

The Indianapolis Times

(A SCRIPPS-HOWARD NEWSPAPER)
ROY W. HOWARD President
TALCOTT POWELL Editor
EARL D. BAKER Business Manager
Phone—Riley 5551



TUESDAY, JULY 11, 1933.

THE FIRST RECOVERY CODE

SIX months ago this country would have laughed to scorn a prediction that July would see child labor wiped out in cotton textile mills, the stretch-out abolished, the mill village on the way to the scrap heap, 1929 wages guaranteed to unskilled laborers for the shortest work week they ever have known, the right to join labor unions no longer questioned.

Yet this has come to pass with President Roosevelt's signature to the cotton textile code.

So quietly has this revolutionary change in the economic and social structure of the country taken place that it is only by wrenching our minds back a little to the misery of former days, to the bloody strikes of Marion, Elizabethtown, Danville, and other mill towns, to the stark suffering of these later years, when all the hours a man or woman could work would not bring enough to live on, that we comprehend the significance of this new order in a great industry.

The cotton textile code does not establish a Utopia for mill workers. The wages it provides are not enough for decent living. Yet it represents such a long step forward toward sane economic adjustment that it justifies real hope for the future.

Its \$12 and \$13 minimum wages are fixed with a definite understanding that they may be raised at any time, and will be as soon as conditions permit. Its forty-hour week, also, is flexible, and may be shortened if employment lags.

Its limit on production promises stabilization of employment. The President, before he signed the code, plugged loopholes by which it easily might have been nullified.

The code adopted for cotton textiles should convince other industries that their own well-being calls for similar agreements under the recovery law at the earliest possible time.

DR. LOWELL IN WORD AND DEED

THE retiring president of Harvard university, Dr. Abbott Lawrence Lowell, made some noble remarks to the Harvard seniors. Among other things he said:

"Our ignorance of what we are doing does not relieve us of all responsibility for our conduct or our opinions, for to think aright to the best of our capacity is a very grave obligation to those dependent upon us, to those who may be influenced by us, to the community of which we form a part

"Truly, in times of public distress or excitement, the salt of the earth are those who hold on to themselves; who keep their calmness and balance of mind, trying to see things in their true proportions, undistorted by possessions

"The cardinal virtues—justice, prudence, temperance, and fortitude—are not evanescent nor can they ever become obsolete Above all, let us bear in mind that a good citizen's first duty—mark you, by no means his only but his first duty—the public is to preserve unvarnished his own moral integrity."

These are lofty sentiments. Had one not noted that they were ascribed to Dr. Lowell by the newspapers, one might have imagined that they had been voiced by Plato, Seneca, or Marcus Aurelius. Let us forget, however, this same Dr. Lowell was the leading member of the committee whose report sent Sacco and Vanzetti to the electric chair.

Here was his great opportunity to appear veritably the "salt of the earth," keeping his "calmness and balance of mind," and "preserving unvarnished his own moral integrity." How well did he measure up to the ideals he now extols?

The dean of American philosophers, a man certainly of greater intellectual eminence than Dr. Lowell, expressed his opinion thereupon in the New Republic of Nov. 23, 1927. In a profound and searching article on the psychology of the Lowell report, John Dewey presented his final estimate in the following words:

"One is humiliated profoundly at the revelation of an attitude which, it is submitted, the record amply sets forth, the record placed before the bar of history. The sense of humiliation is akin to that of guilt, as if for a share in permitting such a state of mind as is exhibited in the record to develop in a country that professes respect for justice and devotion to fraternity and equality."

We have no space here to go into details of the mental attitudes revealed by the Lowell report, but we may present a representative example of the "unvarnished mental integrity" as exhibited in the handling of Sacco's alibi.

Sacco claimed that he had been in Boston on April 15, 1920, the day of the murders, and hence could not have shot anybody in South Braintree. Two supporters of his alibi were Felice Guadagni and Albert Bosco.

They stated that they remembered having seen Sacco in Boston on April 15 and identified the day because it was that upon which a dinner had been given to Mr. Williams of the Boston Transcript.

Dr. Stratton of the Lowell committee communicated with Mr. Williams and the latter told him that the dinner took place on May 13, 1920, and that there was only one dinner.

The Lowell committee believed that it had blasted Sacco's alibi. Members suddenly called Guadagni and Bosco before them and asked these men if they felt sure that the dinner took place on April 15. Both reiterated their certainty that it did. Then the Lowell committee triumphantly put before them Mr. Williams' statement that the dinner took place on May 13.

But the men remained firm. They furnished copies of their paper, *La Notizia*, of April 16, 1920, and it carried an article describing the dinner to Mr. Williams. The latter then admitted that his memory had been defective and that there had been two din-

ners—one on April 15, as Guadagni and Bosco had contended.

The case of the Lowell committee against Sacco's alibi thus fell ignominiously to the ground. Did the Lowell report reveal this fact? It did not. It was smoked out by Dr. Lowell by the famous New York lawyers who edited the report of the trial for Henry Holt.

On Dec. 8, 1928, more than a year after the men had been electrocuted, he confessed to these editors that the facts were as set forth above. In his frigidly impartial history of this famous case, Osmond K. Fraenkel comments on the above incident as follows:

"It is difficult to escape the conclusion that in its treatment of Sacco's alibi the Lowell committee was not actuated by the impartiality and open-mindedness which the outside world had a right to expect. . . . The conduct of the chairman of the committee, President Lowell, in his conduct of the examination and in his colloquies with counsel, seems that of a partisan seeking to vindicate a position, rather than that of an impartial investigator."

REBUILDING AMERICA

IT IS gratifying to learn that the government proposes to ignore timid advice and launch its \$3,000,000,000 public works program under full steam as provided for in Section 2 of the recovery act.

Budget worries in connection with financing the bonds can be met by the next congress if necessary. Should present taxes prove inadequate, new revenues can be raised, as Senator Edward P. Costigan suggests, by increasing the estate and gift taxes to bring in as much as \$100,000,000 a year.

"A schedule of graduated taxes upon estates and gifts running up to 75 per cent of estates and up to 56 per cent of gifts in excess of \$50,000,000 will prove ample, if other taxes lag, to insure revenue to carry out the public works program congress has ordered," said Senator Costigan.

Quite as gratifying are evidences that this great program is to be something more than a wild spending bee. Wisely, Budget Director Lewis Douglas is scanning state projects so that federal money will be loaned only to states in sound financial condition.

Wisely, President Roosevelt is insisting that only socially useful projects be undertaken. More important than any consideration is a determination that this vast project be directed to rebuild the republic's physical plant to conform to changing national ideals.

If this is done, every public dollar spent will be a seed that will flower into many dollars of private spending.

The amazing migration of new families back to the soil in the last three years is too significant a trend to ignore. Congress sensed the force of this land hunger by setting aside \$25,000,000 to settle people on subsistence farms.

Roads, bridges, power plants, transmission lines and housing projects should be built with this movement away from overcrowded cities in mind. Conservation, erosion control, reclamation, and other works should be started with a view toward meeting the needs of a decentralized industrial system.

Before very long one of these industrialists is going to collide head-on with the industrial recovery law—and then we shall see just how progressive our administration really is.

Cities should be made more accessible to auto travel; the grandiose raising of skyscrapers abandoned; the mass housing of workers in downtown tenements avoided.

In this way we shall be spending not only to make wages, but to open new social frontiers.

IMAGINARY FOES

THE chief flaw in the armor of American pacifism is its readiness to joust with imaginary foes, instead of real ones. Our pacifists crusade for petty and imaginary causes with the same vigor that marks their attacks on the munition makers, the ultramilitarists, and the flag-waving patriotic societies.

This is a mistake. If the pacifists hope to weed out the evils of militarism, they should concentrate on major issues and stop wasting their ammunition on a host of petty causes.

The fact that they have not done so explains why the pacifist movement has not made more headway in this country.

Typical of these crusades against imaginary foes is the present fight the Women's International League is making against use of army officers to direct the work of the civilian conservation corps.

In a letter to Conservation Director Robert Fechner, the league makes a stern protest against this practice. It contends that the army officers are unequipped to lead civilians in peaceful activities, that the army will take advantage of the opportunity to glorify itself and to make militarists out of the 250,000 youths in the C. C. C. and that civilians should be placed in authority in the forest camps. It particularly calls for civilians to train the C. C. C. in citizenship.

In this case it seems that the Women's International League is jousting with an imaginary foe.

Certainly, civilian leadership of civilians is better—provided such leadership is readily available.

But it would have cost Uncle Sam millions of dollars to set up a separate organization to handle the C. C. C. It would have required thousands of trained civilian leaders, equipment, and camps, to say nothing of food and clothing.

All this has been provided by the army at little extra cost. Six thousand officers—trained to handle large bodies of men—have been assigned to the forest army to supervise its work.

Army camps and equipment have been used, thus saving the government further millions of dollars.

To the league's fears that the army will try to militarize the C. C. C., they seem to be unjustified. Perhaps the army has that idea in mind, but certainly it is far from the thought of President Roosevelt and administration leaders. In fact, the army has been warned to restrict all drills to minimum, just enough to establish a crude discipline. And, so far as is known, the army faithfully has carried out these orders.

Instead of censure an observer would think that the army is deserving of praise for the efficient way it has whipped the forest conservation corps into shape.

Within a few weeks, 250,000 youths have been recruited from the cities and towns of America, clothed and trained and distributed among the various forests for six months of healthful and much-needed work.

That is an achievement that even pacifists should not hesitate to praise.

RUSSIA'S COURSE AT LONDON

WHEN you consider the abortive London conference, it becomes evident that one nation really did accomplish something defi-

THE INDIANAPOLIS TIMES

nite there. That nation is that international outcast, Soviet Russia.

Russia had precious little interest in currency stabilization measures, and not much more interest in trade embargoes or tariff agreements.

But while the other nations involved were jockeying fruitlessly for advantage on those points, the Russians settled their quarrel with England, effected a new pact smoothing out a troubled situation along their southwestern frontier, and came within shouting distance of recognition by the United States.

For the other delegates the conference was little more than a trip to London, a chance to do some debating and an opportunity to meet lots of interesting people.

For the Russians, however, it was a big opportunity—and the Russians seem to have made the most of it.

LABOR'S RIGHTS TESTED

ONE of the things the events of the summer are bound to show us is just how progressive—or, if you prefer the word, how radical—the national administration really is.

So far, its actions and policies ought to satisfy the most liberal of citizens. It has put progressives in important government positions. It has gone ahead with such progressive programs as government operation of Muscle Shoals.

Most important of all, it has erected a vast framework which is the very essence of daring progressivism for control of industry, expansion of employment and raising wages and commodity prices.

What remains to be seen is how it will act under that framework.

The tip-off on this is very likely to come in connection with the administration's attitude toward organized labor under the industrial control law.

In its outlines, that law is all that the most ardent progressive could desire. Every worker is to be free to join a labor union of his own choosing.

He is to get direct representation in all disputes over pay, hours, and other working conditions, before a government board, empowered to make its rulings stick.

But there are rumblings along the horizon.

Some of the very largest industries in the country never have had any use for organized labor, and spokesmen for certain of these industries have been hinting pretty broadly that they don't propose to change their policy now, no matter what the new law says.

Some of them are working feverishly to organize dummy company unions, by means of which they could thwart their employees' desire for self-expression in labor disputes. Others are evicting employees who join unions and blacklisting men who try to organize them.

Roads, bridges, power plants, transmission lines and housing projects should be built with this movement away from overcrowded cities in mind. Conservation, erosion control, reclamation, and other works should be started with a view toward meeting the needs of a decentralized industrial system.

Before very long one of these industrialists is going to collide head-on with the industrial recovery law—and then we shall see just how progressive our administration really is.

Cities should be made more accessible to auto travel; the grandiose raising of skyscrapers abandoned; the mass housing of workers in downtown tenements avoided.

In this way we shall be spending not only to make wages, but to open new social frontiers.

IMAGINARY FOES

THE chief flaw in the armor of American pacifism is its readiness to joust with imaginary foes, instead of real ones. Our pacifists crusade for petty and imaginary causes with the same vigor that marks their attacks on the munition makers, the ultramilitarists, and the flag-waving patriotic societies.

This is a mistake. If the pacifists hope to weed out the evils of militarism, they should concentrate on major issues and stop wasting their ammunition on a host of petty causes.

The fact that they have not done so explains why the pacifist movement has not made more headway in this country.

Typical of these crusades against imaginary foes is the present fight the Women's International League is making against use of army officers to direct the work of the civilian conservation corps.

In a letter to Conservation Director Robert Fechner, the league makes a stern protest against this practice. It contends that the army officers are unequipped to lead civilians in peaceful activities, that the army will take advantage of the opportunity to glorify itself and to make militarists out of the 250,000 youths in the C. C. C. and that civilians should be placed in authority in the forest camps. It particularly calls for civilians to train the C. C. C. in citizenship.

In this case it seems that the Women's International League is jousting with an imaginary foe.

Certainly, civilian leadership of civilians is better—provided such leadership is readily available.

But it would have cost Uncle Sam millions of dollars to set up a separate organization to handle the C. C. C. It would have required thousands of trained civilian leaders, equipment, and camps, to say nothing of food and clothing.

All this has been provided by the army at little extra cost. Six thousand officers—trained to handle large bodies of men—have been assigned to the forest army to supervise its work.

To the league's fears that the army will try to militarize the C. C. C., they seem to be unjustified. Perhaps the army has that idea in mind, but certainly it is far from the thought of President Roosevelt and administration leaders. In fact, the army has been warned to restrict all drills to minimum, just enough to establish a crude discipline. And, so far as is known, the army faithfully has carried out these orders.

Instead of censure an observer would think that the army is deserving of praise for the efficient way it has whipped the forest conservation corps into shape.

Within a few weeks, 250,000 youths have been recruited from the cities and towns of America, clothed and trained and distributed among the various forests for six months of healthful and much-needed work.

That is an achievement that even pacifists should not hesitate to praise.

RUSSIA'S COURSE AT LONDON

WHEN you consider the abortive London conference, it becomes evident that one nation really did accomplish something defi-



The Message Center

I wholly disapprove of what you say and will defend to the death your right to say it.—Voltaire

Sound Sense

By F. M. Young.

Here is a snappy slogan for a newspaper, taken from the Rockport (Tex.) Transcript, edition of June 11, 1870:

"Late to bed and early to rise.
Never get tight—and advertise."

effort to nationalize children." a Socialistic measure," "a blow at the home," and "opposed to the ideals of our American Constitution."

Such a report is almost unbelievable.

The American Bar is respected by reason of the high standards it has made for human liberty. The names of Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln will be green in the memory of mankind so long as men anywhere love liberty.

In times like these, when the nation is in greater danger than it was during the war, the American Bar has a duty to perform. In other eras it struggled for human rights, it furnished the leadership. Its history is glorious by reason thereof.

Is it possible that in the present crisis it will be found wanting? Is it possible that President Martin is representative of the American