE 1930 census revealed some 2,000,000 children under 18 at work in American mills, mines and shops. Recent investigations in Maryland, Connecticut and Pennsylvania show a disquieting increase in child exploitation. What shall be done about this survival of medievalism?

There are three ways to combat the gainful employment of minors.

One is through industrial action. This has failed. The "baby strikers" of Pennsylvania textile mills, protesting wages of \$1 and \$2 a week and incredible shop conditions, won only a baby victory. Even the active aid of Governor Pinchot's wife failed to obtain substantial gains for the strikers.

Another is state action. This, too, has failed. This year forty-four legislatures met. All had been told that adults want the jobs held by the children. Sentiment ran high. Yet Utah alone among these forty-four states enacted a complete new child labor law.

New York, New Jersey, and New Hampshire passed minimum wage laws for minors; slight gains were made in Indiana and Minnesota. But the prohibition of child labor through state laws failed signally and miserably.

The third way is through federal mandate. Action on the child labor amendment has been fairly encouraging. Six states—Michigan, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Washington, and New Hampshire—have ratified this year. Resolutions are pending in Massachusetts, Illinois, New Jersey, and West Virginia, all of whose legislatures still are in session.

But this method, too, is slow. It is nine years since the amendment was put up to the states, and only twelve out of the needed thirty-six states have ratified.

THE TRANSPORT PROBLEM

THE question of how rail and highway transportation is to be worked out remains to be solved. Two recent supreme court decisions underline our need for a definite program.

In one case, the court held, in effect, that railroads can extend their operations through the use of motor trucks without getting permission of the interstate commerce commission.

This ruling came down after several New York terminal companies had sued to enjoin the Pennsylvania railroad from using its own trucks for transferring goods in the New York area.

In the other case, a Texas law putting

truck companies under strict supervision of the state railroad commission was upset. Texas sought to regulate the rates, hours of employment, and methods of operation of all carriers using state highways; but the supreme court overruled the state's refusal to grant a permit to a trucking company in a test case.

These rulings only emphasize our need for a comprehensive program to deal with the whole question of rail and highway transportation.

HONOR IN WORLD AFFAIRS

NO other American President ever has taken so decided a position of leadership at a critical juncture in world affairs as did President Roosevelt in his message to some fifty-four states of the world.

One might call to mind Washington's neutrality proclamation at the outbreak of the French revolutionary wars, Jefferson's embargo and nonintercourse act, Theodore Roosevelt's action in settling the Russo-Japanese war, the arbitration treaties negotiated under Taft and Wilson, the peace efforts of Wilson in 1918, Harding's summoning of the Washington disarmament conference, and Hoover's encouragement of the Kellogg pact. But none of these compares in realism, daring and possibilities for good with Mr. Roosevelt's present stroke.

Washington and Jefferson were more concerned with American policy than with world relations. The action of Theodore Roosevelt in 1905 was suggested by the two combatants. The arbitration treaties of 1911-1915 were mild affairs, not at all adequate to prevent war.

Wilson had undermined his peace efforts by secretly assuring the allies that his sympathies were with them, and that the United States might enter the war on their side.

The Washington disarmament conference, aside from its far eastern treaties, which since have proved "scraps of paper," did little more than agree to scrap obsolete armament. The Kellogg pact, as actually signed, was the greatest tissue of fraud and futility in the history of modern international relations.

Mr. Roosevelt's appeal, however, goes to the root of matters and may save the world from the greatest military calamity which thus far has overtaken it.

The Roosevelt message was extremely timely and strategic. The allies seemed determined to reject the German demand for equality through increasing its armed forces to the level of the armaments of the neighbors of Germany. But they also frowned upon giving Germany equality through cutting down their own disproportionately large armaments. A clash of policies was imminent, which easily might have bathed the world once more in blood.

President Roosevelt had the sense and knowledge to recognize that the case of the allies against Germany was very weak, so long as they sat tight with their vast armaments and denied Germany the right to reasonable military and naval strength.

The only ground for holding Germany down was the ancient and riddled scarecrow of war propaganda, to the effect that she had been the sole aggressor in 1914. To attempt to keep Germany relatively disarmed in a world bristling with armaments was both illogical and unfair.

Germany was bound, under the circumstances, to attempt to rearm, with consequences which might prove incalculably disastrous to humanity.

The sensible and just thing to do was to give Germany equality through reduction of the armaments of her overarmed neighbors. The MacDonald plan envisages a real step in this direction. President Roosevelt seized the opportunity to recommend this as the starting point for an equitable solution of the tangle.

This procedure will afford justice to Germany and, at the same time, will put Hitler in a hole if he plans any grandiose military gesture. If, on the other hand, he acquiesces in the Roosevelt-MacDonald proposals, he will cut the ground from under those who charge him with being merely an irresponsible firebrand.

There is one notorious defect in the MacDonald plan which will need to be remedied before it will hold any assurance of guaranteeing peace and security.

This plan rests upon the promise of gaining "security by consultation under the Kellogg pact." But so long as the hypocritical and deceptive reservations to this pact are allowed to stand, there is no protection in the document.

According to these reservations, which Britain and France insisted upon putting into the Kellogg pact before they would sign it, the signatory powers do not renounce wars of self-defense, wars in defense of areas of special interest like India and the Caribbean, wars in fulfillment of previous treaty obligations, or wars engaged in to execute sanctions of the League of Nations.

In other words, the Kellogg pact, so long as hamstrung by the reservations, does not apply to any war likely to be waged. There is no diplomat worth his salt who could not bring any war within one of these four exempted categories.

Mr. Roosevelt has moved to spike this sham when he proposes that the nations agree that "they will send no armed force of whatsoever nature across their frontiers."

There is no way of renouncing war save actual renunciation under any and all circumstances. Once any exception is made, the door is wide open for every kind of subterfuge, evasion, and deceit.

PLAIN TALK ON WAR DEBTS

OWEN D. YOUNG'S pungent remarks about America's responsibility for the world depression is the kind of plain speaking that we ought to have had a long time ago.

We insisted that the debts be repaid, he says, and the only practical way in which our debtors could pay us was by sending us their goods.

We would not let them do that, so they had to send us their gold; and they sent it, Mr. Young declares, until "we ruined the currency and banking systems of the world, including our own."

Now, having done all of this, we are prepared to go into hysterics on a moment's notice at the mere suggestion that the London conference may result in a scaling down, a partial or total cancellation, of some of the sums owed us.

Ready to face the realities in every other field, we have persisted in being blind where

the debts are concerned—blind and, one might add, not a little dumb.

We have tried to put them in a vacuum, where they could be considered by themselves in all their pristine beauty; and because of this we have got farther and farther away from contact with the hard facts of the situation.

Is it just to put it that way? Is that a viewpoint which an intelligent American can conscientiously hold? Is Mr. Young's summing up fair?

Many people, probably, will think not. Nevertheless, it is worth considering.

Look back for a moment at the way in which we have treated the war debts. We have tried to insist that they bore no connection whatever to any other phase of post-war politics or economics.

We have contended stoutly that they had no relation to reparations—although any infant might know that our former allies would not pay us if Germany did not pay them.

We have sworn that they had no relation to tariffs—though no reputable economist would for a moment admit that point. We used foreign loans to expand our export trade in blithe ignorance of the fact that that just increased the difficulties our debtors must meet in paying us.

It looks, in short, very much as though we have deluded ourselves persistently about the debts ever since the war. Perhaps it is about time that we listened to people like Mr. Young.

HITLER'S BIG PROBLEM

THE more one thinks about Chancellor Hitler's reichstag speech on disarmament, the more one becomes amazed at the incredible folly of the German Nazis' anti-Jewish campaign.

Herr Hitler's speech was reasonable and restrained. It was the speech of a man arguing a just cause with intelligence and moderation.

It has made an excellent impression everywhere, and it has done Germany a great deal of good in the court of world opinion.

But the biggest hurdle of all that the German cause must surmount is the antagonism and distrust aroused by the anti-Jewish campaign of Hitler's own party. That campaign rearoused all of the old fear and distrust of World War days.

If Hitler seeks a peaceable working-out of Germany's problems, as his reichstag speech implies, the biggest obstacle in his path is the one that his own followers put there.

A former mayor who now has a job as an elevator operator in the Capitol at Washington just has been made a Kentucky colonel by Governor Leflore. Well, an elevator operator is used to ups and downs.

At this season of year, an optimist is a man who believes his garden will produce vegetables as big as those pictured in the seed catalogs.

Soviet Russia just has floated its largest loan at the high interest rate of 10 per cent. Leads one to suspect that the nation is in the red.

The new Roosevelt forestry army of thousands of men armed with axes comes a little too late; we should have had it a couple of years ago, when all those nutty "champion tree sitters" were doing their stuff.

Most people see nothing wrong with dictators, provided they dictate to somebody else.

Perhaps the reason so many ex-bathing beauties become star actresses in the talkies is because they know their lines.

M. E. Tracy Says:

EUROPE presents anything but an auspicious background for peace conferences. Conservative England is plainly worried, while shrewd foresighted France hardly knows which way to turn.

Hitlerism justly can be blamed, but Hitlerism is a logical consequence of the wholesale blundering that has characterized European policy since the war.

Hitlerism was not only on the way, but due to him, three years ago. England knew it, France knew it, everybody knew it, but nothing was done.

Though pretending to wish a better setup, statesmen went right on with their small-minded jockeying for advantage, their pitifully inadequate compromises, their partial agreements and restrictive alliances.

There is a definitely French coalition stretching across central Europe, a definitely anti-Italian Balkan bloc, and a definitely stupid idea that peace can be arranged in spite of it all.

It is right that we should confer with European representatives if and when they desire. It is not right that we should close our eyes to the realities of their situation or expect more than is reasonably possible under the circumstances.

WHAT they really want from us is a further reduction of war debts; just as great a reduction as we can be persuaded to grant, and for just as little in return as they can get away with.

They will consent to a certain degree of disarmament if we make it worth their while. They will accept a tariff treaty, with such reservations as are necessary to safeguard the advantages they now enjoy.

They will co-operate for the stabilization of money if it is on such basis as will keep the dollar relatively high in comparison with their own depreciated currencies.

I am well aware of how harsh such statements sound, but we have been messing around with European politics and problems for the last seventeen years, and what have we to show for it? We have 50,000 dead in France and ten times as many sick or disabled veterans at home.

We have a tax load that is breaking our backs. We have a League of Nations we can't stomach, a Russia we thus far have failed to recognize and a Hitler in the Kaiser's place.

We have the envy if not the ill will of those we tried to help and the privilege of fighting for rights and reforms which we assumed would be recognized as part of the victory.

DISARMAMENT is desirable if not essential to world recovery, but we are going to buy Europe's consent, when Europe has everything to gain by it? If Europe paid less for armies and navies, it would have more with which to pay its debts. Yet the prevailing idea seems to be that we ought to reduce those debts in exchange for Europe's agreement to maintain smaller armies and navies.

The argument is that we can depend on increased trade with Europe if this bargain goes through, but who knows? Why not adopt the French custom of demanding a little guarantee? Already, some European journals are predicting another war, with us taking part and, presumably, giving the usual credit for munitions and supplies.

Why not take a little time to see just where we are going before we get in too deep?

The Shot Heard 'Round the World!



:: The Message Center ::

(Times readers are invited to express their views in these columns. Make your letters short, so all can have a chance. Limit them to 250 words or less.)

A. T. & T. Employee

The financial page of your paper for May 18, carries the following sub-headline: "Dividend Declaration by A. T. & T. Forces Shorts to Cover." Why not add another line, "Forces Employees to Cover?"

For the last year Thursday has been the dreaded day for employees of the A. T. & T., as on that day, nicknamed Ax Day, notice of layoffs are given to the unlucky ones, and very few Thursdays go by without some one getting the call. Week before last there were three, last week one. This week how many?

Every man comes to work with fear in his heart, fearing that he may be the one to go, realizing that his chance to live may be taken away from him and his family. There is no nest egg laid away for a rainy day—not on the salaries paid by this company.

Wouldn't it be a good policy for your paper if your advertisers no longer could afford to pay your rates, if you would lay off your carriers, and your printers and then sit back and say, "Now the advertiser can afford to pay." Silly, isn't it? Our company does that and it's good business.

The employees of the Bell and A. T. & T. are all banking on The Times to help. What say, editor, do we get it?

By P. T. A. Federation

The retiring executive board of the Indianapolis Federation of Parents-Teachers Associations desires to thank The Indianapolis Times for the attention given to the interests of the federation in the last two years of its administration. The service has done much to help promote the aims of the parent-teacher movement in Indianapolis, and has our sincere appreciation.

Daily Thought

But his wife looked back from behind him, and she became a pillar of salt.—Genesis 19:26.

THE first vice of the first woman was curiosity, and it runs through the whole sex.—Richardson.

Doughnut Not as Bad as Its Reputation

BY DR. MORRIS FISHBEIN

Editor, Journal of the American Medical Association and of Hygiene, The Health Magazine.

FOR years it has been the general impression that the doughnut is among the most indigestible of all foods enjoyed by man.

Because of the way in which a doughnut is prepared, it resembles a number of forms of bread and cake, except for its increased content of fat.

The additional fat makes the doughnut richer in calories than other forms of pastry, and it has usually been understood that fats and foods, rich in fat are digested more slowly than foods with lesser amounts of fat, because of the difficulty of penetration of the intestinal juices into these foods.

On the other hand, foods that remain fairly long in the stomach have "staying" qualities and are more likely to satisfy hunger than foods which spend a lesser time in the stomach.

In a recent survey of the subject, made in the department of physiological chemistry of Yale university,

it was found that there were no untoward effects on the health of the men when they consumed as many as six doughnuts daily for six consecutive days.

None of the men developed constipation under such diets and, indeed, doughnuts made in the modern manner with proper distribution of the fat did not in any way affect the digestibility of a mixed diet which included doughnuts.

In the studies, the doughnuts were made to substitute for equal amounts of other proteins, fats, and carbohydrates and under these circumstances the body chemistry was not disturbed in any way.

Apparently, then, the doughnut has been maligned without sufficient evidence as to its bad character.

Given a trial under the right conditions, it seems to accommodate itself to the human system.

:: A Woman's Viewpoint ::

BY MRS. WALTER FERGUSON

ENGLISH women, we read, boldly are challenging the opinion of Mary Borden, who insists that women consider the institution a necessary prelude to happiness.

As I see it, the trouble is that we make such a to-do about the first, and so seldom do anything to promote future honeymoons. And every successful marriage should have several of them. The more the better.

It makes little difference to a bride and bridegroom, who are drowned in oceans of love anyway, if they cannot have a trip to Niagara Falls or some other symbolic spot. Wherever they happen to be right then, the moon is of honey

long wed, can find again the glamor they thought was lost forever.

If men were wise, they would arrange such little jaunts. If women were smart, they would insist upon them. To get away together if only for a day, to try once more as one did in that glad honeymoon time, to be the perfect companion, would do wonders to keep marriage the fine thing it was meant to be, and that it could be if we gave as much careful thought to its middle years as we do to its beginning.

We can get along very well, I am convinced, without any first honeymoon. It is when we forego the second, third, and fourth that we jeopardize our happiness.

It Seems to Me

BY HEYWOOD BROWN

NEW YORK, May 22.—I am of the opinion that the anti-Hitler agitation in America has become somewhat hysterical and has gone too far.

This is not said with any sense of superiority, because I have joined in the outcry and on numerous occasions have expressed an acute distaste for the Nazi leader.

I still don't like him. Nor do I suggest that the silly things and the cruel things which have been done under his leadership should be allowed to pass without stinging comment on the part of America.

But obviously we are not getting anywhere just by hating Hitler. It would be far more useful to make an honest attempt to understand him and the background which has made his rise to power possible. Quite unwittingly a good many of us (and I mean myself among others) have been playing into the hands of the war mongers.

I didn't realize it until somebody tipped me off. A friend of mine who runs a tinny place called "Heywood," your column has been pretty bad in the last few weeks. You haven't tackled this German situation with any seriousness.

"I'm a Jew, and, even so, I don't want to see an entire nation put on the spot because of Hitler's anti-Semitism. We're living 1914, 15, '16, and '17 all over again."

Old Ghost Walks

AND so I went home in due course and looked at something I had written about Hitler. I looked at it in cold type, which somehow gives a different effect, and I found that by substituting "the Kaiser" in every place where "Adolf Hitler" appeared it might have stood as a pretty characteristic piece for the days when America was doing its road work in preparation for the great war.

I don't think I used the word "atrocious," but the rest of it practically was a carbon copy.

Then, as now, there was talk of an economic boycott. We were asked to sign little slips of paper pledging ourselves never again to buy anything made in Germany, and as we signed, we never thought of the fact that it was a pledge to press starvation and misery upon millions of workers whom we never had seen.

And, indeed, it was a bond by which this enmity was to be carried out against their children and down through the generations.

Thousands chanted in the streets of New York, "We want Hitler with a rope around his neck!" and I remembered that we were going to "hang the Kaiser to a sour apple tree."

We didn't, but we chased him into Holland, and the might and majesty of the German empire was crushed. And we did it all by hating. And we were proud of our hatred.

Hatred as a Fine Art

I REMEMBER now an afternoon in the year 1917 in the city of Lyons. They were bringing back French soldiers from German prison camps. The Germans sent back those who were mutilated or tubercular or in any way unfit for further war utility.

And a large French colonel with a big voice made a speech to these men. And he said, "You have been sent back by the Germans because they believe that there is no further service which you can render to France. They are wrong. You can help to keep alive that hatred which is so necessary to our cause."

"And now I want to hear you give that cry which so long has been forbidden to you—Vive la France!" And his voice rang out and he raised both arms in the air, and we went mad and shouted.

Yes, we were so proud of hatred that we wrote it into a treaty and declared that it should stand for all time. The German menace was gone forever. We had hated it out of existence, and we carved "Hate" across the face of this final compact.

But it wasn't. At the end of fifteen years we found that the blood of the world had been shed to put a Hitler in the place of a Kaiser. And so we are starting to say, "Let's begin hating all over again."

The Menace of the Weak

I SAY "No!" to that. I think something quite different must be tried.

By a curious paradox, it is not the strength of Germany which menaces the world, but its weakness.

In establishing conditions which insured the economic ruin of the nation, we ruined ourselves.

It was a little as if a swimmer said to his enemy, "I'm going to drag you down to the bottom of the ocean and choke you to death." Sooner or later that swimmer would find that unless he loosed his grip he, too, would be mired down among the dead men.

Democracy failed in Germany. Socialism failed. The Communist party never came actually into power, but its achievements and effectiveness in that land hardly can be called brilliant.

Everything failed, and everything was meant to fail. It was written in the treaty that Germany was to be forever a death valley of dry bones.

And so we have no right to look askance at even the most outlandish things which have happened beyond the Rhine.

And hate of a two-edged weapon. It slashes both the hated and the hater. Put down that sword!

(Copyright, 1933, by The Times)

I Found Life

BY CHRISTIE RUDOLPH

Oh calm integrity that comes when day is through.

With falling shadows that emerge from silent crevices.

Enfold my thoughts into one sweet reverie of life—

My body remains a part of the morning's falling dew.

Across a vague precipice dawns the beauty of meaning.

Gone all perverted illusions into one clear vision of life—

That rings through my heart of love, and laughter.

The things that deduce from the souls of precious few.

Gone that inertia of mind—in yesterday's sorrow.

Joyously I partake of wine, with the dawn of tomorrow.